LEGISLATIVE REPORT

SUBJECT: State Budget - NCLB

REFERENCES: Act 200
HB 200, HD 1, SD 1, CD 1, Part III, Section 43

ACTION REQUESTED: Comprehensive yearly assessment of the DOE's efforts towards meeting and maintaining compliance with the NCLB Act of 2001. Further requires identified needs of funding, positions, organizational schemes, facilities and equipment for compliance.

DOE REPORT: The Department contracted MGT of America and the Council of Chief School State School Officers to conduct "an organizational, operational, and resource assessment related to maximizing implementation of NCLB." A Diagnostic Report was submitted to the Department in August, 2003, on the findings, commendations and recommendations.

The recommendations are listed in the attached summary, with particular attention to additional resources needed to address the recommendations.

Reference: Maximizing Implementation of No Child Left Behind, Diagnostic Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $ Existing Budget (FY06)</th>
<th>Gen $ Existing Budget (FY04)</th>
<th>Add $ Needed (FY05)</th>
<th>Total $ Needed (d+r+f)</th>
<th>How Funds are to be Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>Limit the number of standards tested.</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>Per OCISS-IBS: Contract with McREL to assist in refining standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Create a strategic plan to implement the Performance Standards Review Commission; create a tracking system to report on the status of implementing the recommendations.</td>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS: Strategic Plan has been developed. OCISS to be reporting quarterly updates to the Board of Education Regular Education Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Create a unified standards implementation document which provides a clear definition of all stakeholder roles.</td>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS: Completed. Included in the Strategic Implementation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Provide additional training to support instructional leaders.</td>
<td>OCISS-PDER/PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,300,500</td>
<td>2,300,500</td>
<td>Per OCISS-PDER: Professional development: $1,986,500 for academic coaching; $225,000 for administrative and teacher teams; and $50,000 for administrators to be leadership coaches for AYP schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Provide additional training to support instructional leaders.</td>
<td>OCISS-PDER/PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Per PEB: A new position will be needed to provide statewide support of curriculum leaders at state, district, complex, and school levels, in the proper use of databases containing student assessment data. Training will incorporate use of existing data sources and analytical tools as well as the student tracking system under development and the future general statewide student database system. Expand on staff development to include training in the writing of test items, development of scoring rubrics, and scoring of open-ended response items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Create a monitoring system for implementation of a standards-based curriculum.</td>
<td>OITS/PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Per PEB: Contract a vendor to develop a monitoring system plan and a budget proposal for enabling implementation of the plan for a monitoring system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Create a monitoring system for implementation of a standards-based curriculum.</td>
<td>OITS/PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Per OITS-ITB (Allan): 1) Establish detailed requirements for a monitoring system for implementation of standards-based curriculum; 2) Design and pilot the system. (The complexity of this effort would vary widely depending on the approach selected, i.e., would it be based on classroom-by-classroom reporting at the subject area level or the standards item level or ? And what would be the frequency of data collection – daily, weekly, monthly, etc.) Assuming a relatively low complexity approach, estimates are .75 FTE from OITS plus .75 FTE from PEB = 1.5 FTE plus $75,000 in &quot;R&quot; funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Ensure a wider representation of qualified staff in the development of any revised academic content standards, including assessment, ESL staff, and SALS.</td>
<td>OCISS (ISS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-IBS: ISB will continue to develop resources that will help schools and teachers implement standards-based education. A wider representation of qualified staff will be included in future development efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Encourage schools to use state-developed criteria for purchasing school-based instructional programs that are used and are in alignment with an analysis of the school's data.</td>
<td>OCISS (ATR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ATR: Develop a user-friendly database that includes a rubric and criteria for selection of resources as well as helps schools collect data for school accountability and review of materials purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>Strengthen communication with Board of Regents and higher education staff to ensure instructional strategies and theories taught in higher education support the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards in the K-12 system.</td>
<td>OCISS/OHR/TECC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCR: The Teacher Education Coordinating Committee meets six times a year to focus on the alignment of programs and the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards through discussions on the State Accreditation of Teacher Education Programs, Hawaii Teaching Standards, K-12 Hawaii Content and Performance Standards and teacher employment needs of the DOE. There are no federal dollars attached to this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Strengthen communication with Board of Regents and higher education staff to ensure instructional strategies and theories taught in higher education support the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards in the K-12 system.</td>
<td>OCISS/OHR/TECC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCR: The Teacher Education Coordinating Committee meets six times a year to focus on the alignment of programs and the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards through discussions on the State Accreditation of Teacher Education Programs, Hawaii Teaching Standards, K-12 Hawaii Content and Performance Standards and teacher employment needs of the DOE. There are no federal dollars attached to this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>MGT Study Recommendation Description</td>
<td>DOE Office</td>
<td>Fed $ Existing Budget (FY04) (d)</td>
<td>Gen $ Existing Budget (FY04) (e)</td>
<td>Addl $ Needed (FY05) (f)</td>
<td>Total $ Needed (d+e+f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Strengthen communication with Board of Regents and higher education staff to ensure instructional strategies and theories taught in higher education support the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards in the K-12 system.</td>
<td>OCISS/OHR/TECC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Funds are to be Expended**

Per TECC: The Teacher Education Coordinating Committee meets six times a year to focus on the alignment of programs and the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards through discussions on the State Accreditation of Teacher Education Programs, Hawaii Teaching Standards, K-12 Hawaii Content and Performance Standards and teacher employment needs of the DOE.

**Component 2: Accountability and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)**

| 2-1 | Assign the Director of the Planning and Evaluation Branch the key responsibility for overseeing the process for proposed changes in the State Accountability Plan. | PEB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2-2 | Continue to create an integrated accountability system that rates schools not only on AYP, but also includes factors Hawaii deems desirable (such as growth). | PEB/OITS | 0 | 0 | 120,000 | 120,000 |

**Completed.**

Per PEB: A new Evaluation Specialist II position ($95,000) will be established to provide statistical and analytical work required to examine student performance and its relation to educational and demographic factors, performance trends, and comparative analysis of schools with similar contexts. A Data Clerk position ($25,000) will be established to provide necessary support in data preparation, analysis, and report preparation.

**2-2** Continue to create an integrated accountability system that rates schools not only on AYP, but also includes factors Hawaii deems desirable (such as growth).

**2-3** Create a strategic document (including a flow chart showing specific responsibilities) which outlines the complex area staff and school responsibilities in implementing a standards-based curriculum and explains the statewide monitoring system for school improvement progress.

**Sup's Office (Pat Sasaki)** | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |

**Per Sup't's Office: Creating the strategic document should be completed internally. The $10,000 would be used to print the strategic document/flow chart.**

| 2-4 | Ensure that the Technical Advisory Committee of national experts, appointed to assist in ratifying and/or developing recommendations for improving the preliminary plan, is established and operational. | PEB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Completed.**

Per PEB: A new Evaluation Specialist II position ($95,000) will be established to provide statistical and analytical work required to examine student performance and its relation to educational and demographic factors, performance trends, and comparative analysis of schools with similar contexts. A Data Clerk position ($25,000) will be established to provide necessary support in data preparation, analysis, and report preparation.

| 2-5 | Establish a process to hold charter schools to the same accountability system as other schools, and amend this process into the Accountability Plan. | PEB | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Completed. Included in Accountability Plan.**

| 2-6 | Develop and implement a systematic process and supporting tools for monitoring and tracking school progress in implementing the Standards Implementation Design. | OCISS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Per OCISS: Included in school website with SID.**

| 2-7 | Provide School Assessment Liaisons and complex area staff additional training related to assessment and instruction. | OCISS/PEB | 0 | 120,000 | 50,000 | 170,000 |

**Per PEB: Conduct monthly sessions in the development and use of report cards, data analysis techniques, using personal computer software, and training in the scoring and reporting of standards-based assessments.**

| 2-7 | Provide School Assessment Liaisons and complex area staff additional training related to assessment and instruction. | OCISS/PEB | 1,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,500,000 |

**Per OCISS: OCISS will need to overtly address the integration of assessment and instruction strategies in the Standard Toolkit workshops.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $ Existing Budget (FY04) (d)</th>
<th>Gen $ Existing Budget (FY04) (e)</th>
<th>Addl $ Needed (FY) (f)</th>
<th>Total $ Needed (d+e+f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>Review the responsibilities assigned to the School Renewal Specialists to ensure that their first priority is supporting schools in the implementation of the standards-based curriculum.</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>60,437</td>
<td>51,200</td>
<td>121,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>Redesign the tool kits to provide specific lesson plans for teachers to support the implementation of standards-based instruction.</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>Monitor each school's SfD progress report semi-annually, ensuring ongoing review, analysis, and feedback.</td>
<td>Complex Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per Central District, Maui Dist, and Leeward Dist CAS: 50,000 for SfD, 10,000 for additional purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>Create a formal communication plan utilizing both electronic tools and traditional memoranda to ensure that the current Accountability Plan is effectively communicated in a timely manner to all appropriate staff.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COMPONENT 2**

|                      | 1,510,000 | 680,437 | 443,200 | 2,633,637 |

**Component 3: Reporting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $ Existing Budget (FY04) (d)</th>
<th>Gen $ Existing Budget (FY04) (e)</th>
<th>Addl $ Needed (FY) (f)</th>
<th>Total $ Needed (d+e+f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Collect comprehensive data on highly qualified teachers for secondary schools and multi-level schools.</td>
<td>OHR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Continue to work with the Office of Information Technology to improve data compilation and quality.</td>
<td>OH/VOITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Add one federally-funded reporting specialist position to the Planning and Evaluation Branch.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Develop a formal NCLB reporting plan that details data sources, collection timelines, and individual responsibilities.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Include required teacher qualification data, information on public school choice transfers, and supplemental educational services data in the State Summary Report.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>Provide definitions and analyses to explain performance data included in the State Summary Report.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Per Hilo/Laupahoehoe/Waiakea CAS: Continued monitoring of funds in relation to the school's SfD and complex area initiatives; 4,000 in general funds currently budgeted; additional 4,000 needed for travel, per diem, etc. - Per Baldwin/Makawao/Maui High CAS: For central Maui, 4,719 in general funds are used for supplies, mileage, and air/ground transportation. - Per Central District CAS: 7,200 in general funds currently budgeted; additional $10,800 needed to address NCLB, SB Education, Critical Ally Teams, and staff development workshops (school specific, complex-wide, statewide) - Per Kauai District Sup't: 3,300 in general funds ($1,100 per SRS) currently budgeted; additional 12,000 needed ($4,000 per SRS), as Neighbor Islands have more challenges dealing with travel costs (airline, per diem, etc.). - Per Leeward District CAS: $10,681 in general funds currently budgeted; additional $18,000 needed to support Standard Base Education, NCLB, Complex Area Teams, staff development to impact student achievement.

- Per Honolulu District CAS: $16,000 in general funds currently budgeted for SRS' and RTs for mileage, supplies, equipment contracts; SRS are given separate allocations using federal Title II funds at the discretion of the respective CAS and the complex principals. - Per Windward Dist CAS: $10,637 in general funds currently budgeted; 7,200 additional funds needed to address NCLB, SB Education, Critical Ally Teams and staff development workshops. - Per Maui Dist CAS: $10,000 in federal funds to continue. - Per Kauai/Kauaipahoa CAS: $4,000 in general funds currently budgeted; additional $10,000 for airline, car coupons (large geographical area), per diem.

Per OCISS-ISB: The Toolkits presently include sample instructional strategies and assessment tasks. Per OITS-ISB: Establish Data Steward program. 0.5 FTE each from OHR, OBS, OCISS, and OITS for a total of 2.0 FTE.

Per PEB: A new NCLB Analyst position will be needed to perform statistical and analytical work mandated by the NCLB Act.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$$ Existing Budget (FY04) (d)</th>
<th>Gen $$$ Existing Budget (FY04) (e)</th>
<th>Addl $$$ Needed (FY05) (f)</th>
<th>Total $$$ Needed (d+e+f)</th>
<th>How Funds are to be Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>Develop a format for NCLB reporting to the Secretary of Education.</td>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS: Format for submittal of data provided by US Department of Education on an on-going basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>Initiate cross training in reporting responsibilities for all staff associated with NCLB data compilation and reporting.</td>
<td>OHR/OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OHR: Reporting is coordinated through the Deputy Superintendent's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>Initiate cross training in reporting responsibilities for all staff associated with NCLB data compilation and reporting.</td>
<td>OHR/OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS: Reporting is coordinated through the Deputy Superintendent's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMPONENT 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>381,000</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4: Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>Require the use of Critical Ally Teams at all low-performing schools.</td>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>Strengthen training opportunities for Critical Ally Teams.</td>
<td>OCISS (SCL)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-SCL: Critical Ally Team Academies to build the competencies of SRSs and Resource Teachers to utilize data, conduct monitoring activities, provide instructional support through training, demonstration teaching, and follow-up activities such as coaching, direct assistance, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>Standardize reporting and monitoring processes and procedures for Critical Ally Teams.</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,526</td>
<td>33,526</td>
<td>-Per Maui CAS: Done. -Per Central Distr CAS: Additional $28,526 not budgeted and needed for reporting and monitoring of procedures are in place for the “CAT” Teams. - continued monitoring necessary. -Per Maui Distr CAS: $5,000 in federal funds currently budgeted and will continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMPONENT 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53,526</td>
<td>83,526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 5: School Support and Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Explore the potential of offering financial incentives to teachers in low-performing schools where significant progress has been made.</td>
<td>OHR</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
<td>Per OHR: Stipends totalling $500,000 are allocated for teachers; $180,000 are allocated to Educational Assistants to complete the program. Additional funds of $500,000 can be used to expand the existing program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMPONENT 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 6: Student Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Include assessment participation criteria for migratory or otherwise mobile students as defined under Title I in the state’s Student Participation Information document.</td>
<td>OCISS (Migrant Ed)</td>
<td>12,276</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,276</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ISB: The budgeted amount reflects the cost of maintaining the state’s migratory education student record system. The formula grant Hawaii receives adequately supports this effort at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Ensure that all Complex Area Superintendents and staff responsible for use of assessment results implement a systematic monitoring protocol.</td>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS: Need to create NCLB State Monitor position to ensure systematic oversight for controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Ensure the timely completion of the SALs evaluation and implement appropriate recommendations to continue the state’s focus on aligning local and state assessment.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>Per PEB: Contractor has started evaluation of the SAL program and has indicated that projected deadlines are reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Review the results of the SALs assessment and modify the classroom teacher support strategies accordingly.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>Per PEB: Recommendations from the evaluation will be reviewed and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Establish a date for concluding the standards-based report card piloting activity and set a tentative implementation date for implementation throughout the state.</td>
<td>OCISS/PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recom. No.</td>
<td>MGT Study Recommendation Description</td>
<td>DOE Office</td>
<td>Fed $</td>
<td>Gen $</td>
<td>Add $ Needed</td>
<td>Total $ Needed</td>
<td>How Funds are to be Expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Conduct, through the Technical Advisory Committee, a detailed professional analysis of student assessment in Hawaii, including the number and type of test items and administration protocol.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>Per PEB: A technical advisory committee comprised of nationally recognized experts in testing and related fields has been created and had its first meeting. They will meet quarterly to advise the department of test reliability and validity, curricular alignment, test equating, and other topics deemed necessary by the Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Review the NEP, ESL, and special education student alternative assessments used by other states and consider adapting them for use in Hawaii.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>Per PEB: Review existing alternate assessment instruments as well as those in other jurisdictions, modify as necessary to properly align with Hawaii's standards and expectations, pilot test, analyze and refine instrument, and administer final version in Spring 2005.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL COMPONENT 6 44,276 49,000 295,000 388,276

Component 7: Teacher Qualifications

| 7-1       | Ensure that recruitment plans are consistent with defined personnel needs.                             | OHR        | 0     | 57,000 | 40,000       | 97,000         | Per OHR: To expand recruitment of highly qualified personnel for shortage areas.                                        |
| 7-2       | Ensure that the automated teacher database contains all information needed on Hawaii's teaching force and that Complex Area Superintendents and Principals can access appropriate components of this database. | OHR/OITS   | 0     | 0      | 137,500      | 137,500        | Per OITS-ISSB (Allan): Integrate Teacher Qualification data from Personnel database with Teaching Assignment data from local SIS database at each school. New SIS will eventually simplify this, but an interim solution is required. Estimate is 1.75 FTE, plus $50,000 in "B" funds. |

TOTAL COMPONENT 7 0 57,000 277,500 334,500

Component 8: Paraprofessional Qualifications

| 8-1       | Develop a statewide paraprofessional database in the Department of Education's Office of Human Resources. | OHR        | 0     | 0      | 100,000      | 100,000        | Per OHR: Development of automated system.                                                                                      |
| 8-2       | Develop a paraprofessional compensation scale, which provides differentiated levels of compensation for paraprofessionals who obtain two years of postsecondary education coursework. | OHR        | 0     | 0      | 13,000,000  | 13,000,000     | Per OHR: Develop and implement a career ladder for Educational Assistants to recognize the new requirements of the job. |
| 8-3       | Merge all professional development and training coordination for paraprofessionals in the Office of Human Resources. | OHR        | 0     | 0      | 500,000      | 500,000        | Per OHR: Develop a unit to oversee the development and implementation of a comprehensive professional development program for all employees. |

TOTAL COMPONENT 8 0 0 13,600,000 13,600,000

Component 9: Reading First/Early Reading First Programs

<p>| 9-1       | Increase efforts to train teachers in research-based reading improvement strategies.                   | OCISS (ISB/ATR) | 19,000,000 | 155,000 | 500,000 | 19,855,000 | Per OCISS-ISR: First Coaches training and Teacher Reading Academies are being provided to build capacity at the complex and school level. As Complex coaches and trainers are developed, they will be able to train more classroom teachers. |
| 9-2       | Increase efforts to train teachers in research-based reading improvement strategies.                   | OCISS (ATR/ISB) | 88,000   | 32,253  | 21,000   | 141,253     | Per OCISS-ATR: Subscribe to statewide online curriculum resources and develop staff development modules that include online, onsite and video conferencing options. |
| 9-2       | Formalize and consolidate the process of selecting research-based reading instruction materials.          | OCISS (ISB)     | 0       | 59,000  | 0        | 59,000      | Per OCISS-ISR: Instructional Services Branch has conducted an Instructional Materials Review of elementary instructional materials, including reading and the reviews are posted on the web for school use. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-3</td>
<td>Aggressively seek opportunities to improve pre-school reading skills.</td>
<td>OCSS (SSS/SES)</td>
<td>1,027,363</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,027,363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COMPONENT 9**

20,115,363 246,253 521,000 20,882,616

**How Funds are to be Expended**

Per OCSS-SSS/SES: To fund pre-school resource teacher positions in each of the districts and a resource teacher/coordinator at the state level. Funds are also expended to provide FAPE to pre-school students with disabilities under the IDEA and to plan for implementation of recommendation 9-3.

**Component 10: Transferability (No funding items)**

**Component 11: Data Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-1</td>
<td>Increase the number of relevant data sources currently available within the Department of Education.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OITS-SSS/IRM (Karl): Begin implementation of SIS, develop system requirements for CSSS and ISSS. Total system costs to exceed $30 mil (SIS - $13.5 mil, CSSS - $7.75 mil, ISSS - $8.75 mil). Costs reflected are the $2.5 mil for SIS and $300,000 each for CSSS & ISSS requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-2</td>
<td>Continue to expand efforts to integrate data &quot;silos.&quot;</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>304,000</td>
<td>304,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OITS-SSB (Allan): Develop first phase of Enterprise Data Warehouse with data extraction, cleansing and loading from DOE Operational Systems. 2.5 FTE and $200,000 in "B" funds needed for Enterprise Data Warehouse project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-3</td>
<td>Develop a systemwide project management policy regarding data collection and reporting to ensure data consistency.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>168,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OITS-SSS (Allan): 1) Complete implementation of capabilities to allow DOE-wide access to Project Management server-based tools; 2) Provide Project Management training to cadres of staff in each organization. The tasks and $$ are based on one possible interpretation of the MGT recommendation as "Implement Project Management discipline within the DOE." This may be too large an interpretation. A simpler interpretation might be just to develop policies regarding data collection and reporting. Estimate using the "larger" interpretation is 1.0 FTE to administer and $125,000 contracted training for FY05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-4</td>
<td>Initiate professional development to promote the use of integrated data sources to drive programmatic decisions.</td>
<td>OCSS (SCL)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OCSS-SCL: Training for State and Complex Area Critical Self, Principals, etc. in program and training evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-5</td>
<td>Initiate cross-training of DOE employees in the collection and reporting of data</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OITS-SSB (Allan): 1) Develop cross-functional Data Quality & Reporting training program; 2) Conduct Pilot training in each primary functional area. 1.0 FTE + $75,000 "B" funds for cross-functional training program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-6</td>
<td>Expand efforts to secure funding for IT improvements in the public and private sectors.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OITS: Potential expansion of: 1) direct licensing of our own products in partnership with vendors as we did with Mesa Unified School District; and 2) relationship with private 501c(3)s to gain their support for funding, as well as establish some kind of website for direct donations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-7</td>
<td>Seek stakeholder input regarding needed data sources and other data management issues.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OITS-IRM (Tom): Development of information, systems and technical architectures based upon information needs identified in the business architecture. Consultant development for metrics on IT effectiveness in relation to I.T. plan. Combined with Recommendation 11-8 and 11-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-8</td>
<td>Develop a formalized Technology Plan to guide the implementation of data management improvements.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TOTAL COMPONENT 11**

160,000 2,500,000 1,404,000 4,064,000

**Component 12: Public School Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Existing Budget (FY'04)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY'05)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (def)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-3</td>
<td>Include private transportation vendors and public transportation representatives in all transportation planning regarding public school choice.</td>
<td>OGS</td>
<td>1,596,332</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,596,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per OGS: Dependent upon approved requests. If necessary, contractors will be consulted and required services procured. Procurement process takes approximately 16-18 months to allow contractors adequate time to purchase vehicles if necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Ex. Budget (FY04) (d)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Ex. Budget (FY04) (e)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY05) (f)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (d+e+f)</th>
<th>How Funds are to be Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-4</td>
<td>Monitor the use of transportation funds for public school choice to ensure that spending matches need, up to required levels.</td>
<td>OBS</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>Per OBS: Current accounting procedures track NCLB parent mileage reimbursement. (FY03: 6,146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-5</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive facilities plan based on estimated impact of public school choice.</td>
<td>OBS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-6</td>
<td>Collect and consolidate relevant programmatic and student data on public school choice.</td>
<td>OITS (AS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OITS-AS: We have a number of standards and guidelines that need to be clearly defined in the next six months. These are infrastructure standards for networking at the school level, security and access, wireless communications, etc. Data stewards will also be established to provide ownership of the quality and integrity of the data itself in terms of consistent definitions and format. These items should be done within the current budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-7</td>
<td>Consolidate all existing policies, data, and resources regarding public school choice into one comprehensive implementation plan.</td>
<td>OITS (IRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OITS-IRM: We will be working to update Chapter 13 on geographical exceptions to incorporate NCLB public choice provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-8</td>
<td>Increase overall monitoring and evaluation of implementation efforts associated with public school choice to promote successful coordination of services and compliance with federal regulations.</td>
<td>OITS (IRM)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OITS-IRM: A tracking system to keep tabs of students moving on the basis of NCLB public school choice needs to be designed and implemented, first within the legacy student information system, then within the new SIS that the DOE will be transitioning to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-9</td>
<td>Increase communication of eligibility requirements and availability of public school choice via the Office of Communications.</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per Communications Office: The current system will gear-up to communicate the GE process for NCLB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-10</td>
<td>Provide additional support to the Office of Communications to facilitate improved communication of public school choice options.</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per Communications Office: The current system will gear-up to communicate the GE process for NCLB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COMPONENT 12**

1,596,952 0 0 1,596,952

**Component 13: Professional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$ Ex. Budget (FY04) (d)</th>
<th>Gen $$ Ex. Budget (FY04) (e)</th>
<th>Addl $$ Needed (FY05) (f)</th>
<th>Total $$ Needed (d+e+f)</th>
<th>How Funds are to be Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-1</td>
<td>Continue to focus on the statewide plan for professional development. Each level of the organization must understand its role in achieving highly qualified staff.</td>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>13,600,000</td>
<td>1,139,823</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,739,823</td>
<td>Per OCISS: On-going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>Consolidate all professional development activities within the Office of Human Resources.</td>
<td>OH-R/Supt Ofc</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OH-R: Should be determined by Superintendent's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-3</td>
<td>Charter a state, complex area, and building-level professional development team to coordinate and evaluate professional development across all programs and levels of the organization.</td>
<td>OCISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS: Learning Catalog completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-4</td>
<td>Continue to provide mentoring support to new teachers.</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>182,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>182,210</td>
<td>One mentor is established for every five new teachers hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-5</td>
<td>Consider developing a statewide &quot;grow your own&quot; program to identify and support students and staff that want to teach and become principals.</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB/PDERI)/OH-R</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ISB: The DOE is working with Honolulu Community College to implement a Teacher Cadet program. Funds will be used for planning and training in 10 pilot schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recom. No.</td>
<td>MGT Study Recommendation Description</td>
<td>DOE Office</td>
<td>Fed $ Existing Budget (FY'04) (d)</td>
<td>Gen $ Existing Budget (FY'04) (e)</td>
<td>Add $ Needed (FY'05) (f)</td>
<td>Total $ Needed (d+e+f)</td>
<td>How Funds are to be Expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-5</td>
<td>Consider developing a statewide &quot;grow your own&quot; program to identify and support students and staff that want to teach and become principals</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB/PERI) OHR</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-PERI: Course development for master's degree program leading into administration. Travel for neighbor island participants to attend classes (combination of face-to-face and video conferencing interaction).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-5</td>
<td>Consider developing a statewide &quot;grow your own&quot; program to identify and support students and staff that want to teach and become principals</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB/PERI) OHR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>Per OHR (Fay hel): Expand the existing &quot;Cadet Program-Summer Journey&quot; to various complexes. Currently, program is implemented on the Waianea Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-5</td>
<td>Consider developing a statewide &quot;grow your own&quot; program to identify and support students and staff that want to teach and become principals</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB/PERI) OHR</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230,318</td>
<td>453,318</td>
<td>Per OHR (BillAnn Noda): Federal NCLB funds currently support the Aspiring Administrator Program (AAP). AAP encourages teachers to become school administrators. The initiative includes orientations, leadership preparation training, individual contacts and counseling and recruitment on all islands. The goal is to improve the quantity and quality of applicants into the ACE certification program. The DOE has initiated the Exploration in Education program for high school students; however, there is currently no funding for this initiative. This program attracts Hawaii's brightest and best public school students to consider teaching careers in Hawaii. There is a need for an educational specialist to oversee the program, teacher training, classroom teacher positions, scholarships and materials for high school students who pursue teaching and who will commit to teach in the public schools. Currently, Campbell, Kaumuku, Kahuku, and Kapolei are committed to participating in pilot program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-6</td>
<td>Consider purchasing software designed to manage training requirements for staff</td>
<td>OCISS (ATR)</td>
<td>43,637</td>
<td>4,546</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>64,183</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ATR: Expand site license to an online course development software program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-6</td>
<td>Consider purchasing software designed to manage training requirements for staff</td>
<td>OCISS (PERI)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS-PERI: Not sure if this can be done internally. Prefer to use the same team that developed PERI website. Problems and new initiatives could be resolved quickly. Teaming more fluid within DOE rather than working with a consultant or company with a specific contract. It will depend on what the software needs to contain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COMPONENT 13**

14,967,847 | 1,174,669 | 388,818 | 15,631,134

**Component 14: Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient (LEP)**

| 14-1      | Review the results of the LAS to determine the effectiveness of services offered to LEP students | OCISS (ISB) | 16,000 | 0 | 50,000 | 66,000 | Per OCISS-ISB: The funding will be used to secure the services of an external evaluator to assist with the evaluation design, analyze LAS data, determine trends, and to recommend program improvements based on that data. |
| 14-2      | Continue to train and evaluate staff related to inputting and transmitting CSSS information. | OCISS (CSSS) | 0 | 14,000 | 0 | 14,000 | Per OCISS-CSSS: CSSS RTs trained on CSSS database. |
| 14-3      | Continue to train school staff on adapting and accommodating instructional materials so that all students can appropriately participate in the assessment system. | OCISS (SES) | 305,000 | 85,000 | 150,000 | 540,000 | Per OCISS-SES: Federal funds to have state team members attend conference on mainland, to develop curriculum and materials on differentiating instruction for all learners, to provide training on standards-based education student participation in statewide and alternate assessments, access to the general education curriculum (including differentiating instruction, one state teacher, and educational specialist). General funds for one state teacher and clerical support. Additional funds for state implementation team. |
| 14-4      | Periodically review and discuss CSSS data in the regularly scheduled meetings of the Strategic Implementation Team. | OCISS (CSSS) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Not applicable - ongoing. |
| 14-5      | Clarify the Department's operational focus and specific mission. | Supt's Office (Pat Sasaki) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Per Supt's Office: clarifying the department's operational focus and mission is an internal responsibility that should not require additional funding. |
| 14-6      | Continue to disaggregate performance data for disabled students by complex area and building levels to determine appropriate interventions for these students. | PEB | 0 | 15,000 | 55,000 | 70,000 | Per PEB: Create special versions of current student test score databases to eliminate potential FERPA violations ($55,000 Testing). To disaggregate performance data for disabled students ($15,000 Evaluation). |

**TOTAL COMPONENT 14**

321,000 | 114,000 | 255,000 | 690,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $ Existing Budget (FY04) (d)</th>
<th>Gen $ Existing Budget (FY04) (e)</th>
<th>Adtl $ Needed (FY 05) (f)</th>
<th>Total $ Needed (d+e+f)</th>
<th>How Funds are to be Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 15: Supplemental Educational Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-1</td>
<td>Aggressively recruit qualified supplemental educational service providers to increase service capacity.</td>
<td>OCISS (SPMS)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-SPMS: Newspaper ads and professional journals; review panel and advisory council cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-2</td>
<td>Maximize opportunities to provide on-line and other distance education media to provide supplemental educational services to remote locations.</td>
<td>OCISS (SPMS)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-SPMS: Funds given to OITS to provide infrastructure to set up distance education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-4</td>
<td>Continue to expand the use of CSAs to provide literacy tutoring and teacher training in this area.</td>
<td>OCISS (CES)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS: On-going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-5</td>
<td>Explore the use of CSAs to include math tutoring and teacher training in this area.</td>
<td>OCISS (CES)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS: On-going. To be implemented in Spring 2004.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-6</td>
<td>Increase communication of eligibility requirements and availability of supplemental educational services via the Office of Communications.</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per Communications Office: The current system will gear up to communicate the supplemental educational services at the local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-7</td>
<td>Provide additional support to the Office of Communications to facilitate improved communication if supplemental educational services.</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per Communications Office: The current system will gear up to communicate the supplemental educational services at the local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-10</td>
<td>Collect and consolidate relevant programmatic and student data on supplemental educational services.</td>
<td>OCISS (SPMS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per OCISS-SPMS: Part of 15-12, include in PREL's contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-11</td>
<td>Consolidate all existing policies, data, and resources regarding supplemental educational services into one comprehensive implementation plan.</td>
<td>OCISS (SPMS)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-SPMS: Contract to develop draft of procedures and FRP revisions for SES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-12</td>
<td>Increase overall monitoring and evaluation of implementation efforts associated with supplemental educational services to promote successful coordination of services and compliance with federal regulations.</td>
<td>OCISS (SPMS)</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-SPMS: Contract for services provided by PREL to monitor and evaluate SES provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMPONENT 15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component 16: Education Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>Continue to integrate technology literacy standards throughout the curricula.</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB/ATR)</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ISB: The technology literacy standards have been disseminated through professional development activities and all teachers have access to standards tools through hard copy, the web, and CD for lesson planning purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-1</td>
<td>Continue to integrate technology literacy standards throughout the curricula.</td>
<td>OCISS (ATR/ISB)</td>
<td>231,534</td>
<td>19,971</td>
<td>1,226,915</td>
<td>1,477,420</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ATR: Continue to integrate technology literacy standards throughout the curricula. A Computer Literacy Program (CLP) will be implemented for all 8th grade students by SY2005-06. Through the staff development of the CLP, teachers will be able to incorporate more technology for learning in all their classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-2</td>
<td>Continue to provide training for teachers to expand beyond using technology for strictly management functions.</td>
<td>OCISS (ISB/ATR)</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>32,641</td>
<td>941,018</td>
<td>1,108,659</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ATR: Develop training module for all content areas that integrate technology into instruction. Develop means to gather teacher best-practices and lessons to share on-line with all teachers in the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-3</td>
<td>Finalize the comprehensive state technology plan accountability baseline measures.</td>
<td>OCISS (ATR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,004</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>29,004</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ATR: Coordinate and develop with OITS to finalize accountability baseline measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-4</td>
<td>The comprehensive state technology plan should be reviewed by all complex areas and schools, and updated regularly.</td>
<td>OCISS (ATR)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,958</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>46,958</td>
<td>Per OCISS-ATR: Expand the SID content creation website to include the State &quot;Ed Tech Plan.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COMPONENT 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>377,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159,574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,247,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,785,841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 17: Student Safety and Health
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recom. No.</th>
<th>MGT Study Recommendation Description</th>
<th>DOE Office</th>
<th>Fed $$$ Existing Budget (FY04) (d)</th>
<th>Gen $$$ Existing Budget (FY04) (e)</th>
<th>Add $$$ Needed (FY05) (f)</th>
<th>Total $$$ Needed (d+e+f)</th>
<th>How Funds are to be Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-1</td>
<td>Continue to monitor school compliance in practicing emergency preparedness.</td>
<td>OBS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-2</td>
<td>Review crime and violence data regularly in the State Safety Committee.</td>
<td>OBS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COMPONENT 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Component 18: Overall Organization of the State Education Agency (SEA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-1</td>
<td>Establish an NCLB Implementation Committee under the leadership of the Deputy Superintendent to ensure that all NCLB activities are integrated and coordinated.</td>
<td>Deputy Supt.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per Deputy Supt.: Monthly meetings with Assistant Superintendents on what is/what is not working with NCLB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-2</td>
<td>Update Department of Education job descriptions to incorporate NCLB responsibilities.</td>
<td>All Offices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Per PEB: Review and update current job descriptions to include appropriate references to NCLB and incorporate the necessary roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-3</td>
<td>Clearly outline, support, communicate, and evaluate the implementation of the Strategic Implementation Plan at the complex area level.</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>On-going requirement that does not require funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-4</td>
<td>Disaggregate all performance measures for complex areas and schools.</td>
<td>PEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>Per PEB: Continue to incorporate dis-aggregation capabilities in all student test score databases and expand our training activities to include not only principals and test coordinators but also curriculum coordinators and special population needs staff such as ESL, SPED, Migrant, and Title I ($55,000 Testing). To disaggregate all performance measures for complex areas and schools ($150,000 Evaluation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-5</td>
<td>Evaluate, periodically, as part of the Strategic Implementation Plan deployment, processes that are used to identify, collect, manage, analyze, and report measurement data to ensure optimum effectiveness.</td>
<td>OITS</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Per OITS-IRM (Tom): Development of information, systems and technical architectures based upon information needs identified in the business architecture. Consultant development for metrics on I.T. effectiveness in relation to I.T. plan. Combined with Recommendation 11-7 and 11-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-6</td>
<td>Coordinate professional development activities among state, complex area, and building levels.</td>
<td>OCISS (PDERI)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,740,500</td>
<td>2,740,500</td>
<td>Per OCISS-PDERI: May need to look at current spending. Is it targeted to meet the needs of low-performing schools? Is it making an impact? Based on the Educational Audits, there may be a need to put more money into Corrective Action Schools if non-Title I schools do not meet AYP. The $2.7 mill reflects the Supplementary Budget requested for FY05. Not sure what the total amount that is expended statewide for professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-7</td>
<td>Create a process that would develop professional goals for all staff.</td>
<td>OHR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>Per OHR: Development of a comprehensive training program for all employees of the Department with identified skills, competencies, and standards of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL COMPONENT 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>3,375,500</td>
<td>3,825,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,115,972</td>
<td>5,666,733</td>
<td>26,378,777</td>
<td>71,161,482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION

In March 2003, the Hawaii Department of Education contracted with the Council of Chief State School Officers and MGT of America, Inc., to conduct An Organizational, Operational, and Resource Assessment Related to Maximizing Implementation of No Child Left Behind. The three part project, addressing Hawaii’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) implementation process and activities, was designed to identify agency strengths and weaknesses, and to produce recommendations to support the effective implementation of NCLB requirements.

Subsequently, a review process was initiated in accordance with the CCSSO/MGT proposal, which stated:

- Content area experts, including former education advisor to President Bush, Sandy Kress, will provide technical assistance to the Department of Education to promote the understanding and effective navigation of key state issues in Component I and throughout the project.

- The organization, operational, and resource assessment comprising Component II will incorporate comprehensive interview, observation, and data collection methods to provide the Department of Education with a clear understanding of current status and key issues affecting the implementation of NCLB in the State of Hawaii. The resulting diagnostic report will reflect Hawaii’s current capacity to meet NCLB requirements and will serve as the basis for subsequent implementation planning. (Current Document)

- The project will culminate in Component III with the synthesis of all information and analyses to lead to a comprehensive plan for the implementation of NCLB in Hawaii. State education officials, MGT, and CCSSO staff will combine internal and external perspectives to identify key issues and resources needed and develop specific strategies for policy implementation in the state. The resulting action plan will serve as a blueprint for initial NCLB implementation as well as future monitoring and evaluation. (August 2003)

Each component of the overall process was designed to result in specific outcomes for the Hawaii Department of Education. Component I was intended to cultivate a fundamental understanding of the requirements and initial issues as well as a self-assessment for NCLB. Component II produced this Diagnostic Report that describes in detail the state’s readiness to meet federal requirements. The NCLB strategic planning session in Component III will assist Hawaii officials to use new understanding of issues and current status to effectively comply with, and gain full benefit from the new federal law.
1.1 **Review Methodology**

The methodology CCSSO/MGT used to prepare for and conduct the assessment is described in this section. Our methodology primarily involved a focused use of indicators and rubrics following the analysis of both existing data and new information obtained through various means of employee input. Each strategy we used is described below.

**Existing Reports and Data Sources**

During the period between project initiation and beginning our on-site review, we simultaneously conducted many activities. Among these activities were the identification and collection of existing reports and data sources that provided us with available recent information related to the various functions and operations associated with NCLB implementation.

Examples of materials requested include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Hawaii’s Accountability Plan;
- Hawaii’s Strategic Implementation Plan;
- state content standards;
- NCLB budget information;
- professional development information;
- teacher training, evaluation and certification information; and
- individual functional area plans for implementing the requirements of NCLB.

A complete list of materials obtained for the review is provided in Appendix A of this report.

**Self-Assessment Survey**

To secure the input of Hawaii Department of Education (DOE) employees, the *State Education Agency Self-Assessment On Implementing The No Child Left Behind Act* was disseminated to all senior staff. The information resulting from this survey was used to focus the assessment and is cited throughout this report. Complete survey results are provided in Appendix B.

**Conducting the On-Site Diagnostic Review**

During the week of May 19 - 22, 2003, the CCSSO/MGT team conducted the on-site diagnostic review. As part of our on-site review, we examined implementation of 18 components of the *No Child Left Behind Act* using a set of quality indicators and rubrics. Our on-site review included meetings with appropriate stakeholders, and analyses of documentation provided by these individuals.
## EXHIBIT 1-1
TIMELINE FOR THE DIAGNOSTIC REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>■ Finalized contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Tailored review guidelines and trained team members using</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information available on the Hawaii DOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Designed self-assessment for DOE senior staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2003</td>
<td>■ Provided surveys to the DOE for dissemination to staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19 - 22, 2003</td>
<td>Conducted on-site diagnostic review of the DOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Collected data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Interviewed staff and related stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - June, 2003</td>
<td>■ Analyzed data and information which were collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Requested additional data from the DOE and analyzed data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15 – August 11,</td>
<td>Made changes to the Draft Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.2 Overview of Diagnostic Report

The Diagnostic Report is organized into four major sections:

Section 1 – Introduction

Section 2 – Agency Strengths And Improvement Opportunities

Section 3 – Findings, Commendations, And Recommendations

Section 4 – Summary And Conclusions

Appendices
SECTION 2 – AGENCY STRENGTHS AND IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES
SECTION 2 – AGENCY STRENGTHS AND IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

This section outlines key strengths that serve as support for the NCLB implementation process, and improvement opportunities that, if not implemented, may hinder overall implementation success within the Department of Education. This section of the report summarizes major issues so that the reader can gain an initial understanding of overall conditions impacting the implementation of NCLB in Hawaii.

While it is important to determine and report current status in the implementation of NCLB, it is also necessary to point out that many of the requirements of the legislation were only recently clarified by the United States Department of Education and could not be effectively implemented. Thus, Hawaii chose to delay some implementation efforts until a clear understanding of the legislation was achieved. Indeed, the primary reason for this diagnostic review is to design a full implementation plan that would maximize the effectiveness of NCLB implementation in Hawaii’s unique state education system. In this light, the Hawaii Department of Education has done much to implement the requirements of NCLB and should be commended for its efforts to date.

2.1 Agency Strengths

The Hawaii Department of Education is unique among the states in its SEA/LEA organizational structure. This configuration allows the state to respond to the requirements of NCLB in a direct and efficient manner. One significant result of the educational structure is the ability to consolidate systemwide planning efforts. This is a significant advantage when dealing with far-reaching policies such as those required by NCLB. Capitalizing on this advantage, the Department of Education has created state-level committees and positions to plan for and manage some of the challenges resulting from the implementation of federal and state requirements.

The state has also developed standards for academic and organizational performance that are supporting the successful implementation of NCLB requirements as well as overall systemic improvement. The Hawaii Department of Education has worked extensively internally and with outside resources to create rigorous content standards in many academic areas. Further, the state’s strategic planning documents guide implementation activities systemwide.

Communication is another area where Hawaii has an advantage in the implementation of NCLB. The ability to communicate directly to schools, without navigating additional layers of bureaucracy, facilitates systemwide coordination and ease in the implementation of educational policies that other states do not have the benefit of. There also exists the ability to communicate a single, unified purpose to the public and to lawmakers, with corresponding specificity regarding the individual issues surrounding the statewide implementation of NCLB. Hawaii has used this advantage to further several areas of NCLB implementation. Examples of this include the development of comprehensive information documents to communicate information to staff and the community as well as an effective accountability Web site.
Hawaii is also adept at effectively utilizing alternative resources to facilitate educational service delivery throughout the state. Many examples of this are apparent in the state system, including the use of technology, contracting with private service vendors, and enlisting the help of community resources available among the islands. In many ways, this flexibility and openness to alternative delivery methods places Hawaii in a position to explore implementation strategies that might not be practical in other states. Certainly, the ability to adapt is rewarded in the NCLB implementation process.

2.2 Agency Improvement Opportunities

A need exists to consolidate NCLB planning efforts at the state level. The requirements of NCLB are complex and impact almost every component of the state education agency. Consequently, there must be a variety of implementation activities being conducted simultaneously to address the many requirements. While there are currently many effective implementation efforts taking place in Hawaii, the Department of Education lacks a consolidated, formal structure from which to initiate and manage these efforts. Overall, this results in an inconsistent and splintered approach to NCLB planning that is apparent throughout the agency.

Associated with the lack of focused NCLB planning is the need to improve systemic monitoring of implementation efforts across the system. Hawaii is attempting to manage many initiatives brought about by NCLB; however, there is little consistency in the monitoring of the various implementation efforts. Many important tasks necessary to the overall success of NCLB implementation are currently being conducted without formal monitoring processes in place. Some of these situations are a result of understaffing functional areas; however, several others are a result of a lack of formal, coordinated planning.

The evaluation of NCLB implementation activities is also a concern that needs to be addressed in the Department of Education. A correlated issue to planning and monitoring, the current evaluation of NCLB efforts is segmented and inconsistent. Presently, many NCLB responsibilities are being carried out without formal evaluation plans. Without a comprehensive evaluation schedule, Hawaii cannot effectively determine the operational effectiveness of programs and practices connected to NCLB implementation.

New federal requirements under NCLB have added many additional responsibilities to staff throughout the Department of Education, impacting state-level, complex area, and building employees. With additional responsibility comes the need for additional training, which is currently lacking in some areas of NCLB implementation. There are many reasons for this; lack of funding, separated staff development responsibilities, insufficient staff resources, and geographic separation are some, but it is clear that there are professional development needs within the state system that should be addressed to promote sustained success.
SECTION 3 – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section of our report examines the 18 components of NCLB we reviewed. Utilizing the diagnostic review guidelines developed for this study, the review team collected information from multiple sources on each component and conducted on-site interviews to assess organizational structure, relevant practices, and overall policy implementation. Each of the following subsections detail the results of data collection activities, interviews, and analyses conducted by the review team for the 18 components, including:

- Academic Standards
- Accountability/Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
- Reporting
- Low-Performing Schools
- School Support and Recognition
- Student Assessment
- Teacher Qualifications
- Paraprofessional Qualifications
- Reading First/Early Reading First Programs
- Transferability
- Data Management
- Public School Choice
- Professional Development
- Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
- Supplemental Educational Services
- Educational Technology
- Student Safety & Health
- Overall Organization of the SEA

The first part of each subsection contains NCLB requirements. Findings of the implementation of the 18 components are presented next so that each component of NCLB can be detailed in isolation, providing a more clear understanding of the issues affecting the implementation of each component. Implementation strengths and improvement opportunities are included, and commentary and analysis are provided to support the findings.

Each of the NCLB components are given an overall rating using the following rubric levels:

1 – Little or no development and implementation
2 – Limited development or partial implementation
3 – Fully functioning and operational level of development and implementation
4 – Exemplary level of development and implementation

The final part of each subsection is comprised of commendations and recommendations for the individual components based on information previously detailed. This part contains a listing of the most successful aspects of each component as well as
recommended strategies and actions to address needed improvements. Recommendations offered for each component should serve as the basis for systemic change and can guide the Department of Education in developing future implementation activities.

**COMPONENT 1: CHALLENGING ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

**Definition:** Federal law requires the development of academic content and achievement standards in reading, language arts, math, and science that apply to all schools and students uniformly. Reading, language arts, and math standards were mandated to be in place at the beginning of the 1997-98 school year under the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA. Rigorous standards in science must be developed by the 2005-06 school year. The state may adopt standards in other subjects as they determine necessary. (Title I, Part A, Section 1111)

In addition, the Hawaii Legislature through Act 334 SLH 1991 created the Hawaiian Commission on Performance Standards. The Commission is required to set the performance standards of achievement expected of all public school students, recommend the means to assess student attainment of these standards, and develop a school-by-school implementation model.

**Rubric Score: 2.5**

**FINDINGS**

Hawaii has been moving towards standards-based education for 10 years. The actual implementation of student standards began in 1994 with the completion of The Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS). The HCPS describe what each student in Hawaii should know and be able to do. The HCPS are based upon the state’s General Learner Outcomes (GLO).

Through a systematic process, the state has developed content standards, benchmarks, and performance standards. Below is a brief description of each:

- **Content Standards** describe what students should know and be able to do. The state has developed 10 content areas: Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Fine Arts, Health, Physical Education, World Languages, Career and Life Skills, and Educational Technology.

- **Benchmarks** were created by the state to make clear what students should know and be able to do at grade levels K-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

- **Performance Standards** answer the questions, "What does good performance look like? How good is good enough?" These standards provide concrete examples and explicit definition of how
well students must learn the material presented by content standards.

The consultant team found two key state initiatives highly supportive of the implementation of a standards-based education—the Strategic Implementation Plan and the Standards Implementation Design (SID) System. The Standards Implementation Design (SID) System is a tool that allows schools to make decisions that will lead to the highest levels of student learning, and achievement. The framework allows school officials to evaluate student achievement based upon the processes involved in teaching and learning, curriculum, school resources, and professional development. The system has been developed so that it can be adjusted to best serve the needs of students.

The SID System combines the support initiatives that are presently being used around the state, such as Title I, School-to-Work, Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program, accreditation, High Schools that Work, Drug-Free Schools, the Comprehensive Students Support System, and Focus on Learning.

Every school is required to create a Standards Implementation Action Plan. This public document outlines each school’s plan for improvement and lists goals to be achieved and how progress is to be measured. The seven parts of the SID System are integrated throughout the Action Plan.

Another key initiative supporting the successful implementation of standards-based instruction is the state’s Strategic Plan for Standards-Based Reform which centers on the implementation of Hawaii’s Content and Performance Standards. This plan is described in a September 1999 document titled, Strategic Plan for Standards-Based Reform, Report of Progress, September 1999.

The state is piloting a standards-based report card and has adopted vision statements that establish standards-based education as the foundation for improving student achievement. A review of the elementary standards-based report card shows an alignment with the state standards. Also, to the DOE’s credit, they are in their first year of conducting a performance-based teacher evaluation program that contains key requirements for implementing the Hawaii Content Performance Standards. Additionally, the state conducts a School Quality Survey which provides feedback as it relates to the performance and content standards.

The consultant team reviewed a report called A Review and Assessment of the Department of Education’s Development of Educational Standards 2001. This document is the result of a Senate resolution that was passed in the 2000 legislative session that led the State Auditor of Hawaii to hire the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) to evaluate the Department of Education’s educational standards. The review was undertaken to assess Hawaii’s standards for competency, and ensure that basic educational skills are on par with the standards of other states.

A review of the document shows that McREL evaluated the DOE’s content standards for language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies, and compared those standards with other states. McREL found that the DOE’s content standards for language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies are coherent and well organized; however, the study also concluded that the level of specificity of benchmarks is inconsistent.
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

glossaries appear incomplete, and benchmarks are written too broadly in some subject areas. We reviewed selected content standards and concur with McREL's overall findings.

Revisions are needed in each of the standards to improve clarity, but overall the standards reflect an appropriate level of rigor. Issues concerning specificity of language in some other subject areas still exist which make the level of rigor difficult to determine. McREL made several recommendations for improving the coherence, clarity, and comprehensiveness of the standards; however, we found that no system has been established to monitor which recommendations have been implemented to date.

Additionally, the McREL report was used as a basis for the Hawaii State Performance Standards Review Commission (PSRC) to conduct its review of the standards. This Commission consists of 11 members from various groups—teachers, parents, students, principals, educational leaders, educational organizations, higher education, and the community-at-large. The Commission was formed as a result of Hawaii's Statute HRS 302A-201 and is charged with assessing the effectiveness of the state standards every four years.

Our review of the Commission's January 2003 report shows that there are a total of 31 findings and conclusions, and 17 recommendations to improve the implementation of the standards-based education in Hawaii. Data were requested, but not provided regarding the monitoring, tracking, and/or reporting of progress on status of implementation of the 1998 or the 2003 PSRC recommendations, the McREL recommendations, NCLB requirements, and/or BOE policies as they relate to implementing standards-based education.

The Hawaii State Department of Education recently contracted with McREL to review all of the standards again, as well as review the grade-level performance indicators to ensure there is no overlap or redundancy.

We found that, through a rigorous process, Hawaii has developed proficiency definitions. These definitions are:

- **Level 1: Well-Below Proficiency** – Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated little or no knowledge and skills in the content standards for this grade.

- **Level 2: Approaches Proficiency** – Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated some knowledge and skills in the content standards for this grade. With more support and effort, the student should be able to reach the proficient level.

- **Level 3: Meets Proficiency** – Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated the knowledge and skills required to meet the content standards for this grade. The student is ready to work on higher levels of the content area.

- **Level 4: Exceeds Proficiency** – Assessment results indicate that the student has demonstrated knowledge and skills that exceed the content standard for this grade. The student is ready for more advanced work in the content area.
The student achievement levels of meets proficiency (proficient) and exceeds proficiency (advanced) determine how well students are mastering the state's academic content standards. The well-below proficiency and approaches proficiency (basic) levels of achievement provide information about the progress of low-achieving students toward mastering the proficient and advanced levels. Also, cut-off points for the standards-based reading and math scales have been established.

These levels were designed by testing and assessment staff primarily through using other states as examples to establish the four levels. The bookmark method (which allows for open-ended items) was used to set the established cutoff points. We found that some personnel interviewed believe that the bar is set too high and there appears to be considerable disagreement on setting the cut-off points. Consequently, until there is consensus, particularly at the state level, schools may not support them.

While the results of the self-assessment conducted by CCSSO/MGT show that 100 percent of the respondents either strongly agree or agree that the SEA is in compliance with NCLB requirements as they relates to academic standards, interviews and a review of documents show a number of issues exist that prevent the comprehensive effectiveness of the implementation of a true standards-based education in Hawaii.

Among those key issues identified by the review team are:

- There are a total of 139 content standards among 10 subjects areas (six of the subject areas are non-core). This is excessive when compared to other states.

- Indicators are being reviewed for redundancy within each content area, but have not been thoroughly reviewed for overlap among all content areas. For example, overlap exists in the math and science standards in areas such as investigations, data analysis, and probability.

- Too many isolated documents exist which attempt to explain the various components of the implementation standards-based education—no single document and/or training exists that ties or unifies the initiatives/documents for a clear, systemic communication system through which all stakeholders are informed about the process and/or progress of standards-based education.

- The consultant team reviewed the state's school improvement process and confirmed in interviews that, in addition to too many isolated documents explaining the various components of the implementation of standards-based education, a lack of complete alignment was found among the State's standards, curricula taught in all schools, local assessments, professional development, and revising of the Standards Implementation Design System which includes strategies that are based on the analysis of data and are research-based.

- While the transition of restructuring the seven districts into 15 complex areas reportedly has strengthened the support for standards-based education at the school level, interviews indicate that the Complex Area Superintendents and the School Assessment
Liaisons vary greatly in their knowledge and commitment to lead and implement standards-based curriculum.

- The Content Specialists developed the content standards, with no representation of the state's assessment staff, ESL staff, or any School Assessment Liaisons (SALs) in the development of the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards. To ensure high quality standards are in alignment with assessment, assessment staff should play an integral role in the development of the standards.

- The performance indicators will be distributed to teachers via a "tool kit". All teachers will receive the tool kit on a CD Rom; and grade-level chairs and principals will receive a hard copy of the tool kit. The tool kit was not piloted before being implemented and staff interviewed believe it was prematurely distributed as the standards are under a key revision period and the tool kit will need to be redesigned. Also, no system is in place for effectively monitoring the use of the tool kits.

- Many staff interviewed stated that the state does not have a state-adopted textbook or instructional materials state-approved list; however, subsequent to the on-site visit, consultants found that there is a state-approved textbook list, but schools are not held accountable for selecting textbooks from that list. Textbook selection is a school-based decision. No process is in place to ensure textbooks and instructional materials are in alignment with the state standards. Similarly, the state does not require that schools select scientifically research-based programs based on an analysis of data. For example, many schools purchased whole language reading programs and little or no improvement resulted. Also, interviews indicate that a stronger relationship should be developed with the Board of Regents and higher education to ensure instructional strategies and theories support the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education has ensured the periodic review of its standards by the Hawaii Performance Standards Review Commission and outside consultants such as McREL.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for implementing the Standards Implementation Design (SID) System in every school.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for piloting a standards-based report card.

- The Hawaii Department of Education has adopted vision statements that establish standards-based education as the foundation for improving student achievement.
The Hawaii Department of Education has implemented a performance-based teacher evaluation program that contains key requirements for implementing the Hawaii Content Performance Standards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1-1:

Ensure McREL reviews indicators for redundancy among all content areas (i.e., math and science) as well as within each content area, and provides recommendations for limiting the number of standards and subject areas being tested. Hawaii should focus on standards and subject areas most critical to the overall success of the school system.

Recommendation 1-2:

Create a formal strategic plan to implement the Performance Standards Review Commission and the McREL recommendations, and create a tracking system to report on the status of implementing the recommendations. It is critical that Hawaii completes this process to effectively manage standards-based education within the state.

Recommendation 1-3:

Create a unified standards implementation document which provides a clear definition of all stakeholder roles, including Department of Education staff (i.e. content area specialists, the Critical Ally Teams, etc.), Complex Area Superintendents, Standards Assessment Liaison (SALS), Comprehensive Student Support Services Teams, the School Renewal Specialists, resource teachers, principals, and teachers. This document should increase overall understanding of the standards and improve systemwide buy-in.

Recommendation 1-4:

Organize a team of state and school-level professionals to establish a consensus support on the proficiency level cut-off criteria. The fact that cut-off scores that have been approved by the Board are the result of high standards and, in particular in mathematics, are two or more years beyond students' current performance. Due to the high standards in place, it is important to establish consensus support for the cut-off criteria. It is essential to Hawaii that these levels are appropriate to promote student achievement within realistic parameters.

Recommendation 1-5:

Provide additional training for the Complex Area Superintendents and the School Assessment Liaisons in how to implement, assess, and align a standards-based curriculum. To effectively serve as instructional leaders in this area, these key positions should be proficient in the subject matter and processes associated with standards-based education.
Recommendation 1-6:
Create a monitoring system to ensure all key players in the school improvement process are held accountable for achieving a clearly defined process for the implementation of a standards-based curriculum. This component is essential to consistent implementation and sustainable improvement in this area.

Recommendation 1-7:
Ensure a wider representation of qualified staff in the development of any revised academic content standards, including assessment, ESL staff, and SALS. A collaborative effort is key in developing appropriate standards tailored to the needs of Hawaii's students.

Recommendation 1-8:
Ensure all schools are selecting textbooks from the state-approved textbook list which is aligned to the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS). The current lack standardization creates a fragmented approach to instruction.

Recommendation 1-9:
Develop criteria that schools must use in order to purchase school-based instructional programs ensuring that researched-based programs are used and are in alignment with an analysis of the school's data. Hawaii should use these criteria to reduce the wide variation in current instructional programs, focusing on those with the most potential for success.

Recommendation 1-10:
Strengthen the communication with the Board of Regents and higher education staff to ensure instructional strategies and theories taught in higher education support the implementation of quality academic and achievement standards in the K-12 system. Alignment is needed at all levels of Hawaii's education system to maximize student achievement of academic standards.

**COMPONENT 2: ACCOUNTABILITY AND ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS**

**Definition:** Under NCLB, states must develop a statewide accountability system to monitor each school district's achievement of adequate yearly progress (AYP) and to hold school districts accountable. Schools and school districts that do not meet AYP will be subject to sanctions designed to bring about meaningful change in student instruction and achievement. *(Title I, Part A, Section 1111 and 1116)*

All states must develop a definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP) to promote continuous and substantial improvement for students in all schools and school districts. States must establish separate measurable annual objectives to measure progress of
schools and school districts to ensure all subgroups of students reach proficiency within 12 years. Annual intermediate performance targets must be established to measure progress, with the first increase occurring no later than the 2004-05 school year. *(Title I, Part A, Section 1111)*

**Rubric Score: 2.5**

**FINDINGS**

Every Hawaii public school is required to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) as is defined in the state accountability plan. Section 302A-1004, Hawaii Revised Statues [Act 238, Session Laws of Hawaii, 2000], requires each school to produce an annual report card as well as a statewide summary report on each school's status. Both Title I and non-Title I schools are included in Hawaii's accountability system.

Hawaii's *Consolidated State Application, Revised Accountability Workbook* (dated May 21, 2003) has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The revisions were based upon a peer review conducted on March 21, 2003, as well as USDOE conference calls.

When compared to other state plans, we found that the three most notable strengths of the Hawaii plan are the following:

- The Hawaii Accountability Plan establishes a singular school accountability system for all public elementary and secondary students and public schools in the Hawaii system. This includes all schools with varied grade configurations, as well as public schools that serve special populations, such as Olomana School Juvenile Correctional Institution, Hawaii Center for the Deaf and Blind, and 25 public charter schools. In particular, the state intends to apply the full range of accountability consequences—recognition, assistance, and sanctions—to all public schools, whether or not recipients of Title I funds. The State is not required to hold schools not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of Section 1116 of NCLB [200.12(b)(40)]. By doing so, Hawaii's plan shows that the state has the same criteria and high expectations for all schools, not just Title I schools.

- Hawaii's Accountability Plan establishes measured student achievement as the dominant criteria for judging school effectiveness (see Component 6 for a more detailed discussion).

- The State's Accountability Plan has a total of 37 criteria used to determine AYP; all but one—the additional academic indicator (i.e., graduation rate for high schools, retention rate for elementary and middle schools, etc.) is based on the state assessment. There are a total of 18 measures for reading and a total of 18 measures for mathematics.

Exhibit 3-1 illustrates the 37 criteria for assessing a school's progress in meeting AYP. An analysis of the grid shows that, by establishing this instrument, the state can
determine which schools miss making AYP by a small measure and distinguish those schools with those that may have not achieved improvement in any (or few) of the 37 criteria.

The Hawaii Accountability Plan assesses students in reading/language arts and mathematics in Grades 3, 5, 8, and 10. The Plan is based upon academic content standards (see Component 1 for recommendations related to standards), student achievement standards, academic assessments, and “other indicators.” For high schools, the other indicator includes the graduation rate, and for elementary and middle schools the additional indicator is retention rate. Like the graduation rate, the grade-level retention rate counterbalances student performance on tests. By using the test performance and retention rate jointly, it should discourage schools from retaining students they do not expect to do well on tests in those grades that are not tested.

The review team found that starting points, intermediate goals, and annual measurable objectives have been set for reading and mathematics. A review of documentation and interviews indicate that a sound methodology was used in arriving at the annual measurable objectives. The measurable objectives were accepted by the Hawaii State Board of Education in March 2003. The methodology used for setting the annual measurable objectives and intermediate goals can be found at http://arch.k12.hi.us (see Component 6 for more detail on state assessment data).

The self-assessment conducted by CCSSO/MGT shows that 88 percent of the respondents either strongly agree or agree that the SEA is currently in compliance with NCLB state requirements in the area of accountability/adequate yearly progress. However, 62 percent also responded that they agree or strongly agree that the SEA will have difficulty complying with the NCLB state requirement as it relates to accountability/adequate yearly progress.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires strict adherence to the rules about adequate yearly progress (AYP); however, the requirements do not insist that a state’s accountability system be solely structured around AYP. In other words, states must develop capacity to determine AYP according to clear rules whether their districts and schools are making AYP, report such identification, and oversee the implementation of consequences accordingly. Yet, as demonstrated in many state plans that have been approved, states retain great flexibility in measuring schools with other yardsticks as part of an integrated accountability system and in dealing with low performance. States can, for example, develop a school rating system that fits its policies and implement consequences it deems appropriate with the stipulation that they comply with the AYP provisions in doing so. This permits the integration of AYP requirements with state accountability policies and is advantageous to the states.

There has been a reluctance in Hawaii in the past to have a school rating system. Yet, since NCLB requires the identification of schools not making AYP, and these identification provisions of NCLB will certainly identify a substantial number of schools as not making AYP (particularly when the state system is fully compliant), the state may wish to consider the opportunity to build an integrated accountability system that also rates schools on factors Hawaii deems desirable (such as growth).
EXHIBIT 3-1
HAWAII STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SAMPLE GRID FOR ASSESSING A SCHOOL’S LEVEL OF MEETING ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>MATHEMATICS</th>
<th>ALOHA SCHOOL SCHOOL YEAR: 2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met Annual Proficiency Objective?</td>
<td>Met Testing Participation Rate?</td>
<td>Met Other Academic Indicator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(95%)</td>
<td>Graduation Rate (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retention Rate (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the school make AYP for the 2002-03 school year?

__ Yes   __ No

What is the school’s designated status for the coming 2003-04 school year?

__ No Status (Making Adequate Yearly Progress) __
__ In Need of Improvement __
__ Correction Action __
__ Restructuring __


Note on table entries: "Yes" indicates that a specific requirement was met and "No" that it was not met. The number in parentheses is the actual performance of the school. Failure to satisfy any one or more requirements, as specified by the federal NCLB regulations, result in a determination that the school has not made AYP.
One area of the state’s Accountability Plan which needs additional planning and resources for implementation includes realistic staffing. Senior staff interviewed concerning the AYP determination process questioned reasonableness, fairness, and feasibility. We found that these imposed requirements create issues with staff including the following:

- The fully conjunctive nature of AYP determinations, particularly the insistence on invoking sanctions if the condition of failing to meet AYP for two consecutive years occurs for any subgroup.

- The NCLB accountability requirements are framed solely (except for the “safe harbor” provision) in terms of adequate yearly status, not progress.

- A target setting process needs to be designed and implemented. Such a process, likely similar in design to the cut-off score setting procedure used to develop recommended performance levels on state assessments, would be based on expert professional judgment, disciplined, and grounded by relevant information. The relevant information would comprise Hawaii’s baseline performance information and, where available, comparable information about the performance of "world class" or exemplary school systems and schools. Such a process can be designed so that it is replicable and produces credible and defensible target values (qualities essential to "believable" measurable objectives that people will take seriously).

NCLB requires that each state provide decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next school year. We found that Hawaii is grappling with how to effectively define the beginning of the academic year. While the tradition or regular academic year begins in the 3rd week of August and ends the second week of June, Hawaii also has over 80 percent of schools operating under School/Community-Based Management that have modified school calendars that resemble single-track, year-round schools. The academic year at these schools may begin as early as the first week of July and end as late as the last week of July. Thus, some schools are already beginning a new academic year while others are still in session for the previous one. Even if data were available instantly after the close of a school’s academic year, some other schools would have already begun a subsequent year.

This situation implies that the state will provide each school with adequate flexibility in assessing student performance as is necessary to ensure that students have a maximum number of instructional days prior to assessment. The state will then take steps to provide data on AYP within a timeframe that is consistent with individual school’s planning needs. This plan assumes that schools operating under alternative, modified, or other year-round calendars can administer assessment instruments at appropriate times, and then receive results on a timely schedule (see Component 6 for further discussion).
The review team found that there is currently no comprehensive process in place for revising the Accountability Plan. While many staff worked diligently to create the respective parts of the plan, there is no systematic process to ensure it is kept updated and revised, as needed. However, in July 2003, the state plans to form a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of national experts in assessment and accountability, and enlist their help in examining the proposed state accountability system.

The Charter School Program Office oversees charter school accountability. By law, charters are held to the same accountability standards as regular public schools and their proposal to adhere to these laws is included in the Detailed Implementation Plan submitted to the state before approval. Once approved, the school receives a five-year contract. The Charter School Program Office conducts first- and second-year evaluations of each charter. An outside evaluator conducts a fourth-year evaluation to determine if the contract is to be renewed for another five-year cycle. The review team could not determine the process the state is using to hold charter schools to the same accountability system as other schools in implementing the Accountability Plan. In fact, we found that the early cycle evaluations have not been conducted in Hawaii’s charter schools.

Parents will be notified of the status for schools in need of improvement prior to the start of each school year through media releases, postings on the DOE Web site, and through the NCLB school accountability "report cards." The Hawaii Department of Education has an exemplary NCLB Web site that is organized into sections designed to target parents, educators, and vendors.

The parent pages provide, in various languages, information including:

- parent letter and fact sheet;
- NCLB student transfer information;
- schools capacities to accept students;
- supplemental educational services; and
- a variety of other resources.

While the state has many initiatives in place to provide technical assistance to schools, a systematic deployment of these initiatives and assistance is lacking and fragmented. While the Strategic Implementation Plan details the state’s plan for carrying out the components of the Accountability Plan, there is a void in communicating the process at the complex area and school levels. A review of documents shows a lack of specificity of the complex area and school responsibilities; further, interviews with staff confirmed this void in communication.

Hawaii has assigned the following positions to provide schools with technical assistance:

- School Assessment Liaisons (SAL)
- Comprehensive Student Support Services Resource Teachers
- Content Specialists
- School Renewal Specialists
- Regular and Special Education Resource Teachers
- Title I Resource Teachers
- Complex Area Resource Teachers
Standards Resource Teachers
Complex Area Superintendent
Critical Ally Teams
Resource Assistance Teams

We found many concerns with these positions.

- There is a high turnover rate among the SALs (about 20 percent for a two-year period).

- MGT consultants found a need for additional training of SALs and evidence that some SALs are unclear of their job functions.

- Complex Area Superintendents vary in their ability to be educational leaders and need training, particularly in monitoring schools for implementation of a school's SID.

- School Renewal Specialists are generalists and should be more content-specific. They are overburdened with issues associated with the Felix Consent Decree and other special education responsibilities; thus, making them less effective in supporting schools in their implementation of a standards-based curriculum.

- The tool kits designed to assist teachers in implementing standards-based instruction lack specific lesson plans and a comprehensive curriculum aligned to standards (a Hawaiian curriculum database is lacking).

- There are no systematic processes or tools in place to track a school's progress in implementing its Standards Implementation Design (SID).

- The SID requires schools to implement activities yearly; perhaps this should be broken down by monthly requirements to ensure better monitoring of the plan.

- There is a lack of communicating the current accountability plan with staff who have key roles in implementing the plan.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for its decision to include Title I and non-Title I schools in the state’s accountability system to ensure that all schools are held to the same high standards.
The Hawaii Department of Education has established a systematic grid that permits the State to determine the extent to which a school is making (or not making) Adequate Yearly Progress in order to determine appropriate interventions and level of assistance needed. The grid also enables the state to reward those schools making significant progress.

The Hawaii Department of Education has established plans to convene a Technical Advisory Committee of national experts to assist in ratifying and/or developing recommendations for improving the preliminary plan.

The Hawaii Department of Education has established a Web site designed to provide important NCLB information to parents, educators, and vendors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 2-1:

Assign the Director of the Planning and Evaluation Branch (under the leadership of the Deputy Superintendent), the key responsibility for overseeing the process for proposed changes in the State Accountability Plan. This should ensure that the proposed changes are reviewed and agreed upon by the Superintendent and Leadership Team resulting in appropriate recommendations, and followed by approval of the Board of Education.

Recommendation 2-2:

Continue to create an integrated accountability system that rates schools not only on AYP, but also includes factors Hawaii deems desirable (such as growth). Hawaii has the opportunity to integrate additional accountability measures that will work in conjunction with NCLB requirements to illustrate the progress of its schools; the state should explore these options.

Recommendation 2-3:

Create a strategic document (including a flow chart showing specific responsibilities) which outlines the complex area staff and school responsibilities in implementing a standards-based curriculum and explains the statewide monitoring system for school improvement progress.

Recommendation 2-4:

Ensure that the Technical Advisory Committee of national experts, appointed to assist in ratifying and/or developing recommendations for improving the preliminary plan, is established and operational. A committee such as this can significantly increase capacity for systemic improvement.
Recommendation 2-5:

Establish a process to hold charter schools to the same accountability system as other schools, and amend this process into the Accountability Plan. Charter school accountability expectations should be clearly articulated and formalized. Additionally, monitoring and evaluation plans must be executed on schedule.

Recommendation 2-6:

Develop and implement a systematic process and supporting tools for monitoring and tracking school progress in implementing the Standards Implementation Design. Comprehensive follow-up activities should promote comprehensive implementation and overall success in this area.

Recommendation 2-7:

Provide School Assessment Liaisons (SALs) and complex area staff additional training related to assessment and instruction. Linking assessment and instruction is critical to standards-based instruction and should be a focal point of professional development activities for these positions.

Recommendation 2-8:

Review the responsibilities assigned to the School Renewal Specialists to ensure that their first priority is supporting schools in the implementation of the standards-based curriculum. When working with limited resources, it is essential to prioritize activities with the greatest potential for student improvement. In this light, School Renewal Specialists should ensure that the standards-based curriculum is functional before devoting time to less critical issues.

Recommendation 2-9:

Redesign the tool kits to provide specific lesson plans for teachers to support the implementation of standards-based instruction. This key curriculum resource should provide as much specificity as possible to help teachers in implementation efforts. Teachers should be included in the creation of the lesson plans.

Recommendation 2-10:

Review the calendar of activities to ensure that each school's SID plan is monitored monthly. These activities should reflect a systemwide commitment to cyclical monitoring, analysis, and planning.

Recommendation 2-11:

Create a formal communication plan utilizing both electronic tools and traditional memoranda to ensure that the current Accountability Plan is effectively communicated in a timely manner to all appropriate staff. Content modules could be designed that summarize information and responsibilities relevant to individual sections of the department.
COMPONENT 3: REPORTING

Definition: The NCLB Act requires that all states develop, produce, and disseminate annual report cards that communicate information on how students are achieving overall and by disaggregated student subgroups. States are also required to produce an annual report to the Secretary of Education regarding their progress in developing and implementing academic assessments, student achievement data by subgroup, and information detailing the acquisition of English proficiency by students identified as limited English proficient. This report should also include information on specific areas including the names of schools identified as in need of improvement, public school choice, supplemental service programs, and teacher quality. (Title I, Part A, Section 1111 and Subpart 1)

Rubric Score: 2.5

FINDINGS

The reporting requirements of NCLB place a great deal of importance on the clear communication of school performance indicators by grade level and subgroup. Hawaii’s reporting structure is unique because the state accountability report also serves as a school district report, focusing all public accountability for school success and failure at the state level. Hawaii currently has a large cohort of status schools, and the state’s Accountability Plan has the potential to produce many more in the short term.

The performance of state schools must be communicated to the citizens of Hawaii and the Secretary of Education in a clear, comprehensive, and timely manner. Indeed, 71 percent of senior staff reported that they agree that the implementation of reporting requirements under NCLB will benefit students. It is clear that the reporting operations of the Department of Education are critical to successful implementation of NCLB requirements and to the overall success of the Hawaii public school system.

Hawaii is currently facing challenges to the effective reporting of vital data resulting from data availability and quality issues. The organizational structure of the DOE and the corresponding evolution of data management systems within the various sections of the organization have resulted in difficulties in compiling and preparing data to be reported.

We found that current challenges associated with preparing NCLB accountability reports include:

- highly qualified teachers data are not presently available for secondary schools and multi-level schools to meet NCLB requirements, but will be collected for 2002-03;
- data come from multiple "silos" throughout the Hawaii Department of Education—there is no coordination of data collection and reporting timelines; and
- data need to be "cleaned" and aligned before they can be analyzed.

More detail on data management issues is provided in Component 11 of this report.
Data issues are compounded by the fact that the Planning and Evaluation Branch is significantly understaffed. The review team found that employees have retired or have moved out of the Branch, while the Department of Education as a whole is experiencing a state hiring freeze. The resultant situation is a lack of capacity to effectively manage responsibilities associated with both the evaluation and reporting of performance data. In interviews, staff members shared that the typical responsibilities of the Branch had to be abandoned to complete school report cards and the 2001-02 State Summary Report that currently serves as the NCLB data report.

Another result of capacity issues within the Planning and Evaluation Branch is the inability to effectively plan for additional NCLB reporting requirements. We found that, at the time of the diagnostic review, all available resources have been focused on producing school-level reports and that no formal consideration had been given to the federal reporting format. The fact that the federal reporting process is unclear at this stage of NCLB implementation is indicative of larger capacity issues.

In spite of the lack of clarity on federal reporting issues, Planning and Evaluation produced the 2001-02 State Summary Report, which we found to be a clear and concise representation of school performance in the State of Hawaii. The report is well formatted, graphically appealing, and appropriate for varying stakeholders. The summary also includes much of the data required in the report to the Secretary of Education and, with some modification, could be used for that purpose.

While the report provides an effective platform to convey school performance information related to NCLB, we also identified issues with the State Summary Report that need to be addressed to bring it in compliance with NCLB requirements. These include:

- the report does not include teacher qualification information for all grade levels and school types;
- the report does not include a comparison between high- and low-poverty schools not taught by highly qualified teachers;
- the report does not include the names of schools not making AYP as required in the Secretary’s report;
- no information regarding the use of public school choice or supplemental educational services is provided as needed for the Secretary’s report; and
- no analyses of performance data exist to provide stakeholders with a clear understanding of individual report sections or overall education system performance.

The addition of required NCLB information and relevant descriptive and analytical analyses of performance data will move the current state report beyond mere NCLB compliance and result in a quality document that clearly reflects the current status of Hawaii’s education in regard to its systemic goals. Also, providing data that are required as part of the report to the Secretary of Education in the Standard State Summary will significantly improve the overall quality of the document. Hawaii can only benefit from comprehensively communicating system performance information to all stakeholders.
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

A situation exists where, even within the reporting function of the Department of Education, there is compartmentalization of responsibilities and knowledge. Interviews indicate that employees become proficient in specific responsibilities and manage these duties until they leave the system, with little coordination or integration with other similar and connected duties. During the diagnostic review, we became aware of a situation where an employee was leaving the Planning and Evaluation Branch and this employee had previously been responsible for essential data collection and reporting duties. The remaining staff did not have knowledge of the various locations where these data originated or the different times throughout the year that data were collected. In interviews, Branch staff shared that they were scrambling to gain the expertise needed to perform the additional duties once the employee left the unit.

On a conceptual level, the Office of Information Technology Services and the Planning and Evaluation Branch have reached an agreement to address one of the primary challenges to effective and efficient reporting of school performance information. The two sections have agreed to collaborate on an NCLB data mart that, once completed, will house all relevant NCLB data and facilitate easier processing of needed reporting information. In addition to streamlining the overall process, this arrangement will place the responsibility of compiling and cleaning NCLB data on the Office of Information Technology Services and will allow the Planning and Evaluation Branch to focus on reporting duties (see Component 11 for more information on data management).

It is clear that the Hawaii Department of Education is aware of some of the reporting challenges associated with NCLB and is ready to address many identified areas of concern.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for performing additional reporting duties associated with NCLB in spite of capacity issues.

- The Hawaii Department of Education developed a quality State Summary Report for the 2001-02 school year.

- The creation of an NCLB data mart to facilitate efficient and effective reporting is a positive development in the effort to communicate systemwide performance information.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 3-1:

Collect comprehensive data on highly qualified teachers for secondary schools and multi-level schools (also see Component 7). The addition of these data will provide rich information systemwide performance analysis.
Recommendation 3-2:

Continue to work with the Office of Information Technology Services to improve data compilation and quality. Sustained collaboration in this area should result in increased reporting capacity over time.

Recommendation 3-3:

Add one federally-funded reporting specialist position to the Planning and Evaluation Branch. Although resources are stretched systemwide, the final communication of systemic performance must be a priority. Accuracy and efficiency in reporting is essential considering the possible consequences under NCLB.

Recommendation 3-4:

Develop a formal NCLB reporting plan that details data sources, collection timelines, and individual responsibilities. The articulation and codification of this process should serve as a planning milestone, thereby reducing informality and improving reporting efficiency.

Recommendation 3-5:

Include required teacher qualification data, information on public school choice transfers, and supplemental educational services data in the State Summary Report. This information will improve the quality of the state-level report as well as prepare Hawaii for federal reporting.

Recommendation 3-6:

Provide definitions and analyses to explain performance data included in the State Summary Report. Data without explanation are insufficient to promote systemic change.

Recommendation 3-7:

Develop a format for NCLB reporting to the Secretary of Education. The development of the revised State Summary Report should reduce additional workload in preparing the federal report.

Recommendation 3-8:

Initiate cross training in reporting responsibilities for all staff associated with NCLB data compilation and reporting. It is imperative that these duties are integrated to ensure sustainable quality and accuracy in reporting.
COMPONENT 4: LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS

Definition: Under NCLB, states establish school support teams to assist schools and school districts in complying with school improvement requirements and give additional support to schools and districts identified for improvement. Title I schools and school districts that fail to meet state-mandated adequate yearly progress standards for two consecutive years must be identified for improvement (Title I, Part A, Section 1111).

Rubric Score: 2

FINDINGS

Hawaii is currently facing a situation where it has many low-performing schools that it must manage. On the CCSSO/MGT Self-Assessment, 63 percent of senior staff agreed or strongly agreed that Hawaii will have difficulty complying with strict NCLB requirements in this area. Clearly, however, the state has begun to develop state-level (and LEA-level) activities to provide assistance to low-performing schools.

In addition to NCLB, Hawaii must comply with state legislation (Act 238), which also requires:

- a set of indicators and a set of evaluations to measure school progress;
- development of a Standards Implementation Action Plan; and
- the implementation and monitoring of the plan.

As stated in our analysis of previous components, the state is combining these implementation efforts to improve measured student achievement of the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS) in reading and mathematics so that schools meet AYP criteria.

The Standards Implementation Design (SID) System (August 2000) provides a framework to facilitate planning and decision making to assist schools in focusing on student achievement and making improvements. The SID System identifies process steps and key parameters to design schoolwide and department/grade level standards implementation action plans that focus on implementing the HCPS. The SID System also provides an excellent framework for the implementation of NCLB requirements.

We found that the state has a systematic plan for the identification of low-performing schools. However, to date, school improvement efforts in identified low-performing schools are not being effectively monitored, although plans are in place to monitor in the future. For example, a critical component of this process is Critical Ally Teams (which was described in a March 2002 draft document provided to the team). As stated in the March 2002 document, the purpose of Critical Ally Teams is to assist schools in raising student achievement on state standards to the proficiency level or above by helping schools to critically assess and prioritize areas needing improvements and undertake systematic improvements. Critical Ally Teams are catalysts for change. Critical Ally
Team (CAT) members are selected by the Complex Area Superintendent, in collaboration with the targeted school, and generally include the School Renewal Specialist, resource teachers, and other educators.

Although this document states that Critical Ally Teams (CAT) serve all low-performing schools; to date, school and complex area participation has been voluntary. In fact, in some of the 15 complex areas few Critical Ally Teams were used during the 2002-03 year to assist low-performing schools. In the future, senior staff anticipate that CAT services will be required for schools that are identified as "in need of improvement" or "corrective action," and that these schools will be given priority.

As identified by the review team, one reason for the delay in the full implementation of Critical Ally Teams has been the recent reorganization of seven districts, with a Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent, into 15 complex areas led by the Complex Area Superintendent (CAS). To promote the full implementation of Critical Ally Teams and to augment the focus of the CAS on accountability and performance, in January 2003, the State Superintendent asked each CAS to develop a six-month performance contract. Each CAS plan had to include a component for showing improvements in a minimum of three schools in the complex area.

The CAS is a critical position in affecting school improvement. The degree to which the State Superintendent holds each CAS accountable for reaching the goals in his or her performance contract will be a major factor in ensuring the effective use of Critical Ally Teams and successful school improvement efforts.

Another area of concern regarding the Critical Ally Teams is the lack of training provided to team members. Additional training will be needed for team members to assist in revisions and implementation of the Standards Implementation Plan. For example, no evidence exists that the technical assistance from the SEA/LEA for low-performing schools to target areas of needed improvement is based on scientifically-based research.

At the time of the on-site visit in May 2003, a work group of senior staff had drafted a document entitled NCLB Assistance and Sanctions and submitted it to the State Superintendent outlining additional levels of support to schools for Year 1 through Year 5. In addition to Critical Ally Teams, other evaluators, auditors, and support teams were identified to assist low-performing schools; they are defined as follows:

- **External Evaluator** – an individual from outside the school system who is selected by the Complex Area Superintendent to advise a school in need of improvement and the leadership of the school.

- **External Auditor** – an individual or firm from outside the school system who is selected by the Superintendent and Complex Area Superintendent to (1) assist a school in corrective action, analyze and clarify the problem(s) inhibiting attainment of AYP, fine-tune its Standards Implementation Action Plan, and develop appropriate corrective action; or to (2) conduct an educational audit of a school in corrective action.
State Intervention Team – a team, largely from outside the school system and selected by the Superintendent, that serves in school planning and preparing for restructuring (in Year 4). The team consists of external consultants, community leaders/volunteers, and department personnel.

State Monitor – an individual from outside the school system who is selected by the Superintendent to monitor and assess implementation of audit recommendations made by the External Evaluator, Critical Ally Team, or External Auditor, and to report the results to the Superintendent and CAS. The monitor is augmented by a team consisting of community leaders/volunteers and department personnel.

The state SEA/LEA has strategies in place to provide school choice alternatives to students in low-performing schools. This year only 31 students used the school choice option; Hawaii has been granted a waiver to limit the options to intra-island choices (Component 12 of this report provides additional detail on public school choice options).

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Standards Implementation Design (SID) System provides an excellent framework for the implementation of NCLB.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for creating Critical Ally Teams to support both the implementations of NCLB and Act 238.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 4-1:

Require the use of Critical Ally Teams at all low-performing schools. As these teams are potentially powerful sources of school improvement, their use should be maximized throughout the school system on a mandatory basis.

Recommendation 4-2:

Strengthen training opportunities for Critical Ally Teams. Additional professional development activities will better prepare teams for point-of-contact service delivery.

Recommendation 4-3:

Standardize reporting and monitoring processes and procedures for Critical Ally Teams. It is critical that the Department of Education develop a clear standard for
team action in order to promote aligned and effective school improvement efforts systemwide.

**COMPONENT 5: SCHOOL SUPPORT AND RECOGNITION**

**Definition:** Federal law requires states to provide support to Title I schools and school districts in school improvement efforts. States must also develop a system of recognition for schools that have significantly closed the achievement gap or have exceeded AYP standards for two or more consecutive years. Schools in this category will be recognized as *Distinguished Schools*, and teachers in these schools may receive financial awards, based on the individual state recognition plan. *(Title I, Part A, Section 1117).*

**Rubric Score: 2**

**FINDINGS**

The evidence for school support was addressed under the previous section on low-performing schools. The Critical Ally Team and State Intervention Team, when fully implemented, will provide the support to low-performing schools.

With regard to school recognition, at the time of the on-site visit, Hawaii has a draft plan to address school recognition through two specific programs: the Blue Ribbon Schools Program and the Distinguished Schools Program. These two programs are defined as follows:

- **Blue Ribbon Schools Awards Program** – Schools with 40 percent of their students from disadvantaged backgrounds who have dramatically improved student performance and are achieving at high levels in reading (language arts or English) or mathematics, as measured by state criterion-referenced assessments or assessments that yield national norms, or schools that score in the top 10 percent on state assessments.

- **Distinguished Schools Awards Program** – Based on criteria required by the NCLB Act, schools exceeding AYP for two or more years or schools making significant gains in closing the achievement gap. Also based on other yet to be determined criteria, include:
  - schools scoring in the top 20 percent on state assessments that do not qualify for NCLB consideration; and
  - schools meeting or exceeding AYP for all students and at least five of eight subgroups of students as specified under the law—economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

The consultant team found that the state intends to implement both programs in the 2003-04 school year. When implemented, Hawaii will have effective programs in place to comply with the intent of Section 1117 of the NCLB Act.

The review team found that one component of the Act not being addressed in the current plan for either program is the potential opportunity to award financial incentives to teachers in these distinguished schools.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for its efforts in planning the two school recognition programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 5-1:

Explore the potential of offering financial incentives to teachers in low-performing schools where significant progress has been made. When considering the consequences for low performance under NCLB and Hawaii’s Accountability Plan, every opportunity to promote school improvement should be pursued.

COMPONENT 6: STUDENT ASSESSMENT

Definition: NCLB strengthens requirements for state assessments. By the 2005-06 school year, states must develop and implement annual assessments in reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8 and at least once in grades 10-12. By 2005-06 states must develop challenging content and achievement standards in science and by 2007-08, states also must administer annual science assessments at least once in grades 3-5, grades 6-9, and grades 10-12. Each assessment must be aligned with state academic content in achievement standards and involve multiple measures, including measures of higher-order thinking and understanding. (Title I, Part A, Section 1111)

In general, state assessment systems must include the following:

- alignment with state academic content standards, and student academic achievement standards;
- inclusion;
- appropriate accommodations;
- adequate reporting systems;
- prompt dissemination of results; and
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- participation in the National Assessment of Academic Progress (NAEP).

Rubric Score: 2.5

FINDINGS

In Hawaii, annual student assessments in Grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 for mathematics and reading/language arts are aligned with academic content standards and academic achievement standards. The development of the HCPS II state assessments involved a comprehensive process including:

- constructing test blueprint and item specifications;
- determining writing rubrics and prompts;
- writing and reviewing items;
- constructing field test forms;
- administering field tests;
- analyzing item data; and
- constructing and reviewing final operational forms.

Teachers, school administrators, content and assessment specialists, and community members from across the state participated in the development of the assessments. Additionally, the assessments were evaluated for validity and reliability by Harcourt. It is important to note that content and assessment specialists played an integral role in the development of the state assessments; however, as discussed in Component 1, the assessment staff were not included in the development of the standards (see Component 1 for related recommendations).

The state has also developed annual assessments aligned to standards for science. The assessments are being piloted in 45 schools for 5th grade students. In subsequent years, Grades 7 and 11 will be piloted. Additionally, West Ed conducted a review of initial items and have determined the test items are appropriate and in alignment with NAEP.

The consultant team reviewed the state's calendar and other data which show the plan for the development, field testing, and revising of statewide assessment. We found the calendar provides for an efficient and timely process for ensuring the mandatory testing of Grades 3-8. The calendar covers a variety of activities spanning from the 2001-02 to 2007-08 school years. The State is expanding its contract with Harcourt for the additional reading and math assessments (i.e., grades 4, 6, and 7). Additionally, the State is working with WestED for a pilot in science in Grade 5 for Fall 2003. It was undecided at the time of the site visit whether WestED will be the state's contractor for science (grades 5, 7, and 11). This decision will be made based on the state's experience working with WestED on the pilot, and compare the offerings of other contractors before a final decision is made.

The obstacles the state is facing include a immense diversion of staff time and energy in order to have the infrastructure necessary to proceed with the completion of the calendar tasks (i.e., filling vacant staff positions, and the related paperwork, phone calls, and e-mails involved; finding and negotiating office space for same, etc.).
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The state has identified four achievement levels: well below proficiency, approaches proficiency, meets proficiency and exceed proficiency (see Component 1 for a description of each).

Two documents related to student assessment have been produced by the state that have had overwhelming positive response from users.

- The HSPS II Hawaii State Assessment, Teacher's Guide for Interpreting the Hawaiian Content Performance Standards was designed to enable teachers to understand what is measured by the state assessment, know how the standards included in the state assessment are measured, and know how to appropriately interprets scores from the HCPS II State Assessment.

- The other document produced by the Test Development Section of the DOE is the Student Participation Information, April 2003 which provides all DOE personnel, complex area staff, and school staff with information regarding state assessment participation criteria for various student populations. A review of the document; however, shows that there is no assessment participation criteria for migratory, or otherwise mobile, students as defined under Title I.

The assessment results for 2002 were presented in the School Report, which is clear and easy to understand. The 2001-02 school year reports will not be available to schools before the beginning of the 2002-03 school year due to the fact that some schools did not return tests prior to the deadline. This delay resulted in state memos to schools issuing sanctions for not returning tests during the appropriate timelines. In an effort to address this issue, the state has expanded the test administration window by one month, with test administration currently beginning in March instead of April.

Additionally, in a February 11, 2003 memorandum from the Superintendent, the state imposed sanctions for schools who are late in returning test materials. In order to receive the score reports by August 1, the ideal date for return is no later than May 9 to Harcourt Educational Measurement in San Antonio, Texas. If tests are returned after May 9, but before May 30th, the Complex Area Superintendents will be required to conduct a review of test administration procedures at each school and provide a report to the Superintendent of corrective actions. If a school turns in materials after May 30, such schools will be identified publicly in school accountability reports—e.g. "School was non-compliant with required state assessment procedures." In this circumstance, students are assigned a default score of well-below proficiency in reading and mathematics (see Component 2 for related recommendations).

While there is evidence that the state assessment system produces individual student interpretative, descriptive, and diagnostic reports, the review team found that there is no item-by-item score analyses; the current analyses is conducted by strands. The state plans to change from the strands to a cluster of items for its 2003-04 score analyses. Additionally, the state's key process for assuring the use of assessment results by school and teachers lies in the hands of the Complex Area Superintendent and staff who are charged with monitoring. While some complex areas such as Maui have instituted a systematic approach to monitoring, interviews suggests that this is not occurring in all complex areas.
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

As previously mentioned, School Assessment Liaisons (SALs) are under the supervision of the Complex Area Superintendents and are provided to schools to implement the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards II. The 24 SALs provide school and classroom support to assist teachers in the development and implementation of standards-based student assessment aligned to the state assessments.

A needs assessment conducted in 1999 shows that teachers report needing support in classroom assessment methods. In response to this need, the SALs program has been in place for three years and is currently being evaluated for its effectiveness. The evaluation is scheduled to be completed in Fall 2003 by the University of Hawaii. Interviews with staff indicate that, overall, the SALs are making a positive difference in assisting schools with the alignment of local assessment to state assessment and are anxious to see the results of the formal evaluation.

The state is currently piloting a standards-based report card in 10 elementary schools for the 2003-04 school year and will continue to pilot in the remaining elementary and secondary schools in forthcoming years.

The DOE plans to test all students including special education students at grade level. Severely cognitively disabled students may, if authorized by their IEP team, take an Alternate Assessment to the state test. Currently, by definition, all such students are assigned standards-based, grade-level indexed proficiency scores at the lowest level—Well Below Proficiency—on the Alternate Assessment.

The state is requiring that all ESL students participate in the state assessment (in English) in reading and mathematics. Some accommodations are allowed for the standards-based segments, which is what the proficiency levels are derived from and which are used for NCLB accountability. There are no other alternatives for the three years prior to being tested in English. Under NCLB, ESL students are to participate in the state assessments and have annual English language proficiency test scores. State staff have reviewed the practicality of "other options"—such as those used or being developed in some other states; however, they have not found one that fits the needs of the state of Hawaii.

A review of documentation shows that Hawaii assures that schools administer an annual assessment of English proficiency that measures listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English to all limited English proficiency students. Two memoranda were sent to all schools during the 2002-03 school year from the Assistant Superintendent of the Office of Curriculum, Instruction and School Support to remind schools of the NCLB Band OCR requirement to identify all current and newly-arrived non-native English speaking students in kindergarten to grade 12. The memoranda also reinforced that schools must provide such students with English language proficiency assessments for listening, speaking, reading, and writing (i.e., Language Assessment Scales [LAS Oral for listening and speaking, and LAS Reading and Writing]) before placement in the school's supplementary ESL Program and the mainstream education program.

All schools are required to collect and report the English proficiency assessment results for non-native English speaking students assessed during the 2002-03 school year. We found that similar memoranda will be sent to schools in 2003-04 to assure that all schools will implement the required annual English proficiency assessments. The exam
represents the state's developed achievement levels for English Language Acquisition Tests.

A Coherence Review sponsored by the DOE Test Development Section, Planning and Evaluation Branch was conducted on April 28-29, 2001. The final report from the Coherence Review Committee indicated there were links between the English language arts standards and the English proficiency assessment (i.e., LAS-Oral and LAS-Reading and Writing). We reviewed excerpts of the alignment matrix of the LAS and the English Language Arts Standards assessed on the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards (HCPS II) Test and the TESOL Standards with the LAS and confirmed evidence that the exam does represent the state’s developed achievement levels for English Language Acquisitions Tests.

Staff report, and a review of other state's test items confirm, that Hawaii has a high number of constructed response items (open-ended) which are a necessary component of assessment, but what considerably slow down the scoring timeframe. Exhibit 3-2 shows that there are eight constructed response items on each of the Grade 3, 5, 8, and 10 standards-based items in reading assessment.

Exhibit 3-3 shows that in the mathematics assessment there are:

- 13 constructed test items and 11 multiple choice in Grade 3;
- 13 constructed test items and 12 multiple choice in Grade 5;
- 13 constructed test items and 14 multiple choice in Grade 8; and
- 16 constructed test items and 24 multiple choice in Grade 10.

EXHIBIT 3-2
HPCS II STATE ASSESSMENT MATHEMATICS BLUEPRINT

Stanford 9 Items
Included in Standards-Based Proficiency Level Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>&quot;NUMBER OF MULTIPLE-CHOICE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9 out of 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number of 30 items.

Standards-Based Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>&quot;NUMBER OF MULTIPLE-CHOICE ITEMS</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Teacher’s Guide for Interpreting the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards, Fall 200 State Assessment.
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EXHIBIT 3-3
HPCS II STATE ASSESSMENT READING BLUEPRINT

Stanford 9 Items
Included in Standards-Based Proficiency Level Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>*NUMBER OF MULTIPLE-CHOICE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 out of 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16 out of 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number of 30 items.

Standards-Based Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>*NUMBER OF MULTIPLE-CHOICE ITEMS</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTED RESPONSE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Teacher’s Guide for Interpreting the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards, Fall 200 State Assessment.

Other student assessment issues of concern to the review team include the following:

- Many staff interviewed stated that, while the four achievement levels have been set, many believe the bar is set too high particularly in mathematics. A consensus does not exist among higher-level officials that the achievement levels are appropriate for the state. Also, it is apparent from interviews that the excessive amount of standards creates problems for assessment purposes.

- Issues surfaced regarding the English as a Second Language (ESL) state assessment. In the state’s current system, Non-English Proficiency (NEP) students are exempted from the reading, but not the math assessment. No alternative assessment is currently available for NEP. Hawaii has exempted the NEP students for the past two years; however, the state may not exempt them in future assessments in light NCLB requirements.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for ensuring a cross-section of stakeholders such as teachers, school administrators, content and assessment specialists, and
community members from across the state to participate in the development of the state assessments and for implementing a comprehensive process for evaluating the validity and reliability of test items.

- The Hawaii Department of Education has produced comprehensive, up-to-date manuals to provide all staff with the same information, to share a clear understanding of the requirements of the HCPS II State Assessment, and to ensure assessment participation criteria are clearly communicated.

- The Hawaii Department of Education has produced and is piloting standards-based report cards.

- The State is commended for establishing an efficient calendar and process for ensuring the creation, field testing, and finalization of annual statewide assessments for Grades 3-8.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 6-1:

Include assessment participation criteria for migratory or otherwise mobile students as defined under Title I in the state’s Student Participation Information document. Compliance in this area is necessary under NCLB requirements and should be adequately communicated.

Recommendation 6-2:

Provide an item-by-item score analyses as it relates to specific standards, and ensure teachers use results to provide instruction for students areas of weaknesses. The ability to target specific weaknesses is an important component of standards-based instruction and especially important to Hawaii considering its large number of low-performing schools.

Recommendation 6-3:

Ensure that all Complex Area Superintendents and staff responsible for use of assessment results implement a systematic monitoring protocol. The Hawaii DOE should carefully adhere to this protocol to promote effective use of assessment data in school improvement.

Recommendation 6-4:

Ensure the timely completion of the SALs evaluation and implement appropriate recommendations to continue the state’s focus on aligning local and state assessment. State-level findings and recommendations in the evaluation report should guide future alignment activities.
Recommendation 6-5:

Review the results of the SALs assessment and modify the classroom teacher support strategies accordingly. Teachers are ultimately responsible for the implementation of assessment plans and should benefit from the information gained from the SALS review report.

Recommendation 6-6:

Establish a date for concluding the standards-based report card piloting activity and set a tentative implementation date for implementation throughout the state. Full implementation will result in the alignment of curriculum, assessment, and reporting, and will promote effective systemwide improvement.

Recommendation 6-7:

Conduct, through the Technical Advisory Committee, a detailed professional analysis of student assessment in Hawaii, including the number and type of test items and administration protocol. A comprehensive understanding of the current status is necessary to facilitate future planning in this area.

Recommendation 6-8:

Review NEP, ESL, and special education student alternative assessments used by other states and consider adapting them for use in Hawaii. While an alternative assessment format is currently needed in Hawaii, this situation may not require that a completely new assessment be developed.

**COMPONENT 7: TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS**

**Definition:** States must develop plans with measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers of core academic subjects are highly qualified. "Highly Qualified" is defined as holding state certification (alternative state certification is acceptable), holding a bachelor's degree, and having demonstrated subject area competency. Core academic subjects include English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography. All newly hired teachers in Title I programs after the start of the 2002-03 school year must meet these requirements. Additionally, all existing teachers must meet these requirements by the end of the 2005-06 school year. School districts must use at least five percent of Title I funds for professional development to help teachers become highly qualified. (Title I, Part A, Subpart 1)

Rubric Score: 3
FINDINGS

We found that the Hawaii Department of Education lacks a comprehensive database to provide baseline information on teachers to quantify what percentage of currently employed teachers are highly qualified. The current database only classifies teachers as elementary and secondary, and not by subject area—a critical component at the secondary level. As an interim measure, in May 2003, the State Superintendent conducted a Web-based Teacher Professional Qualifications Survey to ascertain required information for the annual State Accountability Report to the USDOE, including:

- number of teachers who have been hired with emergency or provisional status; and
- number of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers (as defined by the NCLB statute and regulations).

The state plans to develop an automated data information system that links and tracks teacher qualifications with the areas of teaching assignment including:

- a baseline assessment of the percentage of highly qualified teachers serving in high-poverty areas and schools in need of improvement;
- the number of highly qualified teachers that the Hawaii DOE needs to recruit by subject area and school, in order to achieve annual improvement gains;
- areas of specific teacher professional development needs by school, teacher, and subject area; and
- the annual progress made in the percentage increase of highly qualified teachers who are recruited, trained, and retained.

Once created, the data infrastructure can serve as the vehicle to provide teacher qualification information to the community. Other planned data management improvements are detailed in Component 11 of this report.

Since the production of teachers in Hawaii is so low compared to the state’s need (e.g., only 650 out of 1,552 new teachers in 2001-02 were graduates of Hawaii state-approved teacher education programs), the DOE must go outside the state to recruit qualified teachers. The Hawaii Teacher Education Coordinating Committee (April 2003 report) and the Department of Education’s Office of Human Resources (May 2003, Recruitment and Retention Plan) have each developed plans to meet this shortfall. These plans involve increasing the capacity of the state’s teacher education programs, transition programs for community college students, alternative teacher certification programs, induction support for new teachers, and reward programs for high quality teachers among others.

In addition, the review team found that state is considering salary incentives to attract highly qualified teachers to teach in high-poverty areas and in schools in need of improvement. Potential salary incentives would include stipends, mileage
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reimbursement, or be comparable to incentives that Hawaii provides to licensed special education teachers who teach in geographically hard-to-fill schools as part of compliance efforts with the Felix Consent Decree.

The state is also exploring the provision of a relocation bonus to highly qualified teachers who are recruited from out-of-state to teach in high-poverty areas and at those schools in need of improvement. Currently relocation bonuses are offered to special education teachers as part of the Felix Consent Degree, and it is anticipated that the proposed relocation bonuses to support NCLB requirements would be comparable.

The state is continuing its efforts to centralize all teacher recruitment and training for Hawaii public schools within the Office of Human Resources. A single teacher application serves as an application to all 252 of Hawaii’s public schools in all school districts and complex areas. We found that this centralized approach to teacher recruitment activities and hiring within the state of Hawaii removes much of the recruitment burden from schools.

The DOE has plans in place to balance its recruitment efforts with stronger efforts to retain teachers. The State’s Retention Plan focuses on root causes (e.g., working conditions, school culture, administrative support), induction (e.g., preservice programs, mentor support, network support, resources), preparation (e.g., internship programs, stipends, loans), and career advancement (e.g., career ladder opportunities, recognition programs, partnerships with universities).

In Summer 2002, the Department of Education piloted two programs—The Reading Teacher Endorsement Program and The Mathematics Teacher Endorsement Program. The intent of these programs is to provide advanced preparation in the content areas, assessment and instruction, and standards implementation, as well as the theory and research in teaching mathematics and reading. Participation in the endorsement program will additionally prepare participating teachers for national board certification, and course credits may be applied toward a master’s degree. The Department of Education partially funds the costs of tuition for participating teachers. As a result, participants will be prepared to serve as teacher leaders in their area and also be able to provide professional development and serve as mentors to their colleagues.

As part of analysis of NCLB mandates and the state’s compliance, Hawaii has reviewed its state certification requirements to ensure compliance with NCLB. The analysis showed that Hawaii state certification requirements equal or exceed federal mandates. Additionally, an alternate certification program has been operational in Hawaii for several years primarily because of the shortage of special education teachers. The program is currently being expanded to include other areas of teacher certification.

The state has in place a new Professional Evaluation Program for Teachers (PEP-T). Implemented in the 2002-03 year, the Professional Evaluation Program for Teachers is the Department’s means to effectively assess teacher performance and to ensure that students are taught by professionals who meet state teacher standards. PEP-T reflects the general learner standards established by the Department and set forth in policy by the Board of Education as well as standards set by the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board. PEP-T incorporates the skills, knowledge, dispositions, and conduct expected of all teachers in the public schools of Hawaii.
COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for its multifaceted recruitment activities designed to attract high-quality teachers to the state.
- The single teacher application for all Hawaii’s schools has streamlined the teacher recruitment process.
- Teacher quality is being promoted by the development of the PEP-T.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 7-1:

Coordinate all recruitment plans into one integrated document. In light of Hawaii’s shortage of qualified teachers, a coordinated recruitment effort is essential to ongoing systemwide success.

Recommendation 7-2:

Ensure that the automated teacher database contains all information needed on Hawaii’s teaching force and that Complex Area Superintendents and Principals can access appropriate components of this database. As qualified teachers are vital to the success of Hawaii’s schools, detailed information should be readily available for systemwide use.

COMPONENT 8: PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Definition: Paraprofessionals in Title I programs must have at least two years of postsecondary education or, for applicants with a high school diploma, demonstrate necessary skills of a formal state or local academic assessment. Additionally, all paraprofessionals in Title I programs must hold a high school diploma or its equivalent. All new hires in Title I programs as of January 2002, must meet these standards; existing paraprofessionals have four years from January 2002 to comply with the new requirements. However, these requirements do not apply to paraprofessionals used for translation or parent involvement. (Title I, Part A, Subpart 1)

The law also specifies that paraprofessionals may not provide instructional support services except under the direct supervision of a teacher.

Rubric Score: 3
FINDINGS

The state has a comprehensive plan in place to comply with NCLB paraprofessional requirements. The April 2003 Paraprofessionals Requirements Pamphlet outlines Hawaii’s plan including five options that educational assistants can choose among to obtain the required two years of postsecondary education. In another document—Educational Assistant Training Program (2003-04)—the components of the training program, training objectives, and course topics are included. Additionally, the training program for educational assistants has been matched against the core curriculum of knowledge and skills for paraprofessionals to provide performance expectations for all training courses.

Training focuses on:
- roles and responsibilities;
- effective communication skills;
- foundations of special education;
- overview of special needs students;
- behavior management;
- assessment of students; and
- the instructional process.

In the state’s June 2002 Consolidated State Application, additional paraprofessional training programs are described. DOE staff in the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support have developed training modules for instructional tutors. This 18-hour Literacy Tutor Training Program provides common baseline knowledge for all K-3 tutors and provides consistency throughout the state. A Math Literacy Training Program is also being developed.

The University of Hawaii’s community colleges are exploring ways to establish satellite sites in the pilot complex communities for the delivery of the Educational Assistant (EA) Associate Degree Program. In addition, the Department of Health Services is exploring ways to subsidize child care, transportation, and coursework costs while students are enrolled in the EA Associate Degree Program. This program:
- enables parents to develop the literacy training skills to facilitate their own child’s learning;
- enables the development of quality paraprofessionals who live in the community who can deliver literacy training to the students in the school;
- increases the number of literacy tutors available to the school; and
- enables the school to address the NCLB educational requirements for paraprofessionals with instructional duties.

In addition, new opportunities are being provided to expand the educational assistant career ladder training program for paraprofessional who have earned an associate’s degree. Several alternative routes are available to complete a bachelor’s degree.
including those with City University (Bellevue, Washington), BYU-Hawaii, and Chaminade University of Honolulu.

One concern identified by the consultant team which needs to be addressed by the state is the dichotomy in training programs for paraprofessionals between the Office of Human Resources and the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. Responsibilities for paraprofessional education and training are not effectively aligned nor coordinated. The state’s Consolidated Plan only addresses the training provided by the Office of Curriculum and Instruction. Considering the fact that 74 percent of DOE senior staff responding to the self-assessment identified paraprofessional requirements as an area of difficulty for the state, coordination in this effort is needed.

In addition to augmenting paraprofessional training opportunities, Hawaii has developed an extensive Recruitment and Retention Plan (May 2003) which addresses both teachers and instructional assistants. The critical elements of this plan include:

- marketing;
- retention;
- personnel preparation;
- recruitment; and
- induction.

Also, formal assessments are in place to evaluate the competency of paraprofessionals. A lesson preparation evaluation form and an educational assistant observation form are used by DOE resource teachers in the evaluation process.

The review team found that, because of the ineffective database currently operational in the Office of Human Resources, the state cannot easily quantify what percentage of currently employed paraprofessionals meet the new standards in terms of education and experience; the database for paraprofessionals does not exist. In Fall 2002, the DOE attempted to survey educational assistants in the state to obtain specific information on education and job responsibilities; however, only 50 percent of the state’s paraprofessionals responded at that time.

Currently, due to budget constraints, plans are not in place to account for changes in paraprofessional salaries that might result from meeting elevated requirements.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education’s Office of Human Resources is commended for the extensive opportunities being planned and implemented for paraprofessional training and recruitment.

- The Educational Assistant Career Ladder Training Program has been expanded to include several intermediate and advanced training programs for paraprofessionals.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 8-1:

Develop a statewide paraprofessional database in the Department of Education’s Office of Human Resources. These data are needed for effective systemic planning and monitoring paraprofessional status in Hawaii.

Recommendation 8-2:

Develop a paraprofessional compensation scale, which provides differentiated levels of compensation for paraprofessionals who obtain two years of postsecondary education coursework. There should be a financial incentive to encourage the development of qualified paraprofessionals.

Recommendation 8-3:

Merge all professional development and training coordination for paraprofessionals in the Office of Human Resources. This will ensure a coordinated and focused effort, and should improve systemic capacity to develop qualified paraprofessionals. This recommendation is not intended to imply that Curriculum and Instruction staff are no longer responsible for paraprofessional training activities. Rather, the coordination should be housed in one office.

COMPONENT 9: READING FIRST/EARLY READING FIRST PROGRAMS

Definition: NCLB supports scientifically-based reading instruction programs in the early grades under the Reading First Program and in preschool under the Early Reading First Program. Funds are available to states to apply for this grant to help teachers strengthen previous skills and gain new ones in effective reading instruction. (Title I, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2)

Rubric Score: 2

FINDINGS

Only 40 percent of Hawaii’s students met or exceeded reading proficiency levels in the 2001-02 school year. Considering this, and the fact that 94 percent of state education leaders responding to the CCSSO/MGT Self-Assessment either agreed or strongly agreed that the implementation of the Reading First Program would benefit students, it is clear that Hawaii’s commitment to this program should be strong. In this light, we were able to find evidence of a statewide effort promoting the successful implementation of Reading First.

The Hawaii Department of Education developed an application for the Reading First Program funds that was accepted by the USDOE during the 2001-02 school year. Because Hawaii is both an SEA and an LEA, the State Management Plan for the
Reading First Program provides for the competitive subgranting of funds directly to schools.

The implementation of this program will occur in four phases, as detailed in the plan:

- **Phase I**: Planning and Development
- **Phase II**: Professional Development and Assistance to Participating Schools
- **Phase III**: Implementation of Schoolwide Beginning Reading Model
- **Phase IV**: Independent Evaluation of Overall Effectiveness of Reading First Implementation.

The plan calls for three cohorts of 25 schools per year to enter the Reading First Program. Twenty (20) schools were selected for the 2003-04 school year based on reading performance, free/reduced lunch percentage, and the fact that they were not previously receiving funding under the Reading Excellence Act.

Staff at selected schools will receive professional development on scientifically-based reading methods, and will be provided grant funds to pay for a Reading Coach in each school. Reading Coaches serve as liaisons between the DOE and the schools regarding Reading First.

In reviewing the current status of this NCLB subgrant in Hawaii, we identified several challenges to full implementation.

- **Research-Based Instructional Materials** – Presently, all schools in Hawaii individually select research-based instructional materials. Once schools submit reading materials selections to the state, Reading First staff use USDOE and University of Oregon resources to evaluate the selections for appropriateness. The state has plans to develop a recommended reading materials list, but one does not currently exist.

- **Staffing** – Currently, there is an Interim Program Manager leading the implementation of Reading First. This person is also responsible for other grant management. Additionally, there is one Reading Specialist and one temporary teacher servicing all 20 schools throughout the islands. This situation necessitates large group professional development activities, and keeps Reading First staff from effectively getting to the teacher level when providing support.

- **Island Separation** – As with many other programs in Hawaii, Reading First staff encounter difficulty in providing services, especially professional development, to the various islands. Staff must fly to other islands, or teachers must fly to them for training.
Currently, all professional development activities are delivered in person, as opposed to using distance media.

- **Qualified Teachers** – Additional teacher qualification requirements set forth by NCLB place a significant burden on the state of Hawaii to train and recruit additional teachers in general, and especially for the Reading First Program. Hawaii is now trying to help current teachers obtain additional reading credits through various sources, but the capacity to move teachers rapidly into “highly qualified” status is lacking. In addition, the remote location of Hawaii impedes the successful recruitment of qualified teachers from the mainland.

- **Qualified Paraprofessionals** – The same issues that are affecting teachers apply to paraprofessionals in Hawaii. There is currently a dearth of qualified paraprofessionals on the islands as well as a lack of capacity to train paraprofessionals to meet NCLB requirements.

The review team also found that the Department of Education is attempting to build capacity for systemwide reading improvement by developing Lead Trainers within the school system to go into remote areas and train other teachers in reading methods. The intention is to reduce the amount of outside resources needed from the mainland to develop instructional competency among the schools of Hawaii.

With regard to Early Reading First, the DOE submitted a pre-application to the USDOE, but was not one of the 102 applicants selected (out of a total of 607) to submit a full application. The Hawaii Department of Education is currently developing a focus group to address the issue of pre-kindergarten education within the state, and will consider all programmatic and fiscal outcomes of providing these services in response to a request by the Hawaii State Legislature.

**COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**COMMENDATIONS**

- The Department of Education has developed a quality Reading First Plan to address reading improvement throughout the state.

- The Department of Education has selected the initial cohort of Reading First schools and is currently implementing Reading First plans.

- The capacity building activities of the Department of Education are a positive step in promoting programmatic quality and self-sufficiency.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 9-1:
Increase efforts to train teachers in research-based reading improvement strategies. The use of distance learning technology should be expanded to increase the reach of professional development activities, thereby reducing travel time and cost.

Recommendation 9-2:
Formalize and consolidate the process of selecting research-based reading instruction materials. At present, the process is informal and leads to wide variability of instructional materials. Creating a formal list of approved reading materials will help to standardize selection and reduce evaluation responsibilities (also see Component 1 for corresponding recommendations).

Recommendation 9-3:
Aggressively seek opportunities to improve pre-school reading skills. Although the DOE mission does not overtly address the provision of a universal preschool program and Hawaii’s Early Reading First application was not approved by the USDOE, the Department should utilize resources realized through capacity building activities to enhance the instructional competency of pre-school teachers and paraprofessionals.

Recommendation 9-4:
Collect and compile detailed information on program implementation and performance. It is clear that improvements in reading performance must be sustained and accelerated under current AYP goals. The level of success realized by Reading First should be carefully quantified to provide information for future state-level programmatic decisions.

COMPONENT 10: TRANSFERABILITY

Definition: NCLB allows for the transferring of certain funds to programs and activities that have proven to be the most effective. This provision allows states to transfer up to 50 percent of funds it receives for state-level, non-administrative activities among the following programs:

- Improving Teacher Quality State Grants
- State Grants for Innovative Programs
- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

The law also allows a state to transfer up to 50 percent of the funds it receives from these programs to carry out Title I, Part A activities. However, no Title I funds may be transferred to other programs. (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

Rubric Score: 1

FINDINGS

The consultant team found that Hawaii has chosen not to use the funds provided for transfer flexibility provisions of NCLB at the time of this review. Rather, the state has chosen to defer activity until such time as they have data on the initial results and impact of certain programs. These programs include, but are not limited to:

- Title II Teacher Quality;
- Title III English Language Acquisition; and
- Language Enhancement.

We found that state personnel believe that Title I schools have a substantial allocation of funds, adequate to allow most of them to implement major school improvement reform initiatives. This is particularly true if they coordinate resources within their respective schools. Furthermore, most schools have access to other state and federal resources to support critical staff development activities.

Indications were found that, as separate programs, Title II, Title III, Title IV, Parts A and B, and Title V may target funds to where the greatest need exists, and that Title I schools are frequently the beneficiaries of these program dollars. Targeting these program funds based on actual need may prove to be a more effective use of federal dollars rather than simply providing Title I schools more funds. Nevertheless, no evidence was provided to either support or reject current positions on the funding issue. Additionally, we found that no methods for establishing priorities for targeting funds to specific programs or areas within programs have been established.

This issue may stem from the finding that evaluative data on program effectiveness is currently either lacking or inadequate, and cannot be used to base funding decisions. Plans do exist, however, to regularly evaluate individual NCLB programs. As this is the first year of NCLB implementation, there are no prior year evaluation reports based on the new federal requirements for each titled program.

The review team found that the DOE has three specialist positions assigned program evaluation responsibilities. This section monitors outsourced evaluations as well as provides the technical assistance necessary for the 255 regular schools and 25 charter schools that serve over 183,000 students. We find this situation insufficient to ensure adequate service delivery.

Even though the state has not implemented the transferability provisions of NCLB, senior staff report that they do monitor selected schools, and that NCLB programs will be

* A rubric score of one in the area of transferability should not be interpreted as a negative as it is an optional requirement. The state has examined the concept and chosen to defer action until the issue is examined further after a year's time.
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

monitored to ensure that the federal funding produces performance results. Presently, program managers form teams that include professionals from a section or branch and complex area representatives to monitor selected schools. Samples of past monitoring reports are currently available, and the format is to be revised to meet NCLB program requirements.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 10-1:

Adopt a target date for final determination of decisions to implement the transferability provision of NCLB. It is clear that Hawaii has an opportunity to use transferability options to promote student achievement in potentially powerful ways.

Recommendation 10-2:

Develop criteria that may be used to determine priorities for assignment of supplemental funds to programs and that may be used to determine transferability needs. This process should include comprehensive analyses of programmatic performance based on detailed effectiveness data.

Recommendation 10-3:

Develop and implement a formal program evaluation plan that includes the collection of detailed programmatic data. This plan is needed for Hawaii to determine where transferable funds should be spent to realize maximum performance impact.

Recommendation 10-4:

Create an additional staff position for evaluation. Current staffing is insufficient to ensure adequate coverage of program evaluations.

Recommendation 10-5:

Establish protocol for monitoring the progress of program evaluation implementation. A cyclical and sustainable evaluation effort should be established through careful monitoring.

COMPONENT 11: DATA MANAGEMENT

Definition: The NCLB data management indicators are designed to help state education agencies understand the business functions that support good data management and areas in need of improvement. The major principle that underlies these indicators is—data are an asset to SEAs and they are essential for addressing NCLB requirements. Additionally, good data can help improve instruction and, therefore, is very important to SEAs. Since responding to the NCLB requirements necessitates that SEAs first
consider existing data in addition to possible additions, these indicators are written to broadly address data management as it relates to the entire data resource at a state education agency. (All provisions of NCLB are supported by effective data management)

Rubric Score: 2

FINDINGS

The Hawaii Department of Education – like many other SEAs around the country – is currently experiencing the consequences of allowing data management systems to evolve without comprehensive oversight and coordination. The result is a segmented, disconnected series of data systems that are tailored for specific purposes, without the capacity to communicate and integrate. This situation impedes the Department's ability to access, analyze, or compare valuable data sources from around the system. This is especially detrimental when considering the data analysis and reporting requirements mandated by NCLB.

The review team identified several concerns associated with data management. Major themes include:

- **Data Availability** – Many valuable sources of data are not currently captured within the Department. For example, there are no current data on the impact of instructional practices in the state. Presently, there is no clear understanding of what data are needed and for what purpose.

- **Compartmentalization** – Data sources throughout the system are isolated and specifically tailored for individual sections of the Department. Interviews indicated that these data “silos” are a result – and a reflection – of the isolation of responsibilities that has been the historical norm in the Hawaii Department of Education.

- **Data Consistency** – There is an overarching lack of data consistency resulting from the differing data purposes and processes. Data from multiple sources must be manually “cleaned” and aligned to be utilized effectively. No systemwide project management standards exist to guide data collection and reporting practices. This leads to unclear expectations and lost efficiency.

- **Data Application** – Individual mandates and data needs over time have created data that are useful only for the job in which they were collected. Current data collection and storage impedes the integrated use of systemic data.

- **Data-Driven Decision Making** – The lack of available data has created a culture that does not use data to drive systemwide decisions. The organizational inertia created over time makes this a difficult obstacle to overcome.
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- **Automation** — Many vital processes within the system are presently completed manually. Important examples of this include Human Resources personnel responsibilities and the processing of Individual Educational Plans for special education students. In addition, the current budget process requires individual sections to report separately.

- **Cross-Training** — Many data collection and reporting responsibilities throughout the system are conducted by individuals, with no other employees knowledgeable of the process. Consequently, when that individual leaves the system, knowledge of the process leaves with them.

- **Funding** — Information Technology currently receives less than two percent of the total department budget.

To compound data management issues, we found that many of the data systems and corresponding software used in the Hawaii Department of Education are 1970s vintage.

In an attempt to improve and integrate data management within the Department, a new Associate Superintendent was hired to oversee the Office of Information Technology Services and serve as Chief Information Officer. It is clear from interviews with senior staff that technology integration is presently a major focus of the DOE, and the new Assistant Superintendent was repeatedly mentioned as the center of this reformation.

The Office of Information Technology Services is currently working to create an integrated data system to link instructional and administrative technology information in a format to allow for efficient data communication and application. Interviews and document analyses revealed that the focus of this effort is to streamline data management systems so that more effort can be expended in getting vital instructional data to classroom teachers. This focus led to the creation of the Information Technology and Quality Council within the department. Improvement plans include the creation of the automated teacher information database (as described in Component 7).

At the time of the diagnostic review, the Hawaii Department of Education was finalizing a contract to develop a new Student Information System. According to DOE staff, the new system will have integrated modules based on process reengineering principals to automate current manual systems. The new system will also allow existing systems, such as the Integrated Special Education Database, to communicate with other data sources throughout the department.

The Office of Information Technology Services also initiated the Business Intelligence Project that is designed to pull data from around the system into a centralized data warehouse where it can then be processed and made available to administrators and teachers systemwide. We found that the Office of Information Technology Services is currently working, in conjunction with the Planning and Evaluation Branch, to create a data warehouse specifically designed to meet NCLB data requirements.
Although the Department of Education has made large strides to improve overall data management practices systemwide, a formalized plan to guide these improvements does not currently exist.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is committed to improving data management systemwide.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for hiring a new CIO to direct data management improvement efforts.

- The Hawaii Department of Education has created the Information Technology and Quality Council to promote standardization and quality control.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for the successes of the Business Intelligence Project during the 2002-03 school year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 11-1:

Increase the number of relevant data sources currently available within the Department of Education. The comprehensive collection of systemic data should improve the capacity for effective decision making.

Recommendation 11-2:

Continue to expand efforts to integrate data "silos." It is imperative that data from throughout the system be available and integrated to promote ongoing improvement.

Recommendation 11-3:

Develop a systemwide project management policy regarding data collection and reporting to ensure data consistency. Without articulated standards, there can be no systemic data understanding of expectations for data collection.

Recommendation 11-4:

Initiate professional development to promote the use of integrated data sources to drive programmatic decisions. It is important that the current organizational culture be modified to embrace data-driven decision making.
Recommendation 11-5:
Initiate cross-training of DOE employees in the collection and reporting of data. Data responsibilities are too important to leave to any one individual.

Recommendation 11-6:
Expand efforts to secure funding for IT improvements in the public and private sectors. A wealth of potential funding sources exist to support Hawaii's technology improvement efforts that should be aggressively pursued.

Recommendation 11-7:
Seek stakeholder input regarding needed data sources and other data management issues. Involving stakeholders in the development of new technology resources will strengthen systemwide buy-in and produce valuable information for technology planning.

Recommendation 11-8:
Develop a formalized Technology Plan to guide the implementation of data management improvements. In order to realize the full potential of technology efforts, a plan must be carefully detailed that includes areas of focus, individual responsibilities, and implementation timelines.

**COMPONENT 12: PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE**

**Definition:** Students in schools served under Title I that have been identified for improvement for at least two consecutive years must be given the option to transfer to another public school within the school district, including a public charter school, that has not been identified for improvement. Additionally, school districts must provide transportation to the new school consistent with the NCLB requirements. *(Title I, Part A, Section 1116)*

**Rubric Score: 2**

**FINDINGS**

Requirements regarding the provision of public school choice create an important issue for the state of Hawaii in that they have the potential to significantly impact the operations of the Department of Education and its schools. The existing SEA/LEA system provides the state the ability to implement public school choice policy quickly and efficiently, with little difficulty in communicating expectations and monitoring implementation efforts. In this light, Hawaii's single system structure can prove to be especially beneficial in the area of public school choice.
Since the enactment of NCLB, the DOE has initiated activities designed to successfully implement the federal requirements associated with public school choice within the state's school system. Some of the school choice activities to date consist of:

- systemwide planning for public school choice requirements and implementation; and
- public communication of eligibility for and availability of public school choice within the state.

With the passage of NCLB, the Department of Education developed a plan to address the requirements associated with the public school choice provision. The implementation plan for the 2002-03 school year included the following components:

- **Notification** – Parents were notified of the option to transfer after the determination of AYP was completed in September. Transfers were initiated on the first day of the second academic quarter, October 28th.

- **Capacity** – The decision was made in the Department that no school would gain or lose teachers based on the impact of public school choice transfers. Transfer capacity was calculated using the existing staffing allocation for the 2002-03 school year which allowed for a maximum of 20 students per classroom in grades 1 and 2, and 27 students per classroom in grades 3 through 12.

- **Selection** – Hawaii elected to use a point system based on grade point average and free/reduced lunch status to give school transfer priority to the lowest achieving students from low-income families. Since kindergarten students did not receive report cards, these student were not given the opportunity to transfer in the 2002-03 school year. The plan allows for the transfer of kindergarten students during the 2003-04 school year using first semester report cards; this is where the greatest increase of public school choice transfers is expected.

- **Geographic Limitations** – Utilizing the existing policy, Hawaii has chosen to limit transfer options to non-status schools on the student's same island. The USDOE has approved this decision for the 2003-04 school year.

- **Transportation** – Hawaii provides for federally-funded public school choice transportation services, with low-achieving students from low-income families receiving priority. These services will be available to students as long as federal funds for this purpose are available, and the student's home school remains identified for "improvement" or "corrective action" under federal requirements.

The consultant team found that, at present, there is a small demand for public school choice transfers across the state. During the 2002-03 school year, only 31 out of an estimated 50,000 students eligible for school choice options chose to transfer out of
schools with status. At the current level of demand, there have been few issues associated with the implementation of this requirement; however, there is an expectation that demand for public school choice transfers will increase as awareness of this option increases.

Exhibit 3-4 summarizes the current status of Title I schools within the school system. As is illustrated by the exhibit:

- eighty-two (82) of Hawaii's 146 Title I schools are categorized as "status" schools, meaning that they have been identified for school improvement or corrective action under federal requirements; and
- all of the 82 Title I schools were required to provide the public school choice option during the 2002-03 school year.

Hawaii's accountability framework also sanctions non-Title I schools in the same manner as NCLB Title I requirements, creating the opportunity for students from non-Title I schools to request school choice transfers. Although these students will be prioritized for selection, combined with Title I students using the existing point scale, this situation will undoubtedly exacerbate transfer capacity issues.

The expectation of increases in public school choice transfers exists; however, interviews also revealed that Hawaiians share a special affiliation to their schools. Many identify themselves, in part, with what high school they attended. This bonding is viewed as a possible limiting factor to the number of overall transfers within the state. Additionally, DOE staff shared that social labeling and stigma associated with identifying students as low achieving by using the state prioritization system may have added to the resistance to utilize transfer options.

**EXHIBIT 3-4**
**HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**
**TITLE I SCHOOLS SUMMARY**
**2002-03 SCHOOL YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOLS</th>
<th>PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS</th>
<th>TOTAL TITLE I SCHOOLS</th>
<th>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT YEAR 1</th>
<th>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT YEAR 2</th>
<th>CORRECTIVE ACTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SCHOOLS W/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Oahu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laeward Oahu</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward Oahu</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


We found that the geographic restrictions placed on public school choice transfers make the provision of these services possible within the state. By limiting transfers to schools on the same island, Hawaii has avoided much of the worst-case possibilities that could
make the provision of school choice cost prohibitive. In situations where all island schools are identified under NCLB requirements, such as is the current condition on Molokai, the Department plans to enhance supplemental educational services and professional development to show a good faith effort.

Hawaii's student transportation services consist of privately contracted vendors and municipal bus routes. The DOE coordinates the efforts of 11 vendors and provides municipal bus passes to students where public bus routes are available. However, we found that there is currently no formalized transportation plan, and no transportation planning regarding NCLB has taken place. Additionally, there have been no discussions with private vendors regarding potential increases in demand resulting from school choice transfers.

In the 2002-03 school year, the DOE provided no bus service to students transferring to schools outside of their assigned enrollment district. For parents choosing to transfer students out of district, the Department offered mileage reimbursements paid for with federal funds. Only eight of the 31 families that transferred schools requested reimbursements during the school year. The remaining families could utilize the existing school transportation options, if applicable. The result was that only a small fraction of the federal funding set aside by NCLB for this purpose was expended.

A review of data generated from the NCLB Capacity Survey conducted in August 2002 shows that the DOE has capacity issues among the complex areas that will affect the ability for students to transfer if demand increases significantly. Interviews regarding facility capacity revealed a "wait and see" approach to the issue, with some senior staff sharing that they were "hoping" that the capacity for transfer will be there if needed. Additionally, there has been no formal attempt to project the potential impact of public school choice on DOE operations.

A review of official documents and Web sites resulted in the discovery of several sources of information available to staff and parents regarding public school choice options. These include:

- on-line policy and implementation information;
- on-line news releases regarding public school choice;
- multiple references to school choice issues in the Superintendent's Update - an internal newsletter; and
- information packets sent to schools and parents to communicate vital school choice information.

These sources of information notwithstanding, the current communication and marketing activities regarding public school choice are insufficient to ensure widespread awareness of transfer options.
COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for the timely implementation of the existing public school choice implementation plan.

- The Hawaii Department of Education has successfully negotiated geographic school transfer restrictions with USDOE.

- Quantifying school transfer capacity within the schools is a positive step in overall school choice planning.

- Effective materials have been produced to inform stakeholders on the availability of and processes associated with public school choice.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for utilizing private vendors, public transportation, and mileage reimbursements to support the current volume of public school choice transfers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 12-1:

Develop a systemwide school choice impact projection that includes estimated need figures for facilities, personnel, and transportation. It is likely that Hawaii will experience an increase in school choice transfers that must be adequately planned for.

Recommendation 12-2:

Develop a transportation plan regarding public school choice that adheres to NCLB and state requirements. Transportation plans should be formal and include indicators of status and performance that could be affected by school choice transfers.

Recommendation 12-3:

Include private transportation vendors and public transportation representatives in all transportation planning regarding public school choice. This is especially important considering Hawaii's dependency on alternative transportation.

Recommendation 12-4:

Monitor the use of transportation funds for public school choice to ensure that spending matches need, up to required levels. Legal challenges could result from
a situation where school choice transportation resources do not meet need; the state must protect itself from such challenges.

Recommendation 12-5:

Develop a comprehensive facilities plan based on estimated impact of public school choice. Again, it is essential that the state plan for school choice transfers be prepared if significant increases occur.

Recommendation 12-6:

Collect and consolidate relevant programmatic and student data on public school choice. Comprehensive future planning can only occur with comprehensive status information.

Recommendation 12-7:

Consolidate all existing policies, data, and resources regarding public school choice into one comprehensive implementation plan. Public school choice is a far reaching policy that requires a coordinated and focused effort only possible with a formal implementation plan.

Recommendation 12-8:

Increase overall monitoring and evaluation of implementation efforts associated with public school choice to promote successful coordination of services and compliance with federal regulations. The potential consequences for non-compliance are significant, as public awareness of this issue is growing. Subsequently, the DOE should expect a high level of scrutiny regarding school choice implementation.

Recommendation 12-9:

Increase communication of eligibility requirements and availability of public school choice via the Office of Communications. The communication of school choice options is critical to implementation efforts and should be controlled by those must competent in delivering public information.

Recommendation 12-10:

Provide additional support to the Office of Communications to facilitate improved communication of public school choice options. It is clear that this office is understaffed for the additional communication burden brought about by NCLB (also see Component 15, Supplemental Education Services).
COMPONENT 13: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Definition: Under NCLB, school districts must use at least five percent of Title I funds for professional development to help teachers become highly qualified. Additionally, schools identified for improvement must spend at least 10 percent of their Title I Part A funds on professional development for the school's teachers and principal that directly addresses the academic achievement problem that caused the school to be identified. Additionally, states must provide professional development to support other provisions of NCLB. (Title I, Part A, Section 1111 and 1116; Title I Part A, Subpart 1; Title I Part B, Subparts 1 and 2; and Title II, Part D, Subparts 1 and 2)

Rubric Score: 2.4

FINDINGS

The Hawaii Department of Education has developed a state plan (Professional Development and Training Plan for State of Hawaii Department of Education) that addresses a variety of professional development directives in the NCLB law. The state plan focuses on the integration of program objectives, especially in general education and special education. Further, the focus is on integrated professional development and training opportunities that are:

- consistent with the policies and regulations of the Department of Education;
- consistent with and built upon the other activities of the Department;
- achieved through focusing and aligning of personnel, services, and resources; and
- systemic (accessible throughout the state and for all employees).

A review of the document shows that the state plan ensures that schools spend at least five percent of Title I funds for professional development to help teachers become highly qualified. Professional development is directed where it is most needed based on reviewing a variety of measures and surveys. Additionally, we found that schools identified for improvement spend at least 10 percent of Title I Part A funds on professional development for school staff.

Funds are provided to complex areas and schools to assist with the professional development for school staff to fully implement standards and focus on school improvement. It was found that all professional development activities are based on proven, effective methods of promoting student achievement. Interviews indicated that Department staff understand the need for scientifically-based programs. The Department needs to continue to select and offer training that is scientifically-based. The DOE also hires external evaluators to provide a third-party review of program quality and effectiveness.
Additionally, the state plan provides for an annual increase in the percentage of teachers who are receiving professional development to become highly qualified by 2005-06. The state plan also provides additional professional development for teachers under the Reading First Program (see Component 9 of this report for more information on Reading First).

The review team found that the Department of Education provides both centralized and decentralized professional development for state, complex area, and school staff. The DOE annually plans for state-level professional development based upon documented needs of paraprofessional staff, support staff, teachers, and administrators.

As previously mentioned in Component 8, we also identified two separate areas of the Department of Education with professional development responsibilities. Hawaii's Accountability Plan refers to many professional development activities taking place within the Office of Curriculum and Instruction, but the Office of Human Resources also conducts professional development for the DOE. This dichotomy creates a situation where staff development regarding NCLB is segmented and lacks a systemic focus. It also presents the opportunity for critical professional development needs to be overlooked due to a lack of coordination in staff training. The Department may want to consider purchasing software designed to manage training and professional development activities. This would help to document and manage training and professional development provided to all staff.

The state professional development plan addresses paraprofessional development to ensure that all staff meet federal and state requirements within required timelines. The review team found that paraprofessional standards have been drafted and information packets have been provided to all paraprofessional staff outlining options for staff to become highly qualified (also see Component 8).

We found that professional development is provided to complex area and building staff by state-level content specialists when standards and curriculum are updated or newly adopted. Content specialists assist with state, complex area, and building-level implementation of standards and curriculum. Additionally, evidence exists that DOE staff understand that professional development is focused on implementing standards and school improvement.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

COMMENDATIONS:

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for the development of a statewide professional development plan.
- The Hawaii Department of Education is focused on and funds professional development at all levels of the organization.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendation 13-1:

Continue to focus on the statewide plan for professional development. Each level of the organization must understand its role in achieving highly qualified staff.
Professional development should be scientific-based and must be coordinated in order to achieve high standards for all students and focus on systemwide school improvement.

Recommendation 13-2:

Consolidate all professional development activities within the Office of Human Resources. This recommendation does not mean that all professional activities will be conducted by the Office of Human Resources; in fact many, if not most, will continue to be conducted by the instructional units in the agency. Nonetheless, the ambitious and complex requirements of NCLB and Hawaii’s Accountability Plan necessitate coordinated staff development to reach systemic goals. The current placement of professional development coordination in two separate areas of the DOE is inefficient to ensure the needed level of coordination.

Recommendation 13-3:

Charter a state, complex area, and building-level professional development team to coordinate and evaluate professional development across all programs and levels of the organization. Current efforts are fragmented throughout the organization and must be centrally coordinated.

Recommendation 13-4:

Continue to provide mentoring support to new teachers. Teachers, as the primary agents of educational service delivery, should be coached by others with extended knowledge and experience.

Recommendation 13-5:

Consider developing a statewide “grow your own” program to identify and support students and staff that want to teach and become principals. This program could do much to promote Hawaii’s self-sufficiency in teacher recruitment.

Recommendation 13-6:

Consider purchasing software designed to manage training requirements for staff. This system would be useful in documenting training and notifying staff of new offerings.

**COMPONENT 14: STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT**

Definition: NCLB requires the inclusion of students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency in state accountability measures. States are required to hold students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency to the same standards and assessments as students in regular education following federal timelines for the implementation of these measures. *(Title I, Part A, Section 1111)*
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

Rubric Score: 2.5

FINDINGS

The Department of Education has been actively involved in court action since 1994 in the area of special education. The Felix Consent Decree is the result of a lawsuit filed against the State in District Court on behalf of seven children, their parents, and mental health advocates. The lawsuit alleged that qualified handicapped children were not receiving the educational and mental health services they needed. Since 1994-95, expenditures have increased from $181,071,352 to $301,863,705 in 1999-2000, and the number of children in the Felix class has grown from an estimated 2,894 to 11,842 in 1999-2000. This fact is mentioned to acknowledge the manpower and fiscal impact on the state and the DOE. With this said, the Department must also commit manpower and fiscal resources to implement a new federal NCLB law and participate in the reauthorization of the special education federal law.

The review team found that the DOE is focused on achieving the vision of NCLB. In this effort, all students are included in the statewide assessment and accountability system. The DOE currently identifies 11.9 percent special education students, 15 percent children in poverty, and 6.9 percent English language learners with 185,000 students currently enrolled in preschool through 12th grade.

We found that the accountability system holds all schools and complex areas to the same criteria for reading, writing, and mathematics. Student content standards are applied uniformly to all students. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements are applied to all student subgroups, including students with disabilities and Limited English Proficient (LEP). All students are assessed at grade level by the Department. The DOE also ensures that all reasonable adaptations and accommodations are made when assessing students with disabilities and those that have limited English skills.

The state provides an alternate assessment for students with severe disabilities that cannot participate in the regular assessment with accommodations. Currently, one percent of students identified as disabled take the alternate assessment. The DOE has developed a plan to assess all students in science by 2007-08.

We found that a variety of statewide student services are in place to assist Limited English Proficient (LEP) students to achieve high standards. Services include:

- before- and after-school tutorials;
- extra teaching staff in classrooms, paraprofessionals; and
- summer school LEP students who are given the Language Assessment Scale (LAS) to assess oral, reading, and writing skills.

The LAS is a performance-based English proficiency assessment which is aligned to the state's English Language Arts Standards as well as the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards for reading and writing. All LEP students in grades 3, 5, 8 and 10 are assessed in English in the areas of reading and writing on the statewide assessment.
Additionally, the DOE has implemented the Comprehensive Student Support System (CSSS) in all public schools with the goal of effectively supporting all students to attain the Hawaii content and performance standards. The CSSS is designed to provide a comprehensive continuum of supports and services that can be flexibly employed in a coordinated manner, with the goal of identifying and effectively addressing barriers to learning as early as possible. CSSS services and supports are provided across a continuum of five levels of increasing intensity, ranging from basic support for all students to intensive services provided by multiple agencies.

The CSSS is comprised of the following six critical elements:

- **Personalized classroom climates and strategies**, which meet the individual needs and backgrounds of students and include frequent assessment and revision of teaching and learning strategies.

- **Prevention and early intervention**, so that barriers to learning are identified and addressed early and are therefore much less likely to develop into serious problems.

- **Meaningful family involvement**, based on good school-family communication, so that family members are involved in all aspects of school, including the planning, delivery, and evaluation of services and supports for their own children.

- **Supports for transition**, so that students experience the least possible disruption to learning when moving between schools, classes, or programs and so that students leaving high school experience...

- **Community outreach, volunteers, and partnerships**, so that community members and agencies are involved in and contribute to their local schools, including public and private partnerships to provide CSSS services and supports.

- **Specialized assistance, crisis/emergency support, and follow-through** with school staff as well as students and parents knowledgeable about crisis and emergency procedures, and with the school team prepared to respond effectively in a variety of situations on behalf of students with intensive special needs.

**COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**COMMENDATIONS**

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for the development and implementation of the Language Assessment Scale (LAS) for assessing oral, reading, and writing skills.
The development and deployment of the Comprehensive Student Support System (CSSS) provides needed supports in all of Hawaii's public schools.

The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for its work in improving services to all disabled students with particular attention to students who are severely emotionally disabled (SED).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendation 14-1:

Review the results of the LAS to determine the effectiveness of services offered to LEP students. NCLB requirements necessitate that LEP students are quickly brought to levels of English proficiency. As this is an issue for approximately seven percent of the Hawaii's student population, English language acquisition should be carefully monitored.

Recommendation 14-2:

Continue to train and evaluate staff related to inputting and transmitting CSSS information. Accurate and comprehensive information is critical to the ongoing success of this system.

Recommendation 14-3:

Continue to train school staff on adapting and accommodating instructional materials so that all students can appropriately participate in the assessment system. The very name of No Child Left Behind illustrates that the law is committed to ensuring that all students are assessed on state standards.

Recommendation 14-4:

Periodically review and discuss CSSS data in the regularly scheduled meetings of the Strategic Implementation Team. This review will help to ensure that student support services are appropriate and distributed based on actual need systemwide.

Recommendation 14-5:

Clarify the Department's operational focus and specific mission. An effective template for developing an operational profile can be found on the National Baldrige Web site.

Recommendation 14-6:

Continue to disaggregate performance data for disabled students by complex area and building levels to determine appropriate interventions for these students.
COMPONENT 15: SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

Definition: NCLB requires that school districts obtain supplemental educational services for students attending a school not meeting AYP for the third consecutive year. Supplemental educational services can be during non-school hours, from a public- or private-sector provider that has been approved by the state. Additionally, school districts must provide transportation to the service provider. Faith-based organizations are also eligible to apply for state approval. (Title I, Part A, Section 1116)

Rubric Score: 2.0

FINDINGS

Federal requirements regarding the provision of supplemental educational services present both unique opportunities and challenges for the state of Hawaii. One significant opportunity is that the state's SEA/LEA organizational structure allows for the implementation of supplemental educational services throughout the state's area complexes and schools with a high level of efficiency and standardization. One significant challenge is that the existing organizational structure focuses all of the responsibilities – and potential consequences – on the Department of Education.

In this light, the state has taken several steps to promote NCLB compliance in the provision of supplemental educational services to the students of Hawaii. Relevant activities to date include:

- systemwide planning for supplemental educational services provisions;
- recruiting private vendors to provide supplemental educational services;
- enlisting community resources in service provision and training;
- communicating requirements and expectations systemwide; and
- informing the public of opportunities to receive supplemental educational services for their children.

The review team found that, to varying degrees, these efforts display systemwide focus and coordination in the initial phase of NCLB implementation. Although Hawaii has an advantage in the ability to implement supplemental educational service policy systemwide, the agency is at a disadvantage in actually providing these services. Geographic separation among the seven complex areas impedes the ability to get needed services to remote locations. To compound the issue, Hawaii has experienced difficulty in attracting vendors qualified to provide supplemental educational services.

At present, Hawaii has four private vendors providing supplemental educational services within the state, and three more have recently been approved for the 2003-04 school
year. Each vendor has met a set of basic requirements developed by the Department of Education and submitted a prospectus detailing services to be provided as well as other information required by NCLB.

Private vendors utilized by the state are a mixture of face-to-face and on-line service providers, including:

- **College Connections Hawaii** – provides supplemental educational services to approximately 465 students in 23 Hawaii schools.

- **Kumon North America, Inc. Math and Reading Centers** – operates 53 sites throughout the state providing math and reading instruction.

- **Smarthinking.com** – provides on-line services (no utilization information available).

- **Tutor.com** – provides on-line services (no utilization information available).

On-line services are available from any Internet-connected computer, which allows students the possibility to receive tutoring while at home. However, there is a significant problem with Internet availability – and electricity – in many remote locations.

We found that there is inconsistent implementation of these services among the various complex areas and schools. Currently, each Complex Area Superintendent receives funds into an account for school choice and supplemental educational service implementation. In some cases, vendors bill the Superintendents. In other cases, vendors bill the schools directly. As there is no uniform policy addressing this issue, specific implementation arrangements are left to the discretion of the Complex Area Superintendents.

In an effort to increase service capacity, Hawaii is also utilizing Community Schools for Adults (CSAs) to provide literacy support services to schools throughout the system. As a result, CSAs are currently the largest providers of literacy tutoring in the state. In addition to providing services to students, community schools are training teachers to provide literacy tutoring services.

Additionally, the Department of Education initiated an arrangement with associated regional education laboratories to conduct stakeholder surveys to monitor levels of quality and impact displayed by the various supplemental educational service programs.

One of the most significant challenges to the state is the potential increased demand for supplemental educational services. Exhibit 3-5 summarizes the current status of Title I schools within the school system. As is illustrated by the exhibit:

- eighty-two (82) of Hawaii’s 146 Title I schools are categorized as “status” schools, meaning that they have been identified for school improvement or corrective action under federal requirements;
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

- A total of 76 Title I schools were required to provide supplemental educational services during the 2002-03 school year; and
- Six (6) additional schools could be required to provide these services in the 2003-04 school year, if AYP is not met.

**EXHIBIT 3-5**
HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TITLE I SCHOOLS SUMMARY
2002-03 SCHOOL YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOLS</th>
<th>PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS</th>
<th>TOTAL TITLE I SCHOOLS</th>
<th>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT YEAR 1</th>
<th>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT YEAR 2</th>
<th>CORRECTIVE ACTION</th>
<th>TOTAL SCHOOLS W/STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Oahu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeward Oahu</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward Oahu</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 76 schools required to offer supplemental educational services in the 2002-03 school year produced approximately 3,000 requests for services. Due to capacity issues, only a portion of these requests could be accommodated. In addition, Hawaii’s accountability plan subjects both Title I and non-Title I schools to NCLB sanctions, which could produce a demand for supplemental educational services from non-Title I schools.

The communication of supplemental educational services information as well as the marketing of these services are uneven across different areas of the state. Resources exist, however, that effectively communicate the opportunities, regulations, and processes associated with obtaining these services. Evidence was provided of attempts to communicate information to parents regarding supplemental educational services, including:

- Fact sheets and other parent information materials currently available on the DOE Web site that were developed as a result of parent, community, and school work sessions before the beginning of the 2002-03 school year; and

- Sample letters disseminated to schools designed to communicate eligibility and availability of supplemental educational services to parents.

Much of this information is developed and disseminated through the Office of Communications, which currently has a Director and one part-time temporary staff member. Interviews within the Department of Education revealed that this Office has
virtually no operating budget with which to conduct communications activities (also see Component 12).

In spite of these efforts, the demand for supplemental educational services was very low in the 2002-03 school year, as the 3,000 requests represent only a small fraction of students eligible for services. Presently, Hawaii utilizes 15 resources teachers (referred to as "linkers") to inform Title I school principals and staff in the seven complex areas on issues surrounding supplemental educational services and public school choice. We found that there is no formal structure in place, however, to provide additional marketing or eligibility information to parents at the local level.

During the 2002-03 school year, Hawaii chose not to provide transportation for students receiving supplemental educational services. Senior staff indicated in interviews that the decision was made to wait until regulations were clarified and the federal review of Hawaii's accountability plans were complete before creating policy to address this issue. Consequently, no Title I funds have been spent to date to provide transportation services.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for the timely systemwide implementation of supplemental educational services.
- On-line resources have been effectively used to provide supplemental educational services to remote locations.
- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for using its community adult schools to increase service capacity.
- Effective materials have been developed to inform stakeholders on the availability of and processes associated with supplemental educational services.
- The Hawaii Department of Education uses "linkers" to communicate information on supplemental educational services to state schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 15-1:

Aggressively recruit qualified supplemental educational service providers to increase service capacity. As stated in Component 12, Hawaii plans to use additional supplemental educational services to compensate for school choice limitations in addition to typical needs; this action will require additional service delivery resources.
Recommendation 15-2:

Maximize opportunities to provide on-line and other distance education media to provide supplemental educational services to remote locations. Face-to-face services may be preferred over distance methods, but might not be feasible with increasing demand. The Hawaii Department of Education should continuously seek out alternative strategies for supplemental service delivery to meet increasing needs while minimizing travel costs.

Recommendation 15-3:

Centralize the contracting and payment of supplemental educational service providers in the Title I Office of the Department of Education. Consequences for ineffective and inefficient services could impact the Hawaii Department of Education both legally and in student performance. The management of these services should be centrally coordinated.

Recommendation 15-4:

Continue to expand the use of CSAs to provide literacy tutoring and teacher training in this area. The capacity for service delivery is greatly enhanced by the use of CSAs and this effort should be maximized.

Recommendation 15-5:

Explore the use of CSAs to include math tutoring and teacher training in this area. This resource could be a powerful agent for student improvement and staff development.

Recommendation 15-6:

Increase communication of eligibility requirements and availability of supplemental educational services via the Office of Communications (as stated in Recommendation 12-9). The issues are the same for supplemental educational services and public school choice in this regard.

Recommendation 15-7:

Provide additional support to the Office of Communications to facilitate improved communication of supplemental educational services (as stated in Recommendation 12-10). As detailed in Component 12, the current resources are insufficient to adequately inform the public of supplemental educational services options.

Recommendation 15-8:

Develop a transportation plan regarding supplemental educational services that adheres to NCLB requirements. As a corollary to Recommendation 12-2, students eligible for supplemental services must be provided transportation, if necessary. These needs must be factored into the overarching NCLB transportation plan.
Recommendation 15-9:

Monitor the use of transportation funds for supplemental educational services to ensure that spending matches need to required levels. Similar to the issues raised in Chapter 12, legal challenges could result from underfunding transportation for supplemental educational services.

Recommendation 15-10:

Collect and consolidate relevant programmatic and student data on supplemental educational services. The effective implementation of these services could potentially produce the greatest overall improvement in student performance of any other strategies available, and as such, should be carefully researched.

Recommendation 15-11:

Consolidate all existing policies, data, and resources regarding supplemental educational services into one comprehensive implementation plan. Considering that there is such a potential for systemic improvement, all implementation activities should be included in a centralized formal plan.

Recommendation 15-12:

Increase overall monitoring and evaluation of implementation efforts associated with supplemental educational services to promote successful coordination of services and compliance with federal regulations. The successful implementation of these services are critical to the state of Hawaii and should be managed with precision.

COMPONENT 16: EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Definition: The Educational Technology State Grants Program awards formula grants to states to support improved student achievement through the use of technology. The program emphasizes high quality professional development; increased access to technology and the Internet; the integration of technology into curricula; and the use of technology for promoting parental involvement and managing data for informed decision making. (Title II, Part D, Subparts 1 and 2)

Rubric Score: 2.5

FINDINGS

The Department of Education has developed a comprehensive state technology plan. The plan is a long-term strategy for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of technology in the classroom. The plan also addresses teacher professional development issues. One finding of the review team was that there is presently inconsistency in the use of technology for instructional
purposes within the state's classrooms. Additionally, only 38 percent of senior staff agreed or strongly agree that Hawaii is currently in compliance with NCLB educational technology requirements. Consequently, a primary focus of this professional development is helping teachers to integrate technology effectively into curriculum and instruction.

The state plan has three broad goals, including:

- students will have access to current technologies;
- LEP students, and teachers who serve LEP students, will have increased access to technologies; and
- teachers will be qualified to utilize technology to improve teaching and learning.

Although goals and accountability measures have previously been developed and included in the plan, we found that the accountability measures are continuing to be refined. The DOE will soon be presenting the comprehensive state technology plan to the Board of Education for approval.

The review team also found that the DOE uses five percent of Educational Technology State Grants Program funds for state-level technology activities. State-level activities identified include:

- professional development;
- network infrastructure;
- assessment; and
- research.

A percentage of statewide funds is distributed to the complex areas to be used in high-need schools. The state also provides technical assistance to high-poverty schools in completing applications for competitive funds. We found that the Department is currently looking for a contractor to evaluate the effectiveness of the Educational Technology State Grants Program. Additionally, DOE staff are currently developing effectiveness indicators to focus the program evaluation.

The Department of Education promotes the use of the Standards Implementation Design (SID) System to improve student academic achievement and technology literacy. The SID System is a continuous process for improvement that includes:

- standards-based learning;
- assessment and accountability;
- data-driven and research-based decision making;
- professional development; and
- building capacity of the system.

The Department provides high capacity network accessibility through connection to the currently available statewide network, or through the procurement of broadband network services from service providers to high need school sites. The state's fiber optic based
I-Net will be expanded to add more school sites in an effort to expand systemwide access capacity.

In addition to providing electronic teacher training as detailed in Components 7 and 13, and utilizing distance technology to provide supplemental educational services (Component 15), the Hawaii Department of Education also uses technology to provide student instruction. To this end, the Hawaii E-School (Electronic School) offers standards-based instruction through the Internet (24 hours a day, seven days a week). E-School is a supplementary program that has been in operation since 1996. Currently, there are 50 high school ACCN credit courses available.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for the development of a statewide comprehensive technology plan.
- The Hawaii Department of Education's focus on increased access to technology for LEP students should augment systemwide capacity for English instruction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 16-1:

Continue to integrate technology literacy standards throughout the curricula. With increased technology literacy comes the increased ability to provide comprehensive services using these media, which are essential to the ongoing improvement efforts of Hawaii.

Recommendation 16-2:

Continue to provide training for teachers to expand beyond using technology for strictly management functions. The effective use of instructional technology in the classroom is especially important in Hawaii, considering the current and potential number of status schools combined with geographic separation issues faced by DOE staff.

Recommendation 16-3:

Finalize the comprehensive state technology plan accountability baseline measures. The effective use of technology is essential to the success of the DOE and should be directed by clear performance indicators with a high level of corresponding accountability.

Recommendation 16-4:

The comprehensive state technology plan should be reviewed by all complex areas and schools, and updated regularly. The composition of Hawaii's education
system makes this an easy and powerful opportunity to promote systemwide understanding and buy-in regarding technology issues.

**COMPONENT 17: STUDENT SAFETY AND HEALTH**

Definition: NCLB contains provisions designed to promote student health and safety. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act supports programs to prevent violence in and around schools; prevent the illegal use of drugs, alcohol, and tobacco by young people; and foster a safe and drug-free learning environment. The Gun-Free Schools Act places requirements on all states receiving NCLB funds regarding guns on school campuses. The Unsafe School Choice Option requires each state receiving funds under NCLB to implement policy requiring that students who attend persistently dangerous schools or become victims of violent crimes on their school grounds be allowed to attend a safe school within the same school district. The Pro-Children Act of 2001 prohibits smoking in buildings used to provide children under the age of 18 with regular or routine health care, day care, education, or library services. *(Title IV, Part A; Part A, Subpart 3, and Part C; and Title IX, Part E)*

**Rubric Score: 2.5**

**FINDINGS**

The Department of Education has developed a comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the state agency to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools. The plan was developed in consultation with state officials, including:

- the Governor;
- the Superintendent;
- the head of the State Alcohol and Drug Abuse agency;
- the heads of the state health and mental health agencies;
- the head of the state child welfare agency;
- the head of the state Board of Education; and
- representatives of parents, students, and community based organizations.

In response to federal regulations regarding this issue, Hawaii has established and implemented a statewide policy requiring students attending persistently dangerous public schools be allowed to attend a safe public school within the community, including a public charter school.

All schools in Hawaii must develop a comprehensive campus safety plan that addresses a variety of safety and security issues. Schools must also conduct and document annual training sessions for school staff regarding school safety and security. In addition,
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

Secondary schools have security aides who assist administrators and staff in enforcing rules, monitoring the campus, and assisting with overall campus safety.

The DOE also conducts a Comprehensive Needs Assessment to determine the extent to which public schools are meeting the needs of its students. The assessment is designed to ensure credibility, comprehensiveness, and usefulness of school operations concerning stakeholders inside and outside of the organization. Information was gathered on concerns in 12 improvement areas.

Six core needs emerged from the assessment. The core needs include:

- Improve standards-based learning;
- Improve the quality of student support services;
- Improve professionalism and capacity of the system;
- Need focus on sustained action;
- Need coordinated team work; and
- Improve responsiveness of the system.

We found that all schools report student incident and expulsion data to the Department of Education which factor into the determination of overall school safety and security. Presently, there are no schools classified as persistently dangerous under federal and state criteria. A smoking ban is enforced in all school buildings. Additionally, funds are provided to complex areas and buildings to implement activities supporting safe and drug-free schools.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education has developed a comprehensive plan to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools statewide.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for not having any schools as identified as persistently dangerous.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 17-1:

Continue to monitor school compliance in practicing emergency preparedness. A public premium is placed on school safety, especially in light of recent emergency situations throughout the country. Hawaii must be diligent in its efforts to ensure that schools are proficient in their responses to emergencies.

Recommendation 17-2:

Review crime and violence data regularly in the Strategic Implementation Team meetings. To avoid having schools classified as persistently dangerous, the DOE should incorporate a centralized systemic approach.
COMPONENT 18: OVERALL ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

Definition: In several sections of NCLB, reference is made to the need for greater collaboration and communication at the state level and among the state, local and national levels. The statements in this section address a state's readiness to fully implement NCLB. Due to the fact that Hawaii has one district organization (i.e., a combined LEA and SEA), services are coordinated on a statewide basis. (All provisions of NCLB are supported by effective organizational management.)

Rubric Score: 2.5

FINDINGS

The governance and administrative structure of Hawaii's public school system is unique among states. The Hawaii public school system is a single, unified, statewide K-12 system of schools headed by the State Education Agency (SEA) and the district or LEA. Hawaii is approximately the 10th largest school system in the nation.

Hawaii's State Board of Education formulates policy for the public schools and state library system. The Board has 13 elected members—10 from Oahu and three from neighbor islands—and one non-voting student member elected by students in grades 7-12.

The Superintendent has appointed four Assistant Superintendents to run state-level offices responsible for:

- curriculum, instruction, and student support;
- human resources;
- business services; and
- information technology services.

The Superintendent also has appointed 15 Complex Area Superintendents who each oversees and supports two to four school complexes. Each complex consists of a high school and the elementary and intermediate/middle schools that feed into the high school. The Complex Area Superintendents are based in administrative offices located in seven geographical districts: Honolulu, Central, Leeward, and Windward on Oahu; and Hawaii, Maui (including Molokai and Lanai) and Kauai (including Niilau) on the neighbor islands.

As stated previously, in many ways, as a combined SEA and LEA, Hawaii has an advantage in the coordination of NCLB. As a district organization, professional development, technical assistance, and other support services can be coordinated on a statewide basis. For additional support, efforts are in place to modify state fiscal and accounting barriers so that schools can easily consolidate federal, state, and local funds for schoolwide programs.
Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations

In 1999, the Hawaii Department of Education developed a Strategic Plan for Standards-Based Reform. The plan (which highlighted the standards and assessment, accountability, evaluation, and support services systems) provided the state’s framework for education reform.

In January 2003, a Strategic Implementation Plan was issued which stated that by Summer 2002, 84 percent of the 1999 plan had been completed or implemented and the other 16 percent had either been updated, revised, or incorporated in the January 2003 document. The 2003 Plan has four goals:

- provide a standards-based education for every child;
- sustain comprehensive support for all students;
- deliver coordinated, systemic support for staff and schools; and
- achieve and sustain continuous improvement of student performance, and professional school and system quality.

The 2003 Plan provides objectives, strategies, and actions for each goal as well as measures. The SIP contains four goals, 12 objectives, 13 outcome measures, and 91 strategic actions. The Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) is a road map designed to move the system to a standards-based education model. The review team found that each element of NCLB is incorporated into the plan.

Senior staff shared that not all functions in the SEA as they relate to NCLB are integrated and coordinated. Indeed, only 41 percent of senior staff agreed or strongly agreed that NCLB implementation is being effectively coordinated across areas of responsibility: As an example, professional development is housed in two separate areas (Human Resources and Curriculum), as are professional training requirements. Until recently, no one individual was coordinating NCLB in the agency; in May 2003, this responsibility was transferred to the Deputy Superintendent.

The implementation of the Strategic Implementation Plan is assigned to the Strategic Implementation Plan Committee. This committee includes the Superintendent of Education, 11 DOE and complex area senior leadership staff, and an outside consultant who serves as the Coordinator. The Strategic Implementation Plan Committee is charged with meeting regularly and issuing progress reports on implementation activities. Meeting minutes and plan updates are posted on the DOE Web site.

The Hawaii Legislature passed Act 238 (Session Laws of Hawaii 2000) which mandates that the Department of Education implement an educational accountability system for Hawaii’s public schools that would measure and report on student attainment of statewide content and performance standards. The Department will be challenged to meet the general accountability system design requirements specified by Act 238 while simultaneously meeting the highly specified accountability measures required by NCLB.

The Department has developed a set of outcome measures to use when analyzing, aligning, and improving student and organizational performance. The virtual Assessment Resource Center Hawaii (ARCH) provides detailed educational assessment and
accountability information for teachers, administrators, parents, policy makers, and the community at-large. The site includes school accountability information, system accountability information, and resource links.

School accountability measures include:

- **School Status & Improvement Report (SSIR)** — the SSIR includes description of the school and information on context, process, and outcomes of education at each school;

- **School Quality Survey (SQR)** — the SQR is designed to survey selected stakeholders regarding school quality indicators;

- **Senior Exit Plans Survey (SEPS)** — the SEPS is an annual statewide survey of public high school seniors; and

- **No Child Left Behind (NCLB)** — the NCLB section is an annual posting of progress related to Public Law 107-110.

Additionally, the system accountability measures include:

- **Accountability Framework (AF)** — the AF is a legislatively-mandated accountability framework for public schools;

- **Superintendent’s Annual Report (SAR)** — the SAR is intended to inform the people about progress toward goals of the State’s public schools;

- **Hawai`i Opinion Poll on Public Education (HOPPE)** — the HOPPE measures public attitudes toward public education; and

- **Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)** — the CNA determines the extent to which public schools are meeting the educational needs of its students and to do so in such a manner as to suggest priorities for improvement.

The third and final part of ARCH are the Resource Links, which we found to effectively provide an array of student, professional, instructional, and school improvement information. The resource area is designed for teachers, administrators, parents, policy makers, and the community at-large.

The DOE has also developed a state plan (*Professional Development and Training Plan for State of Hawaii Department of Education*) that addresses a variety of professional development directives in NCLB. The state plan supports the integration of program objectives, especially in general education and special education. The focus is on integrated professional development and training opportunities for LEA staff that are:

- consistent with the policies and regulations of the Department of Education;

- consistent with and built upon the other activities of the Department;
achieved through focusing and aligning of personnel services and resources; and

systemic.

The plan is accessible throughout the state and for all employees (see Component 13, Professional Development).

Although the DOE provides staff development for all state-level employees, it also needs to continue to focus professional development efforts on improving knowledge and skills to better serve complex area and building staff.

The Department has created a new position, NCLB Grant Monitoring Specialist, which was being advertised at the time of the diagnostic review. When filled, this position will provide necessary NCLB coordination and be responsible for such activities as:

- monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of activities funded by NCLB grants to determine compliance with NCLB requirements;

- coordinating the analysis of data and program effectiveness with DOE programs and related agencies, including forming work groups or task forces to complete the task(s); and

- advising and serving as liaison with program managers for the development of proper fiscal planning, policies, and procedures related to NCLB.

Previously, Hawaii has returned unused funds to the federal government. The new Grants Monitoring Specialist needs to ensure that all NCLB funds are used as specified in the grant.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS

- The Hawaii Department of Education has developed a comprehensive Strategic Implementation Plan which integrates NCLB and state requirements into measurable goals and objectives.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for creating and convening the Strategic Implementation Plan Committee and hiring a facilitator to manage the team’s work.

- The development of the Assessment Resource Center Hawaii (ARCH) is an effective way to provide assessment information to staff and the public.

- The Hawaii Department of Education is commended for creating a NCLB Grant Monitoring position to promote the efficient and effective use of NCLB grant funds.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 18-1:

Establish an NCLB Implementation Committee under the leadership of the Deputy Superintendent to ensure that all NCLB activities are integrated and coordinated. These efforts should be coordinated through regular reports and meetings with the Strategic Implementation Plan Committee.

Recommendation 18-2:

Update Department of Education job descriptions to incorporate NCLB responsibilities. DOE employees should have a clear understanding of NCLB expectations as they relate to position duties.

Recommendation 18-3:

Clearly outline, support, communicate, and evaluate the implementation of the Strategic Implementation Plan at the complex area level. The Strategic Implementation Plan Committee should work with complex area and building staff to collaboratively plan, implement, evaluate, and update the Plan.

Recommendation 18-4:

Disaggregate all performance measures for complex areas and schools. Performance goals should be precise and specific to the individual complex areas and to individual schools.

Recommendation 18-5:

Evaluate, periodically, as part of the Strategic Implementation Plan deployment, processes that are used to identify, collect, manage, analyze, and report measurement data to ensure optimum effectiveness. The Strategic Implementation Plan should drive effective data use to serve as the foundation for all programmatic decisions.

Recommendation 18-6:

Coordinate professional development activities among state, complex area, and building levels. The alignment of professional development activities is critical to ensure a unified understanding of expectations and to promote a common approach to goals articulated in the Strategic Implementation Plan.

Recommendation 18-7:

Create a process that would develop professional goals for all staff. In addition to developing professional goals, supervisors should be trained to coach staff regarding professional goal implementation. This process should be conducted through the Department’s Human Resources Section.
SECTION 4 – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
SECTION 4 – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Organizational practices impact the success of policy implementation. Perhaps never in the history of the federal role in public education has there been a better example of this than No Child Left Behind (NCLB). This legislation affects virtually every aspect of a state school system, and the organizational practices of SEAs around the nation will dictate success or failure in its implementation. The rewards for successful implementation may be high for NCLB, but the consequences for failure are significant.

NCLB brings with it many challenges and opportunities for the state of Hawaii. In response, the Department of Education has initiated many activities to promote full implementation of NCLB requirements. The commitment to full implementation of NCLB requirements is apparent in all areas of the Hawaii Department of Education. At this early stage of the process, it is appropriate to have both positive and negative aspects of implementation.

Subsequently, the CCSSO/MGT team identified practices in the overall implementation process that displayed varying levels of implementation and quality. From our findings on organizational structure, process and practice, we compiled commendations and recommendations that are designed to identify successful implementation strategies as well as to improve on areas of concern. Generally, these commendations and recommendations illustrate current status and potential development in Hawaii’s implementation of NCLB requirements.

From the over 100 diverse recommendations developed from the review findings, several general themes can be constructed.

- The Hawaii Department of Education should consolidate NCLB responsibilities at the state level by developing a new formal structure charged with planning and managing all NCLB activities under the leadership of the Deputy Superintendent. Current implementation coordination is inconsistent and lacks a substantial level of formal oversight. A more centralized approach should provide a greater degree of standardization and accountability in NCLB implementation.

- Hawaii should increase the centralized monitoring of NCLB implementation. The Department of Education has initiated many positive implementation activities without a sufficient monitoring structure in place to manage the various efforts. The resulting situation is inconsistent levels of implementation across functional areas of the agency. The DOE can promote comprehensive and effective implementation of NCLB requirements by coordinating and intensifying monitoring activities.

- A more comprehensive evaluation process is needed to ensure the quality of implementation practices. NCLB and state accountability requirements will impact Hawaii for many years to come. The long-range realities associated with NCLB policy implementation call for a thorough evaluation process to identify systemic strengths and
weaknesses. Only through a centralized process of cyclical planning, monitoring, and evaluation can Hawaii realize the full potential of NCLB implementation success.

- Professional development supporting NCLB implementation should be consolidated and expanded to cover all areas of NCLB requirements. This is clearly a daunting task for all school systems, including Hawaii. Presently, there are many factors impeding the comprehensive delivery of staff development throughout the system, but a more centralized approach should improve the delivery of current professional development activities and facilitate the development of needed ones.

- Hawaii should focus on the major priority challenges presented by NCLB and allow less critical areas of implementation to wait. The Department of Education should identify recommendations within this report that will have the greatest impact on systemic success. For example, current academic standards need to be consolidated and refocused. The current number of content areas assessed negatively affects the agency's ability to effectively analyze and report student performance data. As academic standards are the core of the accountability system, this situation illustrates a larger philosophical approach that impacts systemwide implementation activities.

- The state has an opportunity to modify the current accountability system to more comprehensively portray the progress of public education in Hawaii. The state should mold current accountability plans and processes to communicate student and school performance in conjunction with NCLB requirements. Federal legislation on school improvement serves many functions, but might not capture other measures of success that Hawaii would like to monitor and celebrate.

Overall, the Hawaii Department of Education has effectively addressed the initial phase of NCLB implementation, making many positive adaptations to systemwide practice to meet the requirements of the legislation. The SEA/LEA organizational structure has allowed Hawaii to move quickly and effectively towards articulated implementation and performance goals. Further, the cooperative organizational culture present in the Hawaii Department of Education has promoted an initial implementation effort that displays high levels of teamwork and organizational commitment. Hawaii is clearly focused on maximizing the benefits associated with NCLB implementation.

The key to Hawaii's sustained success in this area is in tailoring implementation efforts to suit the specific and unique needs of the state education system. Within this document, we have recommended many strategies to assist Hawaii in addressing NCLB, and subsequent state requirements in a manner that is consistent with the many positive steps that have been taken by the Hawaii Department of Education to date. These suggested strategies are designed to solidify the present process as well as to identify improvement opportunities in the execution of NCLB responsibilities. It is our hope that these recommendations will be used to the benefit of the state education agency and the students of Hawaii.
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SOURCES OF DATA AND INFORMATION

Many sources of data and information were examined as part of this diagnostic review. Below is a list of that data and information.


Guidelines for Reporting and interpreting Student Data, Hawaii Department of Education, August 2000.


Consolidated State Application Revised Accountability Workbook, Revised May 21, 2003.


No Child Left Behind-Blue Ribbon Schools Program and Hawaii’s Distinguished Schools Program, Draft 2003-04.
Student Participation Information, Office of Planning and Evaluation, Test Development Section, April 2003.


Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 8, 2002.


Multiple copies of Superintendent's Update for the Board of Education and Hawaii's Public Schools.


Alternative Route To Licensure In Special Education Program, Department of Education, Office of Human Resources, Recruitment and Retention Support Center, date unknown.


Reading First Program Hawaii Department of Education Proposal, Second Submittal, September 13, 2002.


Key Policy Features On Supplemental Education Services, Department of Education, 2002.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Fact Sheet Supplemental Education Services School Year 2002-2003, Department of Education, August 9, 2002.

State Of Hawaii Request For Exemption From Chapter 103F, HRS, 2002.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Key Policy Features On Public School Choice, Department of Education, August 5, 2002.

NCLB Parent Information And Guidelines, Department of Education, October 2002.

NCLB Administrator Guidelines, Department of Education, October 2002.

No Child Left Behind Mileage Reimbursements School Year 2002-2003, 2002.

Multiple News Releases from the Department of Education regarding NCLB.

Various Memos from Patricia Hamamoto, Superintendent.
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STATE EDUCATION AGENCY (SEA) SELF-ASSESSMENT ON IMPLEMENTING THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES = 17 out of 26

PART A: OVERALL PERCEPTIONS OF NCLB REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The requirements of NCLB are well designed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The USDOE provided for sufficient State Education Agency input in the development of NCLB requirements.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The requirements of NCLB are appropriate for the current educational environment in the United States.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The requirements of NCLB are appropriate for the current educational environment in our state.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All requirements of NCLB can be successfully implemented in the United States.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All requirements of NCLB can be successfully implemented in our state.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will benefit students in the United States.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will benefit students in our state.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will increase student achievement in the United States.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will increase student achievement in our state.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will close gaps in student achievement in the United States.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will close gaps in student achievement in our state.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will improve the effectiveness of State Education Agencies in the United States.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will improve the effectiveness of our SEA.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will improve the effectiveness of my division(s)/department(s).</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will improve the effectiveness of schools in the United States.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Implementation of the requirements of NCLB will improve the effectiveness of schools in our state.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **SA** = Strongly Agree
- **A** = Agree
- **N** = Neither Agree/Disagree
- **D** = Disagree
- **SD** = Strongly Disagree
- **DK/NA** = Don't Know/Not Applicable

CCSSO

Page B-1
18. DESCRIBE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT BENEFITS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NCLB REQUIREMENTS IN OUR STATE (IF ANY).

- It may help some students, but not all.
- Clear targets (performance goals). Accountability for improvement in student achievement.
- There will be more consistency of requirements across the state.
- This Act has brought us to the forefront of teachers' and administrators' consciousness the need to implement a rigorous standards-base curriculum and that the bottom line is student achievement. In addition, this Act has helped to establish the reality of accountability as an integral component of a quality organization.
- Student accountability. School-system accountability.
- The singular focus on measured student achievement via statewide tests, required by NCLB, has made statewide test scores the priority outcome measures. Such focus was previously lacking.
- Focus on accountability.
- The "ideas" but not the implementation process and timeline.
- Greater focus on the need to improve student achievement.
- Setting of standards. States will do this or that to reach student achievement goals. The focus on student achievement is of great benefit.
- Focus on accountability for student outcomes.
- Focus on standards and high expectations of all students/teachers.

19. DESCRIBE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CONSEQUENCES TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NCLB REQUIREMENTS IN OUR STATE (IF ANY).

- Inappropriate and unnecessary labeling of schools as failing due to impossible requirements (e.g. disaggregation of data). Lack of funding sufficient to implement all requirements, particularly to Non-Title I schools/students.
- The unintended labeling of schools as "failing". The inability of our state to fully implement the requirements of NCLB, due in large part, to insufficient capacity and resources.
- Difficult to implement requirements for the diverse groups - so many schools. May fall into needs improvement or corrective action even if they show gains in the general population.
- The tremendous workload increase for staff – especially since many positions could not be filled due to the hiring freeze.
- Sanctions for schools in at-risk communities.
NCLB requires a business-like, "by the numbers", approach to planning, implementation, evaluation, and decision-making activities. Educators at all levels-SEA, complex areas, schools-generally lacks training and experience working that way.

- Impact on schools with status.
- The sanctions penalize the lower socio-geographic (remote)-economic areas.
- More negative labeling of schools and public education bashing.
- Some of the requirements are simply not achievable given the time constraints. We need more time/more resources.
- Schools will see themselves as failures including the school communities if they do not attain AYP.
- Impossible to achieve NCLB requirements resulting in low morale, exodus of teachers/administrators from education, students feeling demoralized and giving up; huge burden placed on schools.
- Expectation of ESL students entering the USA to meet the criteria of NCLB. Also, for all special education students to meet NCLB requirements, if parents choose to not have students take tests, they are still counted.
- Still no parent accountability, teacher shortages and administrative shortages may compound punitive aspects of NCLB; despite touting of scientific methods for ensuring reading success-where are they? And no money from feds to fund and no public school left standing and mass retirements.

20. WHAT ARE OUR SEA'S GREATEST STRENGTHS WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NCLB (IF ANY)?

- One centralized school district.
- A single SEA/LEA can communicate a coherent systematic approach to implementing NCLB.
- Since we are one system (district) it is easier to develop one plan for the state. We do not need to deal with multiple districts who may disagree.
- A single state system that enables the consistent and coherent implementation of the law. Dedicated, student-focused DOE personnel who give 200% effort to meet the unrealistic timeline expectations of this Act -- and in spite of the inadequate staffing!
- Attitude of leadership to meet requirements.
- As a single, unified SEA/LEA, the Hawaii public school system comprises one jurisdiction. As such, authority disputes are relatively rare. Time and energy can be focused on getting the job done well.
- Comprehensive and focus support to the schools.
- Sec. 1118 to increase parent/community involvement.
- Unified system; able to implement evenly throughout the state.
We are one unified system. Funding/resources are equitable however limited.

Single statewide school system—easier to implement statewide.

Consistent, statewide educational system.

We are a statewide system (one school district) so every school is on the same page.

We are organized and now using data to drive improvement, assess progress.

21. WHAT ARE OUR SEA’S GREATEST WEAKNESSES IN REGARDS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NCLB (IF ANY)?

- Lack of sufficient funding. Uncertain economic conditions.

- Lack of sufficient capacity and resources to implement high quality services. "Change is difficult".

- Training capacity to meet requirements.

- The lack of comprehensive data collection and management system to enable real time reporting on personnel, student achievement, budget, school data, etc.

- Geography. Teacher/Administrator shortages. Funding for schools. Poor economy of state; political climate of desiring change.

- 1. Lack of sufficient capacity to support, "turn around", under-performing schools. 2. Lack of sufficient capacity in the area of assessment, analysis, and accountability (including data management). 3. The administrative/operational aspects of "district" (LEA) support services are enmeshed in the too complex politics related to our SEA/LEA structure.

- No consideration has been made for unique circumstances such as the high poverty level or rural areas where it is difficult to get people with college degrees. No consideration was given to our "makun" or "kupnna" who impact cultural knowledge to our students.

- Communication.

- Teacher and Educational Assistant degrees. This has a sweeping effect on hard to fill areas.

- Insufficient funding; staffing shortages.

- Lack of resources. Movement of a large system can sometimes be slow.

- Some teacher qualification/certification and most paraprofessional qualification.

- Very, very difficult to implement NCLB requirements and still meet the needs of all students.

- None, if there are any it would be providing time for everyone to do what needs to be done well with consideration of facets of schooling other than NCLB.
PART B: UNDERSTANDING AND COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a good understanding of the requirements of NCLB as they relate to my job.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have a good understanding of the statewide requirements of NCLB.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The USDOE has effectively communicated the requirements of NCLB to our SEA.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our SEA has effectively communicated the requirements of NCLB to its individual divisions/departments.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Our SEA has effectively communicated the requirements of NCLB to its individual school districts and schools.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Employees of our SEA have been made aware of their responsibilities in implementing to NCLB.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don’t Know/Not Applicable

7. WHAT COULD OUR SEA DO TO IMPROVE THE SYSTEMWIDE UNDERSTANDING OF NCLB REQUIREMENTS AND EMPLOYEE RESPONSIBILITIES?

- Ensure that the parents and communities are given an opportunity to understand NCLB.
- Continue to provide seminars to improve understanding.
- Provide smaller work communication units. Low monitoring-tracking system. Feedback and follow-up poor.
- Not sure. In context, NCLB is just one of the many important things that needs attention.
- Continue with the communication efforts.
- Reduce "clutter" of other initiatives. Focus on NCLB.
- Additional inservice.
- Create Web site for FAQ for anyone in state to access.
- Continue with timely, accurate communication.
- Give schools, teachers, and administrators TIME to plan effective lessons; provide adequate resources; decrease paperwork; continue to provide effective systemwide staff development.
## PART C: REQUIREMENTS OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

### STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our SEA is currently in compliance with NCLB state requirements in the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic Standards</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Accountability/Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reporting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School Support and Recognition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Student Assessment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Paraprofessional Qualifications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Reading First/Early Reading First Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Transferability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Data Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Public School Choice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Professional Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Supplement Educational Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Educational Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Student Safety &amp; Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Overall Organization of the SEA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our SEA will have difficulty complying with NCLB state requirements in the following areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic Standards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Accountability/Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reporting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don’t Know/Not Applicable
PART C (Continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. School Support and Recognition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Student Assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Paraprofessional Qualifications</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Reading First/Early Reading First Programs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Transferability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Data Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Public School Choice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Professional Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Supplemental Educational Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Educational Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Student Safety &amp; Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Overall Organization of the SEA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The implementation of the following components of NCLB will benefit students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic Standards</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Accountability/Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reporting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. School Support and Recognition</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Student Assessment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teacher Qualifications</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Paraprofessional Qualifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Reading First/Early Reading First Programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Transferability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Data Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Public School Choice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don't Know/Not Applicable
### Statements on Assessment Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n. Professional Development</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o. Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Supplemental Educational Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Educational Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Student Safety &amp; Health</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Overall Organization of the SEA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don’t Know/Not Applicable

For items 4 through 7, please refer to the 18 areas of NCLB contained in previous table.

4. **List the three areas of NCLB that our SEA is most prepared to currently comply with.**

- Academic Standards, Student Safety & Health, Reading First
- Academic Standards, School Choice, Reading First
- Academic Standards, Education Technology, Student Health/Safety
- Standards, Student Assessment, Public School Choice
- Choice, Supplemental Services, Student Assessment
- Academic Standards, Professional Development, Student Assessment
- Student Assessment, AYP, Reporting
- Reporting, Student Assessment, Accountability
- Teacher Qualifications, Parent/Community Component, Reading Programs
- Academic Standards, Reading First, Student Safety and Health
- Standards, School/student assessment, School choice
- Academic Standards, Reading First/Early Reading First Programs, Student Safety and Health
- Academic Standards, Student Assessment, Reporting
- Professional Development/School Support, Academic Standards, Student Health/Safety
5. LIST THE THREE AREAS OF NCLB THAT OUR SEA IS THE LEAST PREPARED TO CURRENTLY COMPLY WITH.

- Accountability/AYP, Data Management, Reporting
- Paraprofessional Qualifications, Low Performing Schools
- AYP, Paraprofessional Qualifications, Supplemental Educational Services
- Teacher Qualifications, Paraprofessional Qualifications, Data Management
- Teacher Qualifications, LEP, Low performing schools
- Low-performing schools, teacher qualifications, data management
- Continued Professional Development, Paraprofessional Qualifications, Low-performing schools
- Getting qualified teachers to remote geographic areas, Transportation for remote geographic areas, AYP for low socio-economic schools
- Teacher Qualifications, Reporting, Professional Development
- Teacher Quality, Paraprofessional Quality, Low-performing schools
- Paraprofessional qualifications, Data management, Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
- Low-performing Schools, Teacher Qualifications, Educational Technology
- Pacific Islanders (ESL-a challenge for schools in Hawaii)
- The wedding of IDEA and NCLB

6. LIST THE THREE AREAS OF NCLB THAT WILL POSE THE GREATEST CHALLENGES FOR OUR SEA OVERALL (IF ANY).

- Accountability/AYP, Data Management, Reporting
- Accountability (AYP), Student Assessment, Teacher Qualifications
- AYP, Paraprofessional Qualifications, Teacher Qualifications
- Paraprofessional Qualifications, Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency, Accountability/AYP
- Teacher Qualifications, AYP, Reporting
- Low-performing schools, teacher qualifications, data management
- Continued Professional Development, Paraprofessional Qualifications, Low-performing schools
- Funding to schools that need qualified teachers, ESL student requirements, Public school choice
- Low-performing schools, Teacher Quality, Paraprofessional Quality, Supplemental Resources
- Paraprofessional qualifications, Data management, Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
- Accountability/AYP, Low-performing schools, Public school choice
- Teacher Qualifications, Paraprofessional Qualifications, Ed Tech (no money)

7. LIST THE THREE AREAS OF NCLB THAT WILL PROVIDE THE GREATEST BENEFITS FOR OUR SEA (IF ANY).

- Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency, Supplemental Services, Educational Technology
- Academic Standards, Reporting, Professional Development
- Professional Development, Standards, Student Assessment
- Academic Standards, Student Assessment, Data Management
- Accountability, Standards, Professional Development
- Student Achievement, Professional Accountability, Academic Standards/Curriculum Practices
- Reporting, Student Assessment, Accountability
- Academic Standards, Educational Technology, Professional Development
- Standards, Raising student achievement, Focusing efforts on student achievement
- Academic Standards, Teacher Qualifications, Professional Development
- School Support and recognition, Reading First/Early Reading First Programs, Educational Technology
- Academic Standards, School Support, Professional Development
## PART D: SUBGRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The successful implementation of the following subgrants is of critical importance within our state's educational environment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Even Start Family Literacy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Education of Migrant Children</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Comprehensive School Reform</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Enhanced Education Through Technology</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Community Service Grants</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 21st Century Community Learning Centers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
*SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don't Know/Not Applicable*

## PART E: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The current organizational structure of our SEA is adequate to promote effective NCLB implementation and future success in compliance with its requirements.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The current management system within our SEA is efficiently addressing the implementation of NCLB requirements.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The current implementation process is well defined by our SEA.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Input on effective implementation strategies is gathered from all levels of our SEA.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The implementation of NCLB requirements is being effectively coordinated across areas of responsibility.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is collaboration among our SEA divisions in the implementation of NCLB.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
*SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don't Know/Not Applicable*
7. WHAT CHANGES IN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE COULD IMPROVE NCLB IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS IN OUR SEA (IF ANY)?

- More staffing resources needed.
- An oversight office dedicated to monitoring implementation of NCLB.
- I hope this will be one of the outcomes of this study.
- Clearly identifying data, responsibilities, roles of SEA -- local schools.
- Rearranging the chairs on the deck of the Titanic will not help! The "ship" needs a new engine room! Fewer navigators and a stronger hull!
- Stronger support to the complex area - infrastructural support.
- Funding to go directly to LEA's.
- Not structural--more interoffice communication--get out of the silos.

---

**PART F: ACCOUNTABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A single, statewide accountability system is applied to all public schools and LEAs equally.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All public school students are included in our state accountability system.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Current state accountability plans are adequate to bring all students to 100 percent proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics within 12 years.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our SEA makes appropriate annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The state definition of AYP is based primarily on our state’s academic assessments.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Our SEA is providing appropriate assistance to schools in implementing the requirements of NCLB.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Current state plans place an appropriate level of accountability on schools for student performance.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Current state plans adequately reward successful schools.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Current state plans adequately identify low-performing schools.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Current state plans provide adequate assistance to low-performing schools.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don't Know/Not Applicable
PART F (Continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS ON ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>DK/NA (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Current state plans adequately sanction failing schools.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Our state plan to provide supplemental educational services is adequate to promote the meeting of state student performance requirements under NCLB.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Our state plan to ensure public school choice is adequate to promote the meeting of state student performance requirements under NCLB.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neither Agree/Disagree, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, DK/NA = Don't Know/Not Applicable

14. PLEASE LIST SPECIFIC STATE ACCOUNTABILITY POLICIES YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE MODIFIED TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF NCLB IMPLEMENTATION (IF ANY).

- Do not know.
- The NCLB requirement that ALL students be tested on the state assessment tests.
- Rewards. Sanctions.
- Funding to go directly to LEA's. Grants should be given to lower achieving schools. 2002-03 school year, very little money went to areas in the most need.
- Do away with NCLB.
- Punishing schools by listing them as low performing. Punishing educators—we are the good guys!

15. PLEASE LIST ANY NEW STATE ACCOUNTABILITY POLICIES THAT SHOULD BE ADDED (IF ANY).

- Do not know.
- Documenting teacher effectiveness.
- To enable/facilitate implementation of "corrective action" and "restructuring" options, related limitations (e.g., transfer process) are needed in the contracts for teachers and school administrators.
- Provide more support to hard pressed regions. Like SES, give a greater percentage of funds to LEA's with high poverty and remote geographic areas.
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