

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B
for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education
Act

For reporting on
FFY 2022

Hawaii



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Hawai'i State Department of Education (Department) is submitting its Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The plan was developed based on guidance from OSEP, OSEP-funded technical assistance (TA) centers, and broad educational and community partner input.

Hawai'i's K-12 public education school system was founded on October 15, 1840, by King Kamehameha III. The Hawai'i State Board of Education (BOE) is the authorized policy-making body of Hawai'i's K-12 public education system. The BOE consists of nine (9) voting members, who serve without pay and are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the state Senate and two (2) non-voting members – a public high school student selected by the Hawai'i State Student Council and a military representative appointed by the senior military commander in Hawai'i, pursuant to Hawai'i Revised Statutes 302A-11012. The BOE is the governing board for public education and has statutory responsibility for adopting standards and assessment models, monitoring school success, appointing the superintendent of education, who serves as the chief state school officer and organizational head of the Department, and appointing members of the Hawai'i State Public Charter School Commission responsible for authorizing public charter schools. For more information about the BOE, visit the website at <https://boe.hawaii.gov/Pages/Welcome.aspx>.

The Department serves as both the state educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) and operates as a tri-level system – state office, complex area (CA), and school – with all levels working in cross-level teams to meet the needs of all students. The Superintendent serves as the chief executive officer of the public school system. While the Department oversees seven (7) Districts divided into 15 CAs across 42 Complexes, it remains centralized as one (1) single District. The Department oversees 295 public schools, including public charter schools, and serves 150,598 students without disabilities and 19,611 students who receive special education and related services ages 3 through 21. Of the total student population, eleven percent (11%) are students with disabilities who receive special education and related services under IDEA and Hawai'i Administrative Rules (HAR) Chapter 60; ten percent (10%) are English Learners; forty-eight percent (48%) are economically disadvantaged; and fifty-three percent (53%) of students with disabilities receive special education and related services inside the regular class eighty-percent (80%) or more of the day. The most common languages spoken other than English are Ilocano, Chuukese, Marshallese, Tagalog, Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin, and Samoan.

Under the Office of the Deputy Superintendent, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) monitors all public schools, including public charter schools, to ensure compliance with IDEA and HAR Chapter 60. The Exceptional Support Branch (ESB), under the Office of Student Support Services (OSSS), provides leadership, professional development (PD), and TA to CAs and schools in planning and implementing programs that increase achievement for students with disabilities. Support and services to students with disabilities are provided in accordance with IDEA and HAR Chapter 60. Policies and procedures related to special education are posted and disseminated on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx> and on the BOE's website at <https://boe.hawaii.gov/policies/AdminRules/Pages/default.aspx>.

Our mission is to serve our community by developing the academic, character, and social-emotional well-being of our students to their fullest potential. We work with partners, families, and communities to ensure that all students reach their aspirations from early learning through college, career, and citizenship. We envision a K-12 public education system that prepares all graduates to be Globally Competitive, Locally Committed. This means our students not only have the academic knowledge and skills to thrive and be successful but also possess that special sense of responsibility to give back to our communities and island home.

On February 2, 2023, the BOE approved its 2023-2029 Strategic Plan. The plan has twenty-seven (27) Desired Outcomes. On May 18, 2023, the BOE approved an Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan Phase II, including Action Items and Performance Measures for each Desired Outcome. To achieve the BOE's desired goals and outcomes, the Department is committed to innovation, improvement, and partnership within schools, among schools, and as a system of schools, along with our community. The 2023-2029 Strategic Plan can be accessed on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Advancing%20Education/2023-29-ImplementationPlan.pdf>.

The Department recognizes the long-term effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on students' social and emotional well-being. As a result, the Department prioritized strategies focusing on positive student behaviors that are necessary for a safe, nurturing, and culturally responsive learning environment that contributes to high-quality learning. The Hawai'i Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) and "Here to Help" were the two (2) primary initiatives that support timely identification and response to student needs with interventions and support. The HMTSS is a student-centered, data-driven, team-based decision-making framework for achieving positive outcomes for every student through a layered continuum of evidence-based practices. In HMTSS, students are provided targeted support for well-being and mental health based on their needs. "Here to Help" is a multi-year plan to train and coach staff to support student well-being and to provide equitable access to mental and physical health for all students in schools statewide. For more information about Here to Help, please visit <http://heretohelp.hidoe.us/>.

Supporting students and staff requires a comprehensive approach involving mental health support, social services, education, and community involvement. The Department meets monthly with the IDEA State advisory panel, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), to review progress, share updates on policies and procedures, and discuss necessary changes to achieve ambitious goals for our students with disabilities. Through collaboration with our educational and community partners statewide and TA centers, we continue to fulfill our commitment to preparing students to be Globally Competitive, Locally Committed and ensure that:

- All students with disabilities have available a free appropriate public education (FAPE);
- The rights of students with disabilities and their parents are protected; and
- Federal and state special education requirements are implemented, monitored, enforced, and reported.

The future of our special island home and preparing our students for Hawai'i's future depends on a united, collective effort — ne'epapa — grounded in Na Hopena A'o, a framework of outcomes that reflects our core values and beliefs in action throughout the school system and the communities in which

our schools reside, to develop the competencies that strengthen a sense of belonging, responsibility, excellence, aloha, total well-being, and Hawai'i ("BREATH" or "HA") in ourselves, students, and others.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

The School Year (SY) 2022-2023 reflects the data from a second full year following the COVID-19 pandemic. It is important to keep in mind the continuous lingering impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic when reviewing and examining performance data for each indicator, more specifically for those indicators that use lag data, Indicator 1- Graduation, Indicator 2 - Dropout, and Indicator 4 - Suspension/Expulsion.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

The Department's General Supervision System (GSS), through the collaborative work of the MAC and the ESB, focuses on support and accountability at the state, CA, and school levels. The ESB provides direction, PD, and TA on program implementation and improvement to achieve improved outcomes. The MAC oversees monitoring activities to ensure the Department meets the requirements of both IDEA and HAR Chapter 60 regulations and provides guidance, support, and resources to meet these statutory requirements. The Department maintains rigorous outcome expectations for students with disabilities and a high level of regulatory compliance by sharing the responsibility of monitoring, support, and accountability across its tri-level system (State Offices, CAs, and Schools).

Critical to accountability and decision-making is genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement, which includes a variety of activities on a continuum ranging from informing and educating, consulting and discussing, to engaging and collaborating. The Department values partnerships with (SEAC, Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawai'i (LDAH), Department of Human Services (DHS)/Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawai'i State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), the University of Hawai'i, and other representatives of higher education to expand engagement opportunities. The Department's GSS includes the following components:

1) Integrated Monitoring Activities

Due to the Department being one SEA/LEA, each CA, and the respective school is monitored on an annual basis. The Department's monitoring activities include but are not limited to: a) Reviewing special education information related to compliance, such as meeting timelines, the content of IEPs, and other data sources; b) Analyzing Child Find data; c) Examining and evaluating performance and results data on early childhood outcomes, family outcomes, and involvement, IDEA Section 618, and other data sources; d) Analyzing assessment data; e) Evaluating programs, policies, procedures, and practices for fiscal management and expenditure data; f) Conducting interviews with parents and community members as a way to gauge compliance; g) Visiting schools and interviewing staff on procedures and practices; and h) Examining information gleaned from the Department's dispute resolution system. One aspect of the monitoring system that is unique and outside these activities is the ESB and the MAC staff attending monthly meetings at the SEAC and listening to input/feedback/concerns from the parents and community members about special education matters.

Integrated monitoring activities are achieved through a differentiated accountability and support system. The MAC and the ESB collaborate to provide accountability measures and support activities to CAs via a tiered system. A CA's need is based on how it performs on the Results and Compliance Rating. The rating is used to determine the CA's assigned intervention tier.

Examples of Tier I: Universal Activities

Collect, verify, conduct annual audits, and analyze data for SPP/APR compliance and results indicators; Public Reporting of SPP/APR data; Stakeholder engagement in developing and implementing SPP/APR; and Statewide data-informed PD and TA.

Examples of Tier II: Targeted Activities

In-depth file reviews for indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13; Target CA improvement planning to address focused results indicators; and Target TA to CA based on compliance data and findings.

Examples of Tier III: Intensive Activities

Conduct on-site monitoring to audit files and review procedures and practices; Issue findings and ensure noncompliance findings are corrected in accordance with GSS guidance of July 2023; Require meetings with the CA team to monitor improvement activities and expected outcomes.

2) Data on Processes and Results

The Department utilizes a data collection and analysis process designed to measure IDEA implementation, identify noncompliance and priority areas, determine levels of support, and ensure the reporting of valid and reliable data. The following are part of the data processes and results:

A. Data Collection and Verification;

B. Data Examination and Analysis;

C. Public Reporting of Data;

D. Department Determination; and

E. Improvement Activities - The Department uses the results from SPP/APR indicators, dispute resolution, and information from other state-collected data to measure the performance of the SPP/APR indicators as well as identify areas for improvement that need TA and PD.

3) The SPP/APR

The monitoring and implementation of the SPP/APR is a collaborative effort of the ESB, MAC, and each of the CA District Educational Specialists (DES). The MAC collects, examines, and reports data; provides TA and PD to CAs and schools in meeting federal and state requirements; and continuously monitors the implementation of the IDEA and HAR Chapter 60 in all public schools, including charter schools. The ESB provides leadership in planning, developing, coordinating, implementing, and evaluating programs and services to ensure that students with disabilities receive free appropriate public education (FAPE). Each DES provides leadership in planning, developing, coordinating, implementing, and monitoring special education and related services in their CA's respective schools.

4) Fiscal Management

Fiscal and resource management of federal IDEA funds are monitored at the state, CA, and school levels. CA applications, financial reports, and related supporting documents are used to monitor the use of these funds. In addition to compliance with allowable costs, fixed assets, and payroll certification, assurances that all personnel are qualified to and actively participate in advancing IDEA priorities within their area are required.

5) Effective Dispute Resolution

Mediation, impartial due process hearing requests, and state complaints are the mechanisms to assist in resolving disputes. A review of complaints and decisions is conducted on a frequent basis to identify systemic patterns of noncompliance, ensure correction of noncompliance in a timely manner, verification that noncompliance was corrected, and recommend PD and TA to improve specific requirements in a specific school, CA or throughout the state.

6) Tiered System of PD and TA

Based on a review and data analysis, TA and PD are identified across the three (3) tiers of support: universal, targeted, and intensive. Although the accountability and support activities vary across the three (3) tiers of support, the Department is guided by Learning Forward's 7 Standards for Professional Learning: learning communities, leadership, resources, data, learning designs, implementation, and outcomes.

7) Policies, Procedures, and Practices Resulting in Effective Implementation

The Department's policies and procedures are established primarily through IDEA, HAR Chapter 60, and the BOE Policies. These policies are available electronically and can be found on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/fedstateregulations/Pages/default.aspx>.

8) Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions

The Department's comprehensive monitoring system provides oversight of the implementation of IDEA requirements by:

- Determining risk for noncompliance in the areas of fiscal management, IDEA and HAR Chapter 60 requirements, and performance;
- Identifying noncompliance from a variety of sources;
- Issuing of findings of noncompliance, as appropriate, in accordance with the OSEP QA 23-01 issued on July 24, 2023;
- Ensuring correction within one (1) year of identification;
- Verifying and following up to ensure data reported reflect actual practice;
- Providing TA and PD to meet the requirements of IDEA and HAR Chapter 60; and
- Imposing sanctions when appropriate.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

The Department has multiple mechanisms to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based TA and support to all CAs and schools. The ESB and the MAC manage all the TA activities related to the implementation of the IDEA and HAR Chapter 60. The ESB and the MAC have teams of subject matter experts in instruction, behavior, program planning, and federal and state statutory regulations. Data from various sources, such as SPP/APR, Section 618, dispute resolution, team meetings input/feedback, SPP/APR Principal/CAS meetings, and other data sources, are used to identify necessary TA and are provided to other Department offices, CAs, schools, and various organizations. TA is provided in the form of standing meetings, written guidance, consultation, infographics, PLCs, and collaboration with other state agencies, parent groups, and TA providers. Examples of the Department's TA activities include, but are not limited to:

Monthly Meetings with Community Partners

The Department and the SEAC continue to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage parents and educational and community partners in monthly meetings as a part of the TA system. These meetings provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community partners include the SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, DHS/DVR, CCCs, the DD Council, the University of Hawai'i, and other representatives of higher education.

Early Intervention Part C and Part B Collaboration

The Department regularly schedules monthly meetings with Part C staff (Early Intervention) and Home Visiting. A Memorandum of Understanding was developed and finalized, which identified mutual goals, policies, and procedures for each of the agencies as it pertains to Child Find, the transition from Part C to Part B, and data sharing. The Department continues to participate with Part C and other community partners such as Head Start, the Executive Office of Early Learning (EOEL), and higher education in the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) to address recruitment and retention issues, pre-service, in-service system, and workforce systemic issues related to early childhood. In SY 2022-2023, Part C and Part B were awarded technical assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and DaSy (The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems). Support in the development of data-driven systems thinking capacity is anticipated to begin in FFY 2023, with both agencies targeting strengthening Child Find procedures and processes towards increasing the percentage of children referred from Part C to B in having timely transitions and IEPs developed and implemented by a child's third birthday.

Quarterly Multi-Agency Transition Meetings

The Department, in partnership with the following partners (DHS/DVR, Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD), DD Council, Center on Disability Studies (CDS), CCCs, and Self-Advocacy Advisory Council (SAAC)), continues to collaborate on a monthly meeting designed to support and assist the development of postsecondary transition plans. The content of the PD/TA is designed to update transition teachers, coordinators, counselors from the Department, and other state agencies responsible for the planning and development of postsecondary transition plans for students with disabilities.

CCCs Meetings

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. Fully supported collaborative partnerships require equal participation and shared responsibilities of families, local providers, community stakeholders, and representatives.

ECTA

Every year, the Department receives TA from ECTA to address preschool matters. In the school year (SY) 2022, the TA specifically focused on inclusive practices and environments for preschool-age children, emphasizing expanding the need to have a range of programs (both formal and informal) for children to have access to regular preschool environments. Community partners, such as Head Start, the EOEL, Part C - Early Intervention, LDAH, the University of Hawai'i, and Department staff from various role groups collaborated to form the Hawai'i State Early Childhood Inclusion Partnership Team. The leadership team was established to examine and refine policies, procedures, and practices to support preschool-aged children with equitable access to quality, inclusive educational experiences and opportunities.

SPP/APR Principal/Complex Area Superintendents (CAS) Meetings

During SY 2022-2023, the MAC and the ESB team met with each CA's principals, CAS, and their leadership teams. The purpose was to share information on the purpose of SPP/APR, how it relates to the everyday work of principals and teachers, share data for their schools, discuss the areas for improvement, and engage in discussions on improvement activities that will yield results. The discussions were very powerful, and a common theme

was the importance of prioritizing results while ensuring compliance with federal and state regulations.

Dispute Resolution TA Sessions

Debrief sessions are held with the CA and school staff after a state complaint and due process decision to provide the staff with an opportunity to ask questions on the issues, required resolutions, if any, and the support that schools and CAs staff need to ensure the issues do not re-occur. This is an opportunity for the MAC and the ESB staff to provide TA and build staff capacity.

Monitoring and Compliance TA Sessions

The MAC team meets with the CA and school staff to review and discuss their noncompliance findings and current policies and practices, address each CA's questions, and explore strategies for improvement.

DES Monthly Meetings

The DES meetings are used as an avenue for the ESB, the Student Services Branch (SSB), the MAC, and other relevant offices and stakeholder groups to disseminate and share information and practices with CAs. DESs are responsible for providing leadership and guidance relating to special education to their designated ACs and respective schools.

A few highlights of the meetings held during SY 2022-2023 are:

- Multidisciplinary Teams
- Science of Reading
- Specially Designed Instruction
- General Supervision Support Guidance (OSEP QA 23-01) issued by OSEP on July 24, 2023
- Hawai'i's Special Education Dispute Resolution Strategic Plan

Written Guidance: Memorandums

Memorandums are developed to guide the field by establishing or clarifying procedures and policies. The Department issues and maintains a repository of state memorandums accessible to the Department's employees. Examples of memorandums include:

- Education Records for Students with Disabilities Eligible under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA)
- Procedural Safeguards Notice for Parents and Students
- Parent Involvement Survey Indicator 8
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004: Section 618 Data Verification for School Year 2022-2023
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) Post-School Outcomes Survey - Class of 2021

Infographics for Parents and Community Partners

In partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN, the Department continued to develop infographics designed to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. To support the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator were created. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.

The Department is committed to aligning its professional learning with critical components of evidence-based professional learning and provides a variety of PD opportunities to ensure that teachers, paraprofessionals, and related service providers have the skills to improve results for children with disabilities. The following PD opportunities were provided during SY 2022-2023:

Audiology Training to Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs)

The ESB provided training to SLPs on hearing screening, play audiometry, and otoacoustic emissions testing to ensure appropriate screening is conducted for hearing loss and appropriate referrals.

Hawai'i Statewide Assessment Program (HSAP) Training Conference

On September 19 and 20, 2022, the Department held a two-day conference to amplify staff knowledge about statewide assessments and how they can help schools inform instruction and support student learning. The MAC staff facilitated a session on SPP/APR titled, "SPP/APR What Does It Mean to You?" During a 75-minute session, the participants were provided with an overview of SPP/APR, understanding how the U.S. Department of Education evaluates Hawai'i's efforts toward improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

Inclusive Practices

Since 2017-2018, the Department has engaged schools and CAs in inclusive practices. The ESB has continued to work on scaling up inclusive practices across the state by training cohorts of schools on rethinking inclusive education. The following PD opportunities were provided across the state:

- The ESB created a Professional Learning Network (PLN) dedicated to increasing knowledge and building capacity on inclusive practices. The PLN is comprised of fifty-five (55) CA representatives across the state. Monthly and quarterly PLN meetings are offered to PLN members where the focus is on increasing capacity and knowledge of the implementation of inclusive practices across the state.
- To broaden the audience of inclusive practices and continue to build capacity statewide, the ESB hosts bi-weekly Book Club meetings where the fifteen (15) members are provided with professional texts and engage in conversations about how the information read and shared can be used to affect change in the field.
- The ESB provides tiered support to CA teams. For more information on tiered support, please access the Department's infographic at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jSJd6nkiDDADh5bJCrL5ofNvnYeOV2UQ/view>.
- Visits to the five (5) Inclusive Practices Model Schools/Demonstration Sites from the ESB staff to discuss the need for additional support, as SY 2022-2023 was the second full year of in-person learning. These sites continued to open their doors and allow visitors to see model practices. For more information on the model sites, please visit the Department's website at <https://inclusion.hawaiipublicschools.org/home/demonstration-sites>.
- Two (2) at-no-cost Online Inclusive Practices Credited Courses were created as learning opportunities for CA and school staff. The learning opportunities focused on accommodations, modifications, differentiation, collaborative teaching, leadership, and other areas. For more information on these courses, please visit the Department's website at <https://inclusion.hawaiipublicschools.org/home/pde3-learning-opportunities>.

"I KE ALU LIKE – We Are All In This Together" Hawai'i State Special Education Conference, March 14 and 16, 2023

The ESB hosted the "I KE ALU LIKE – We Are All In This Together," Hawai'i State Special Education Conference designed for all instructional personnel serving students with disabilities. Participants were provided with the opportunity to learn how to improve instructional practices, enrich their skills, and

gain valuable resources to support our students and their families.

Secondary Transition

To strengthen transition programs and services, the following learning opportunities were provided:

- Quarterly transition coordinator meetings focused on post-school outcomes, self-determination, and transition resources (assessments, services, outside agencies/organizations/community resource partners).
- Monthly Transition Interagency workgroup to obtain input from groups across the state to discuss transition issues.
- A statewide transition professional development group.
- A Secondary Transition website was developed to provide information and resources about secondary transition students with disabilities. For more information, please visit the site at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/secondarytransition/home>.
- Secondary Transition planning in the IEP was updated in the electronic data system, and statewide training was conducted.
- Transition Assessment website was developed. Please refer to the site at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/transitionassessmenthawaiiidoe/home> for more information.
- Targeted Indicator 13 Compliance Training - The Department continued to provide PD to each CA and their schools on Indicator 13 requirements for teachers to build their capacity in writing effective transition plans that meet the 100% federal compliance requirements.

TeachTown Pilot Program Training for Special Education Teachers, October 3-5, 2022

The ESB hosted a three-day conference designed to support special education teachers serving students with moderate to severe disabilities and CA staff supporting teachers and schools. The training guided participants through the TeachTown online platform and supplemental resources to strengthen the specially designed instruction (SDI) and ensure it is aligned with the Common Core and evidence-based practices.

Monthly PD to SLPs and Resource Teachers

The ESB continued to hold monthly PD for SLPs and Resource Teachers on evidence-based assessments and interventions to build foundational language and literacy skills. Topics covered included: a) Foundational knowledge of the Early Childhood Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) course of study; b) Assessments focusing on Oral Language, Phonological Awareness, Print Awareness, and Structured Teacher Observation; c) Data analysis focusing on how to integrate and interpret assessment results from multiple sources; d) Interventions focusing on using a shared reading approach to comprehensively cover language and literacy for preschool children; e) Coaching; and f) Progress monitoring focusing on language and literacy IEP reviews.

Personnel Initiatives

Reading Specialists: The Department Initiated and began implementation of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the University of Hawai'i, College of Education, to create a Reading Interventionist program. Through the MOA, the Department pays for up to twenty Department-licensed special education teachers to complete courses in reading interventions to become eligible for certification as Reading Interventionists. The course is based on the International Dyslexia Association (IDA) Knowledge and Practice Standards for Teachers. All participants are required to complete coursework (5 courses) and one practicum with three students and pass the PRAXIS Test. Skills and knowledge learned will be implemented in schools with students with disabilities. Cohort 1 had eighteen (18) teachers sign up for the program.

SLP Shortages: The Department began discussions with the University of Hawai'i, John A. Burns School of Medicine, and the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders to develop a Grow Your Own Plan to increase the number of students who will complete the graduate program in Hawai'i and work in the Department as a speech-language pathologist.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs.

These infographics are available on the Department's website at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Apply stakeholder engagement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

21

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The Department collaborates with the SEAC monthly on the topics to be discussed and presented at each SEAC meeting. Each meeting's presentations and resources are provided to the participants and posted on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>. Each month, the SEAC leadership group and the Department determine topic areas of priority to SEAC and the Department.

Each meeting's agenda and materials for the activities conducted are made available to the public via SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/meetings/agendas/>.

In addition to each monthly meeting, SEAC and the Department plan an annual culminating meeting where they invite a broad stakeholder group to share information on indicators and inform the development of the SPP/APR.

During each monthly meeting and the December culminating meeting, the Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final SPP/APR indicators review. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse participants to learn about each indicator and review the data before providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

At the culminating meeting on December 9, 2022, priority FFY 2021 indicator data identified by SEAC and the Department were analyzed. The meeting was attended by sixty-four (64) participants composed of parents, parent center staff, advocacy groups, and Department staff. Of the 64 participants, 16 were parents of children with disabilities. At this meeting, stakeholders attended small breakout sessions to discuss data trends and progress toward targets. They provided input on improvement strategies for next year's SPP/APR FFY 2022 submission. More detailed information on the December 9, 2022, agenda and breakout sessions can be found on the following sites:

- Department website: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-EducationPerformance-Report.aspx>
- SEAC SPP/APR Resources Page website: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

At the culminating meeting on December 8, 2023, priority FFY 2022 indicator data, identified by SEAC and the Department, were analyzed. The meeting was attended by sixty-six (66) participants, composed of parents, parent center staff, advocacy groups, and Department staff. Of the 66 participants, 21 were parents of children with disabilities. Participants attended small breakout sessions at this meeting to engage in rigorous discussion around data trends and progress toward the targets. They provided input on improvement strategies for the next year's SPP/APR FFY 2023 submission. More detailed information on the December 8, 2023, agenda and breakout sessions can be found on the following sites:

- Department SPP/APR Page at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and
- SEAC's SPP/APR Resources Page website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In addition to monthly meetings with SEAC and the December annual culminating meetings, to reach a broad audience, more specifically for parents and educational/community/agency partners, the Department developed indicator fact sheets, presentation slides, and feedback forms that were uploaded on the Department's SPP/APR Page at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx>.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The Department's vision is that Hawai'i's students are educated, healthy, and joyful lifelong learners who contribute positively to our community and global society. Our vision will only be accomplished through a kakou (collaborative) effort between the Department, BOE, state agencies, advocacy groups, families, community organizations, employers, higher education, and other community partners. The Department values family engagement for student achievement, social development, and a strategy for sustainable long-term student success.

Between August 2022 and December 2023, monthly SEAC meetings were open to the public, where special education matters, including the SPP/APR information, were shared and reviewed. Each SEAC meeting is prepared to educate parents/community/state agency partners, build their capacity in special matters, and address their questions and concerns. For a copy of the agendas, meeting notes, and materials shared, please visit SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/meetings/minutes/>.

August 12, 2022

- 2022 OSEP Determination by Monitoring and Compliance Branch Team

September 9, 2022

- Dispute Resolution System Improvement by Special Education Policy & Practice, National Center for Systemic Improvement

October 14, 2022

- Feedback from the Policy, Innovation, Planning and Evaluation Branch (PIPE) on Proposed Parent Harassment Legislation

- Trauma-Informed Care by Student Support Branch

November 18, 2022

- Update on Secondary Transition Data and Improvement Activities: Transition Data - Monitoring & Compliance Branch; Improvement Activities - ESB;

Big Island Bright Spots - SEAC Vice Chair

December 9, 2022

- FFY 2021 SPP/APR Stakeholder Engagement

January 13, 2023

- Dispute Resolution Model Form for the Written Complaint by Special Education Policy & Practice, National Center for Systemic Improvement

- Proposed Projects for Professional Development Utilizing Parents as Co-Trainers by the ESB and SEAC Vice Chair: 1. Hawai'i-centric Dispute Resolution Video and 2. Learning Environments for Preschool Children with Disabilities

February 10, 2023

- Dispute Resolution Model Form for Due Process Hearing Requests by Special Education Policy & Practice, National Center for Systemic Improvement: SEAC members and guests will review the model form changes and provide feedback/suggestions

- Presentation on the Department's Budget and Legislative Priorities by Policy, Innovation, Planning and Evaluation (PIPE) Branch and the ESB

April 14, 2023

- Department's annual application for Federal IDEA Funds by Special Education Director, ESB

- Draft Revision of the Procedural Safeguards Notice by Special Education Policy & Practice, National Center for Systemic Improvement: Input received to date will be reported, and further input from SEAC members will be sought.

- Update on Secondary Transition (Indicator 13) Improvement Strategies by the ESB

May 12, 2023

- Procedures for Virtual IEP Meetings by Special Education Director, ESB

- Due Process Report on Due Process Hearing Requests, Hearing Decisions, Written Complaints, and Mediations from SY 2021-22 by Susan Rocco.

This is SEAC's annual report on the utilization of IDEA procedural safeguards related to dispute resolution by parents of students with disabilities.

- Annual Report Draft Recommendations by SEAC's Vice Chair. Members discussed recommendations to Superintendent Hayashi included in SEAC's Annual Report for School Year 2022-23.

August 11, 2023

- Department Priorities for School Year 2022-2023 by the State Special Education Director, ESB

- 2023 OSEP Determination by the MAC

September 8, 2023

- Updates on the Maui Wildfires by the State Special Education Director, ESB

- Overview of Inclusive Practices

November 17, 2023

- Update on the Dispute Resolution Strategic Plan by the National Center for Systemic Improvement and Monitoring & Compliance Branch

- Discussion regarding Planning for the December 8th State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Stakeholder Engagement Meeting

December 8, 2023

- FY 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Stakeholder Engagement Meeting

Each SEAC meeting also included time for members and participants to develop infographics on special education matters for parents and the community. For more information on infographics developed during SY 2022-2023, visit the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>.

In addition to the SEAC meetings, the Department implemented the following strategies to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

The Department values parents' involvement in the IEP meetings and other school activities/events relating to their children's education and encourages parents to participate in the Parent Involvement Survey. The survey is provided to parents via a paper copy or online that can be found at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/>. The Department has developed a handout with questions and answers to help parents understand the survey and its importance. The handout can be found at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/handout.php>.

Based on the feedback from the SEAC meetings, the Department revised the special education public website to ensure it is easily accessible and parent-friendly. The revised website can be found on the front page of the Department website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/Pages/Home.aspx>.

Throughout the year, various stakeholders were involved in providing feedback on improving materials related to special education dispute resolution, such as model forms for a state complaint, due process, and mediation. The Dispute Resolution page was revised, and the updated materials are available to the public at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/disputeresolution/Pages/default.aspx>.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The primary mechanisms the Department uses to solicit public input are monthly SEAC meetings, sharing information with CAs and schools to inform parents and community partners, and utilizing the Department's public SPP/APR page at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx>.

SEAC's public website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

The Department's SPP/APR page was updated to reflect the new materials for FFY 2022. The Feedback Forms are available for the public year-round.

As described in the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section, multiple meetings throughout the year were held to focus on input strategies, target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies to guide the implementation and future SPP/APR submission.

Following each monthly meeting, a culminating meeting is held annually where the Department and the SEAC invite a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate in reviewing targets, analyzing data, and discussing improvement strategies for the next submission. The participants are subdivided into small groups and engaged in the capacity-building and input process to examine indicators.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR culminating meeting was held on December 9, 2022. The Department and the SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate in discussing the FFY 2021 data, reviewing targets, and developing improvement strategies for the FFY 2022 submission.

The participants were subdivided into small groups and engaged in the capacity-building and input process for the following indicators:

Group 1 – Graduation (Indicator 1), Dropout (Indicator 2), and Suspension/Expulsion (Indicator 4)

Group 2 – Statewide Assessments (Indicator 3)

Group 3 – School-Age Educational Environments (Indicator 5) and Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)

Group 4 – Preschool Educational Environments (Indicator 6) and Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7)

Group 5 – Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14)

Group 6 – State Systemic Improvement Plan/SSIP (Indicator 17)

Stakeholders were provided with the opportunity to access the materials in advance. After each meeting, they could continue to provide feedback on indicators via Feedback Forms. The materials are available on the Department's SPP/APR web page at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR culminating meeting was held on December 8, 2023. The Department and the SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate in discussing the FFY 2022 data, reviewing targets, and improving strategies for the FFY 2023 submission. For a copy of the invitation, please visit the SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/SPIN-News-December-2023-R.pdf> or <https://drive.google.com/file/d/16TGyLd6lSeuZt5lgM9q4O4mcVoKNzdhd/view?usp=sharing>.

The participants were subdivided into small groups and engaged in the capacity-building and input process for the following indicators:

Group 1 – Graduation (Indicator 1), Dropout (Indicator 2), and School-Age Environments (Indicator 5)

Group 2 – Statewide Assessments (Indicator 3)

Group 3 – Preschool Environments (Indicator 6) and Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7)

Group 4 – Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)

Group 5 – Secondary Transition (Indicator 13) and Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14)

Group 6 – State Systemic Improvement Plan/SSIP (Indicator 17)

After the meeting, the participants and other stakeholders were provided with the opportunity to continue to provide feedback on all of the 17 indicators via Feedback Forms. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit:

- The Department's SPP/APR page at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

- SEAC's SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

The Department appreciates the input and feedback the parents, advocacy groups, and educational/community/state agency partners provided to improve outcomes for our students with disabilities.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The Department developed an SPP/APR page on the public website dedicated to sharing information related to SPP/APR indicators.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx>.

In order to support parents and community/agency partners in providing meaningful feedback, the Department, in collaboration with SEAC and SPIN, created the following materials:

- Presentation Slides
- Factsheets
- Infographics
- Feedback Forms

The materials developed are parent-friendly and include the following information:

- a. An overview of what each indicator measures;
- b. Data considerations;
- c. The importance of each indicator;
- d. How each indicator aligns with the Department's strategic plan;
- e. The last three years of longitudinal data;
- f. How the Department compares to the national average.
- g. Feedback Forms for each indicator were developed to reach a broader audience. They are available to the public throughout the year for their continuous feedback.

Each of the materials developed was made available prior to each meeting through the Department's public website at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the SEAC's SPP/APR Resource Page at the website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

The FFY 2021 SPP/APR was posted on the Department's website at

https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2021.pdf within a week of submission to OSEP of its revised version submitted during the clarification process in April 2023, which was within the IDEA requirements, no later than 120 days following the submission of the Department's APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)

The CIFR provided TA to the ESB staff regarding fiscal and resource management of federal American Rescue Plan (ARP) funds used and monitored by the state. As a result, the Department collaborated with CIFR to develop a fiscal monitoring plan related to the use of ARP funds.

Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)

The Department received TA from ECTA to address inclusive practices for preschool-age children and develop a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) within the State. The ECTA TA providers and the Department conducted:

- a. One full day of PD with teams on preschool LRE and outcomes measures.
- b. Two half-day PD at the Hawai'i Special Education Conference (March 2023) on preschool LRE.
- c. Supported the Department and Part C with the development of the CSPD.

As a result, the Department continued to build staff capacity on preschool LRE and outcomes and established a State Interagency Team to focus on inclusion and combined efforts; both agencies funded the establishment of the CSPD Coordinator position to further promote and establish high-quality personnel toward improving outcomes for children and families. More information on CSPD can be found at <https://ecpcta.org/featured-state/>

National Technical Assistance Center for Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C)

The Department received TA in transition assessments in developing transition plans and collecting and analyzing post-school outcomes data (quarterly B14 Community of Practice).

As a result, the Department:

- a. Provided PD to CA and school staff and created a transition assessment website as a resource for school and CA staff. The website can be found at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/transitionassessmenthawaiidoe/home>.
- b. Developed a monthly Transition Interagency workgroup to obtain input from groups across the state to discuss transition issues. The agency groups participating are Department staff (DES and Resource Teachers), DOH, DDD, CDS, DVR, Hawai'i Disability Rights Center (HDRC), and SPIN.

IDEA Data Center (IDC)

The IDC continued to assist the Department in reviewing and developing processes and protocols for data collection and submission. The Department participated in monthly Data Manager Connection and Data Manager Data Quality Peer Group sessions to support data manager competencies and improve data quality. As a result, the Department began to review and develop new protocols for each indicator data collection.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

The Special Education Director continued to participate in dialogue and discussions with other directors around the nation related to policies and trends in current special education matters, more specifically, on how other states addressed the post-COVID-19 pandemic lingering impacts, as well as how other states are addressing a shortage of personnel. As a result, the Department used the resources and information shared through the dialogues and networking with special education directors throughout the nation in the development of Hawai'i's post-COVID-19 pandemic recovery.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Cross-State Learning Collaborative (CLSC): Results-Based Accountability and Support (RBAS)
The Department attended monthly RBAS meetings on developing, implementing, and evaluating special education accountability and aligning it with a state's GSS. As a result, the Department continues to refine its GSS processes toward improving compliance and student outcomes.

NCSI: TA on Indicator 8 Parent Involvement Survey

NCSI facilitated a group of various stakeholders during SY 2022-2023 to review the current parent survey, compare it with the surveys used nationwide, and make recommendations on revising the survey. As a result of the workgroup, a new survey is anticipated to be in effect for SY 2023-2024.

NCSI, Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) - Capacity Building on Discipline Practices and Data Analysis

NCSI and the Center on PBIS partnered with the Department to provide TA in building State staff capacity in discipline practices and data analysis for students with disabilities and provide recommendations to the Department on improvement activities. Together, the teams reviewed data and the TA centers provided tools for the Department to conduct an initial analysis of the data. The Department received the appropriate tools and is currently conducting the data analysis.

Participation in Special Education Conferences

As a result of the TA provided, the Department's staff researched relevant professional development conferences and participated in PD activities to increase their knowledge and keep abreast of national and state policies and trends. The following is a list of conferences attended:

Improving Data, Improving Outcomes (IDIO) Conference, 2022

This conference offered the 619 Coordinators and Data Managers the opportunity to focus on leadership and equity. Much of the discussion and sessions provided staff with information about preschool environments and data collection. State personnel came away with information to help school teams understand natural environments for preschool-aged children. As a result of attending this conference, the Part B and Part C staff began to meet on a regular basis to discuss systemic changes to address smooth transition and provision of services when children move from Part C to Part B.

DASY Center, 2023

Part B and Part C applied and received an invitation to receive TA to explore using data to support the system's change. The focus of this TA was to bring about system changes for both Part C and Part B. As a result of this TA, Part C, Part B, and Home Visiting are focusing on identifying the critical data points that will help with both Child Find and transition as well as family engagement.

The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE): National Symposium on Dispute Resolution October 26-28, 2022

The Symposium provided an array of opportunities for State-level staff to: a. Learn from special education dispute resolution experts from around the country; b. Stay current on special education dispute resolution issues; and c. Expand knowledge on emerging special education dispute resolution issues and trends. As a result of attending this national symposium, the Department made improvements to the dispute resolution system, such as engaging parents and educational/community/state agency partners in revising the model forms for state complaints, mediation, and due process. Additional materials were developed to support parents in accessing dispute resolution options. Please visit the Department's Dispute Resolution page at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/disputeresolution/Pages/default.aspx>.

IDC - Interactive Institute 2023

At the institute, the Department collaborated with IDC staff to dive deeper into the IDC IDEA Data Meeting Toolkit and Data Tool Analysis to support state and CA teams in guiding conversations around data and decision-making to improve student achievement.

SPP/APR Summit - 2023

During this highly interactive summit, the IDC facilitated discussions around priority SPP/APR topics and issues, dug in-depth into select indicators, and pinpointed challenges and opportunities for states to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The ESB and MAC staff utilized the latest updates in developing, submitting, implementing, and monitoring the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

OSEP Conference - 2023

During the OSEP conference, the Department staff were provided with the opportunity to build and strengthen partnerships with colleagues from other states and increase professional growth and insight into trends and strategies, which in turn were utilized to assist the Department's efforts in improving the Department's GSS.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2022 and 2023 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 23, 2023 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	72.24%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	88.00%	90.00%	83.00%	72.24%	73.00%
Data	65.29%	64.01%	63.41%	72.24%	69.72%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department’s SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department’s progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department’s performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs.

These infographics are available on the Department’s website at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC’s website at

<https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 1 is provided below.

The stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data since the establishment of the baseline to determine whether the Department made progress or had slippage, whether the targets needed to be adjusted, discussed current improvement strategies, and provided input on new improvement strategies. In reviewing the data from FFY 2020, when the Department and stakeholders established a new baseline of 72.24%, there was a slight decrease in FFY 2021 and an increase in FFY 2022, with the rate of graduation at 70.22%. Although the Department did not meet the target of 74%, the stakeholders commented that this may be due to the COVID-19 pandemic lingering challenges. They determined that the targets were reasonable and did not need to be adjusted.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Prioritize improvement rather than focusing on a target.
- The COVID-19 pandemic's lingering effects impacted graduation rates.
- Participants were curious to see what the SY 2022-2023 data will look like.
- Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies to support student well-being.
- Share strategies with general education staff for students who have complex needs.
- Utilize Positive Behavioral Supports and restorative practices.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	922
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	153
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	30
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	208

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
922	1,313	69.72%	74.00%	70.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

In accordance with Board Policy 102-15, High School Graduation Requirements and Commencement, Hawai'i has one set of standards for all youth with and without disabilities in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

All Hawai'i public school graduates will:

- Realize their individual goals and aspirations;
- Possess the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to contribute positively and compete in a global society;
- Exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship; and
- Pursue post-secondary education and/or careers.

To receive a regular high school diploma, all youth must meet the following course requirements and standards for a total of 24 credits: English = 4 credits; Social Studies = 4 credits; Mathematics = 3 credits; Science = 3 credits; World Language or Fine Arts or Career & Technical Education/JROTC = 2 credits; Physical Education = 1 credit; Health = 0.5 credits; Personal Transition Plan = 0.5 credit; Electives = 6 credits

For more information about graduation with a regular diploma, please refer to the Department's graduation requirements at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Graduation%20Brochures/GraduationBrochure.pdf>

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The 2021-2022 school year reflects the first full school year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges. The pandemic widened pre-existing achievement gaps, dampened educational opportunities, and created emotional and mental health concerns for students, staff, parents, and the community. Thus, these challenges should be considered when reviewing and examining performance data for indicator 1.

On February 2, 2023, the Board of Education (BOE) approved its 2023-2029 Strategic Plan. The plan had 27 Desired Outcomes. Subsequently, on May 18, 2023, the BOE approved an Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan, including Action Items and Performance Measures for each Desired Outcome. One of the goals of the Implementation Plan is Goal 1.3: All students graduate high school prepared for college and career success and community and civic engagement. The Strategic Plan's cornerstone is to prepare students for college and careers. A copy of the 2023-2029 Strategic Plan can be accessed on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Advancing%20Education/2023-29-ImplementationPlan.pdf>.

Although the Department did not meet its FFY 2020 target, graduation rates are trending in a positive direction after facing many post-COVID challenges. To support student learning and equip schools with an array of mental health supports and services, the Hawai'i Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) and the multi-year "Here to Help" initiative to train and coach staff to support student well-being and to provide equitable access to mental and physical health services through a continuum of school-level supports and community partnerships.

To support students in accelerating their college and career goals, the Department continued to implement the following strategies:

1. Dual Credit Programs
2. An Expectation for College
3. Advanced Placement
4. Test Preparation
5. GEAR UP Hawai'i
6. Science, Technology, Engineering, & Math (STEM)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS009.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	14.93%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	14.00%	11.00%	11.00%	14.93%	14.00%
Data	14.89%	16.82%	12.38%	14.93%	12.55%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs.

These infographics are available on the Department's website at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 2 is provided below.

The stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data since the establishment of the baseline to determine whether the Department made progress or had slippage, whether the targets needed to be adjusted, discussed current improvement strategies, and provided input on new improvement strategies. In reviewing the data from FFY 2020, when the stakeholders established a new baseline of 14.93%, there was a slight decrease in FFY 2021 and an increase in FFY 2022, with the rate of dropout being 15.84%. The Department did not meet the target of 13.00%. The stakeholders commented that this may be due to the COVID-19 pandemic's lingering challenges. The decision was not to modify the targets as the stakeholders determined that the targets are reasonable and must remain low, and standards must remain high.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- While there was a decrease in SY 2020-2021, the Department exceeded the SY 2021-2022 target. The participants wondered whether the COVID-19 lingering effects impacted students' coming back to in-person learning. Perhaps parents decided to homeschool or use alternative placement.
- Moving from middle to high school may be a big jump for some students.
- Dropout by disability categories points out mental health needs.
- Collaboration among school teams.
- Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies to support student well-being.
- Share strategies with general education staff for students who have complex needs.
- Use alternatives to suspensions - cap suspensions at the elementary level.
- Utilize Positive Behavioral Supports and restorative practices.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	922
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	153
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	30
SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/24/2023	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	208

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
208	1,313	12.55%	13.00%	15.84%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The data for Indicator 2 reflects the first full school year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges. The pandemic widened pre-existing achievement gaps, dampened educational opportunities, and created emotional and mental health concerns for students, staff, parents, and the community.

In SY 2021-2022, there was a substantial statewide increase in the chronic absenteeism rate. The single most influential factor attributable to 2021-2022 absences was due to COVID infections and quarantines due to potential exposure. Increases in absences and peaks in infection rates were consistently mirrored during September – November 2021 (Delta variant) and January – May 2022 (Omicron variant). Chronic absenteeism is acutely linked to dropout, so the substantial increase likely impacted the dropout rate.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

The Department utilizes the statewide Student Information System (SIS) to track student enrollment, transfers, and exits. The dropout definition is the same for youth with and without Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Students who dropout of school are classified as those who:

- Leave school between the ages of 15-18 years old (or age out) without earning a diploma;
- Withdraw from school to work or attend work readiness programs;
- Enroll in non-Department alternative educational programs;
- Join the Armed Services;
- Are court-ordered to a youth correctional facility;
- Are excluded from school due to zero-tolerance policies (for possession of guns, drugs);
- Are in-flight and the school had no information on whereabouts;
- Has left the state to reside on the mainland (unable to verify);
- Are married and not returning to school;
- Do not return/show up for school as expected; and
- for "other" reasons.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

To support student learning and equip schools with an array of mental health supports and services, the Hawai'i Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) and the multi-year "Here to Help" initiative to train and coach staff to support student well-being and to provide equitable access to mental and physical health services through a continuum of school-level supports and community partnerships.

For the Department's resources to support student learning, see below:

Student Well-Being and Mental Health webpage:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForStudents/StudentWell-being/Pages/default.aspx>

About Here to HELP webpage:

<http://heretohelp.hidoe.us>

Bullying Prevention Work webpage:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/AntiBullyingWork/Pages/home.aspx>

Speak Now HIDOE anti-bullying reporting app webpage:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/AntiBullyingWork/Pages/Speak-Now-HIDOE.aspx>

SEL Resources for Parents, Families, and Educators webpage:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ConnectWithUs/MediaRoom/PressReleases/Pages/SEL-Resources-for-Parents-Families-and-Educators.aspx>

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using *EDFacts* file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	96.31%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	94.11%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	87.79%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	96.38%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	94.85%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	87.43%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional information specifically related to Indicator 3A is provided below.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Create awareness of the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) accessibility features available for students, their families, and IEP team members.
- Provide the statewide assessment accommodation training to be expanded to include families and other IEP team members.
- Promote greater awareness about statewide assessments, such as highlighting infographics, holding events throughout the year, and having social media campaigns.
- Improve awareness and understanding of the Hawai'i State Alternate Assessment (HSA-Alt) performance level expectation for a student to be eligible to take the HSA-Alt.
- A common reason why there is a reduction of statewide assessment participation for grade 8 and high school from various stakeholder groups identified that as students mature, they choose to decline to participate in statewide assessments.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1,501	1,313	1,096
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	343	636	743
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	987	482	81
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	129	93	95

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs (2)	1,501	1,315	1,097
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)	346	649	760
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)	987	482	75
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	127	93	93

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

(2) The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,459	1,501	95.69%	95.00%	97.20%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,211	1,313	90.80%	95.00%	92.23%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	919	1,096	76.26%	95.00%	83.85%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,460	1,501	96.16%	95.00%	97.27%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,224	1,315	91.47%	95.00%	93.08%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	928	1,097	77.64%	95.00%	84.59%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

As required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A), the Department has posted FFY 2021 SPP/APR data at the following link.
https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2021.pdf

Public Reporting of assessment results can be accessed in the following links:

Participation
<https://adc.hido.us/#/participation>

Accountability Resource Center Hawaii (ARCH)
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/>

Every Student Succeeds Act Report Card
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/reports/essa>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting
<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/ideasection618data/Pages/default.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response
3A - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED Facts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	8.36%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	6.29%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	12.56%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	10.18%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	4.15%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	1.40%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	19.00%	21.00%	23.00%	25.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%	22.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	7.00%	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 3B is provided below.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Create awareness of the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) accessibility features available for students, their families, and IEP team members.
- Provide the statewide assessment accommodation training to be expanded to include families and other IEP team members.
- Promote greater awareness about statewide assessments, such as highlighting infographics, holding events throughout the year, and having social media campaigns.
- Address chronic absenteeism.
- Provide appropriate accommodations during testing.
- Students without disabilities are also struggling.
- Improve awareness and understanding of the Hawai'i State Alternate Assessment (HSA-Alt) performance level expectation for a student to be eligible to take the HSA-Alt.
- Targets are appropriate, and no modifications were recommended.
- Increase tutoring services.
- Focus on literacy from preschool.
- Employ literacy coaches at the school level.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,330	1,118	824
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	55	66	95
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	70	27	11

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,333	1,131	835
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	66	41	14
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	87	11	2

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	125	1,330	8.76%	14.00%	9.40%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	93	1,118	8.50%	12.00%	8.32%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	106	824	11.49%	19.00%	12.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The Department did not meet its target for grade 8 reading assessment and had a slippage of 0.18 percentage points compared to FFY 2021. Looking at the data from FFY 2020, the Department was at 8.34%, which is comparable to FFY 2022 data with a slight decrease of 0.02 percentage points. In School Year 2021, the Department administered a shortened version of the statewide assessment, a skip-year growth methodology was used, and participation rate penalties were waived as approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, comparing FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data is not appropriate. Furthermore, FFY 2022 continued to be impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic lingering challenges.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	153	1,333	9.62%	16.00%	11.48%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	52	1,131	3.32%	10.00%	4.60%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	16	835	2.16%	7.00%	1.92%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The Department did not meet its grade 11 math assessment target and had a slippage of 0.24 percentage points compared to FFY 2021. Looking at the data from FFY 2020, the Department was at 1.84%, which is comparable to FFY 2022 data with a slight gain of 0.08 percentage points from FFY 2020. In School Year 2021, the Department administered a shortened version of the statewide assessment, a skip-year growth methodology was used, and participation rate penalties were waived as approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, comparing FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data is not appropriate.

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

As required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A), the Department has posted FFY 2021 SPP/APR data at the following link.
https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2021.pdf

Public Reporting of assessment results can also be found in the following links:

Proficiency
<https://adc.hido.us/#/proficiency>

Accountability Resource Center Hawaii (ARCH)
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/>

Every Student Succeeds Act Report Card
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/reports/essa>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting
<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/ideasection618data/Pages/default.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using *EDFacts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	50.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	41.61%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	35.20%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	49.12%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	39.86%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	37.10%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs.

These infographics are available on the Department's website at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input related explicitly to Indicator 3C is provided below.

Annually, the Department holds an HSA-Alt Stakeholder meeting and receives their input on the HSA-Alt Classroom Embedded Assessment. In addition, the Department solicited input in collaboration during the culminating meeting of the December SPP/APR.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

HSA-Alt Stakeholder Annual Meeting and Test Administrator Training

Stakeholders reviewed the currently available testlets and suggested continuing to support formative practices for the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, streamlining the process and improving access, and providing additional professional development to engage the teachers. Additional feedback was solicited through the statewide HSA-Alt Test Administrator training.

SPP/APR December SPP/APR Culminating Meeting

- Support the instruction aligned with state content standards for the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities through the state-sponsored curriculum and professional development.
- Provide professional development for the formative strategies through HSA-Alt Classroom Embedded Assessment.
- Promote inclusive practices.
- Participants did not suggest any modifications to the targets.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	129	93	95
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	53	29	35

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	127	93	93
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	47	29	34

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	53	129	42.86%	56.00%	41.09%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	29	93	23.19%	48.00%	31.18%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	35	95	31.58%	41.00%	36.84%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The Department did not meet its grade 4 reading assessment target and had a slippage of 1.77 percentage points. The FFY 2022 data indicates that proficiency is still recovering from the impact of the school closure due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Across the state, schools are still in the process of addressing pandemic-related challenges. This slippage is likely attributed to the impact of the loss of instruction in the early grades when introduced to foundational academic skills and school routines. Furthermore, the inconsistent student attendance contributed to the inconsistent participation in the statewide assessments, which impacted the proficiency rate slippage.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	47	127	37.61%	55.00%	37.01%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	29	93	24.09%	46.00%	31.18%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	34	93	37.27%	43.00%	36.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

As required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A), the Department has posted FFY 2021 SPP/APR data at the following link.
<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

Public Reporting of assessment results can also be found in the following links:

Accountability Data Center
<https://adc.hido.us/#/>

Every Student Succeeds Act Report Card
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/reports/essa>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting
<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/ideaSection618data/Pages/default.aspx>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

3C - OSEP Response**3C - Required Actions**

Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	43.10
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	45.20
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	46.50
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	37.56
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	33.55
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	28.71

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	37.00	35.00	33.00	31.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	39.00	37.00	35.00	33.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	40.00	38.00	36.00	34.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	32.00	30.00	28.00	26.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	28.00	26.00	24.00	22.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;

3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 3D is provided below.

In reviewing the data from the baseline year of 2018, the gap decreased overall despite the COVID-19 pandemic challenges, with the exception of 4th-grade math.

ELA

4th Grade

- Baseline 43.1%; FFY 2022 showed a decrease to 41.60%

8th Grade

- Baseline 45.2%; FFY 2022 showed a decrease to 41.36%

11th Grade

- Baseline 46.5%; FFY 2022 showed a decrease to 45.64%

Math
 4th Grade
 • Baseline 37.56%; FFY 2022 showed an increase to 37.75%
 8th Grade
 • Baseline 33.55%; FFY showed a decrease to 26.10%
 11th Grade
 • Baseline 28.71; FFY 2022 showed a decrease to 23.04%

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Strengthen family engagement.
- Inclusive practices to support students with IEPs to receive grade-level instruction by strengthening Tier 1 instruction.
- Continue developing standard-based IEPs.
- The participants did not suggest any modifications to the targets.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,272	9,876	10,474
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,330	1,118	824
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6,699	4,879	6,117
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	70	27	11
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	55	66	95
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	70	27	11

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,344	10,008	10,534
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,333	1,131	835
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6,482	3,061	2,627
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	87	11	2
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	66	41	14

f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	87	11	2
---	----	----	---

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9.40%	51.00%	42.22	37.00	41.60	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.32%	49.68%	41.75	39.00	41.36	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	12.86%	58.51%	48.46	40.00	45.64	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	11.48%	49.23%	35.74	32.00	37.75	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	4.60%	30.70%	27.37	28.00	26.10	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	1.92%	24.96%	23.54	23.00	23.04	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Data indicates that proficiency rates increased for both students with and without IEPs. The proficiency rate for all students increased more than that for students with IEPs. While both demonstrated a positive trend, students with IEPs increased at a lower rate. In line with the national trends, the persistent gap was widened by the COVID-19 lingering impacts, specifically social, emotional, and mental health needs. A deeper analysis of the data is provided below. Furthermore, on FFY 2021, the Department administered a shortened version of the statewide assessment, a skip-year growth methodology was used, and participation rate penalties were waived as approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Therefore, comparing FFY 2021 and FFY 2022 data is not appropriate.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon LEAs that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs.

These infographics are available on the Department's website at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 4A is provided below.

The Department defines significant discrepancy when the rate difference is 0.75 percentage points. The Department is considered to be identified as having a significant discrepancy when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least 0.75 percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. The Department uses a minimum cell size of five (5) children in each race/ethnicity category in order for the data to be included in the analysis. The data for FFY 2022 indicates the Department's rate difference was .31 percentage points; thus, the Department does not have a significant discrepancy. During stakeholder input, it was noted that this indicator only measures suspension/expulsion rate for more than ten (10) days and that paying attention to suspensions of less than ten (10) days is important because these suspensions can impact students' learning. They also noted that students with disabilities are suspended twice the rate of students without disabilities. The group inquired about the system of support at the elementary school level. Participants did not suggest making any changes to the current 0.75 rate difference. This threshold was examined and updated on FFY 2020 in collaboration with stakeholders and Department staff.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Utilize Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) strategies to support student well-being.
- Use alternatives to suspensions - cap suspensions at the elementary school level.
- Utilize Positive Behavioral Supports and restorative practices.
- Suspensions of less than ten (10) days can impact student learning.
- Collaborate across school teams.
- Share strategies with general education staff for students who have complex needs.
- The Office of Student Support Services (OSSS) has prioritized reducing suspensions and utilizing restorative practices.
- Drill down on the root cause of suspensions.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Methodology

Hawai'i is a single District State, which means that SEA and LEA are the same; therefore, Hawai'i determines significant discrepancy by comparing the rates of suspension/expulsion for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to the rates of suspension/expulsion for children without disabilities within the Local Education Agency (LEA)/State Education Agency (SEA). Consistent with IDEA Data Center (IDC) Measuring Significant Discrepancy "An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide," pages 37-41 (https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring_significant_discrepancy-an_ind.pdf), to compare a district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the same district suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities, the Department uses the rate difference methodology. Rate difference compares the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. Rate difference equation = state suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities minus (-) the state rate for children without disabilities. This is one of the OSEP-approved comparison methodologies that are used to determine whether significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspension and expulsion are occurring between children with and without disabilities [34 CFR §300.170(a)].

Definition of Significant Discrepancy

The Department defines "significant discrepancy" when the rate difference is 0.75 percentage points or greater. This means the Department is considered to be identified as having a significant discrepancy when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at a minimum 0.75 percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. The Department uses a minimum N-cell size of five (5) children in order for the data to be included in the analysis.

In analyzing the FFY 2022 data, the Department used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted in October 2022 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the SY 2021- 2022. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

FFY 2022

Step 1: Calculate the State's suspension/expulsion rates of children with and without disabilities:

State's Rate for Children with Disabilities:

102 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 19,655 (Total number of special education children) = 0.52%

State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:

469 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 153,621 (Total number of children without disabilities) =0.31%

Rate Difference = (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children without disabilities)
0.52% - 0.31% = 0.21 percentage points

Summary

The difference between the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities and the suspension rate for children without IEPs within the Department is 0.21 percentage points, which is lower than 0.75. Because the rate difference is less than 0.75 percentage points, the Department IS NOT identified as having a significant discrepancy.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Indicator 4A data is complete, valid, and reliable. Data shows the number of children with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in SY 2021-2022 is higher when compared to SY 2020-2021.

In SY 2020-2021, there was a decrease due to the extraordinary circumstances of school campus closures and the shift from a face-to-face instructional delivery model to various modalities and blended models to address health and safety protocols in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The SY 2021-2022 reflects the first full school year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges. Thus, these challenges should be considered when reviewing and examining performance data for indicator 4A.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

If the Department is identified as having significant discrepancy, the Department conducts a review of procedures, policies, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards (e.g., reviews of school-level data, analysis of state policies, procedures, and practices, and verification of implementation of these practices in schools and complex areas, etc.).

Due to the fact that the Department did not have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2022, no review of procedures, policies, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards were warranted.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	1		0%	0.00%	Met target	N/A

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Definition of Significant Discrepancy

The Department defines "significant discrepancy" when the rate difference is 0.75 percentage points or greater. This means the Department is considered to be identified as having a significant discrepancy when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at a minimum 0.75 percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. The Department uses a minimum N-cell size of five (5) children in each race/ethnicity category in order for the data to be included in the analysis.

Methodology

Hawai'i is a single District State, which means that SEA and LEA are the same; therefore, Hawai'i determines significant discrepancy by comparing the rates of suspension/expulsion for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to the rates of suspension/expulsion for children without disabilities within the Local Education Agency (LEA)/State Education Agency (SEA). Consistent with IDEA Data Center (IDC) Measuring Significant Discrepancy "An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide," page 70. (https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring_significant_discrepancy-an_ind.pdf), to compare a district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the same district suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities, the Department uses the rate difference methodology. Rate difference compares suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs to the suspension/expulsion rate for children without IEPs. Rate difference equation = state suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities minus (-) the state rate for children without disabilities. This is one of the OSEP-approved comparison methodologies that are used to determine whether significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspension and expulsion are occurring between children with and without disabilities [34 CFR §300.170(a)].

FFY 2022 Rate Difference Percentages by Race/Ethnicity Category

The rate difference is calculated by the State rate of each race/ethnicity of children with disabilities minus the State rate of each race/ethnicity of children without disabilities.

State's Rate for Children with Disabilities:

102 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 19,655 (Total number of special education children) =

0.52%

State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:

469 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 153,621 (Total number of children without disabilities) = 0.31%

Rate Difference= (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students without disabilities)
0.52% - 0.31%= 0.21 percentage points.

American Indian

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(469/153,621) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).

Asian

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $(10/3226) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(469/153,621) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- Rate difference is $0.31\% - 0.31\% = 0.00\%$

Black or African American

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(469/153,621) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).

Hispanic or Latino

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $26/4210 = 0.62\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(469/153,621) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- Rate difference is $0.62\% - 0.31\% = 0.31\%$

Two or More Races

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(469/153,621) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $55/6309 = 0.87\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(469/153,621) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- Rate difference is $0.87\% - 0.31\% = 0.56\%$

White

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $10/2333 = 0.43\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(469/153,621) \times 100 = 0.31\%$
- Rate difference is $0.43\% - 0.31\% = 0.12\%$

Summary

The Department DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2022 by race/ethnicity in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days as the rate difference for each race/ethnicity is either not applicable due to the n size being less than five (5) or fell below the threshold of .75 percentage points.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Indicator 4B data is complete, valid, and reliable. Data shows the number of children with disabilities by race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in SY 2021-2022 is higher compared to SY 2020-2021.

In SY 2020-2021, there was a decrease due to the extraordinary circumstances of school campus closures and the shift from a face-to-face instructional delivery model to various modalities and blended models to address health and safety protocols in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The SY 2021-2022 reflects the first full school year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges. Thus, these challenges should be considered when reviewing and examining performance data for indicator 4B.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

If the Department is identified as having significant discrepancy, the Department conducts a review of procedures, policies, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards (e.g., reviews of school-level data, analysis of state policies, procedures, and practices, and verification of implementation of these practices in schools and complex areas, etc.).

Due to the fact that the Department did not have a significant discrepancy FFY 2022 by race/ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with disabilities, no review of procedures, policies, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards were warranted.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS002.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target >=	52.00%	57.00%	57.00%	50.71%	53.00%
A	50.71%	Data	40.63%	43.86%	47.95%	50.71%	52.54%
B	2020	Target <=	15.00%	14.00%	14.00%	16.30%	15.80%
B	16.30%	Data	18.94%	17.15%	16.41%	16.30%	16.22%
C	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	0.96%	0.96%
C	0.96%	Data	1.11%	1.21%	1.07%	0.96%	1.21%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Target B <=	15.30%	14.80%	14.30%	13.80%
Target C <=	0.95%	0.95%	0.94%	0.94%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to

learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 5 is provided below.

The stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data since the establishment of the baseline to determine whether the Department made progress or had slippage, whether the targets needed to be adjusted, discussed current improvement strategies, and provided input on new improvement strategies.

- Indicator 5A: The Department made gains from FFY 2020, the establishment of a baseline at 50.71%, and FFY 2022 at 52.77%. Although the Department did not meet the target of 55.00%, the data shows an upward trend.
- Indicator 5B: The Department did not meet the target of 15.30% and slightly increased the percentage of students served inside the regular class, which was less than 40% of the day.
- Indicator 5C: The Department did not meet the target of 0.95% and had slippage.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- COVID-19 lingering impact on students' increasing needs for social-emotional and mental health support. Many students were freshmen who came with a COVID mentality and started behind, not feeling confident.
- Keep expectations high and aim for growth.
- Efforts to be consistent across the state - rather than voluntary.
- Work with schools to understand the importance of inclusive practices.
- Participants did not suggest any changes to the targets as they are reasonable and achievable.
- Continue with the current improvement strategies:
 - Professional Learning Network (PLN);

- Inclusive Practices Model School/Demonstration Sites; and
- Online inclusive practices courses offered to staff at no cost.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	18,040
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,519
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,953
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	161
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	24
SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	08/30/2023	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	56

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,519	18,040	52.54%	55.00%	52.77%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,953	18,040	16.22%	15.30%	16.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	241	18,040	1.21%	0.95%	1.34%	Did not meet target	Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
C	<p>The number of students placed inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospitals has increased since FFY 2020, the year before the COVID-19 pandemic. FFY 2020 (173); FFY 2021 (216); FFY 2022 (241).</p> <p>In doing the analysis, in comparison to FFY 2021, students placed in residential facilities remained consistent and students placed in homebound/hospital placements decreased by 18%. The largest increase was in students placed in separate schools (22%). The most prominent eligibility categories of students who were placed in separate schools are Deaf and Emotional Disability. The Department has a separate school for students who are Blind and/or Deaf.</p>						

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>Subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic, such as infections and quarantines, continued to contribute to students' mental health and social-emotional state. Three years later, the COVID-19 pandemic continues to have lasting effects on students' mental health and social-emotional well-being. The CA staff have reported that schools are seeing an increase in students' emotional and behavioral needs, thus requiring a more intensive and structured environment to meet their needs. In comparison to the mean across all states of 2.63, according to the latest 2022 Part B FFY 2020 SPP/APR Indicator analysis booklet, the Department is at 1.34 and below the mean.</p> <p>To address these needs, the Department prioritized strategies focusing on positive student behaviors necessary for a safe, nurturing, and culturally responsive learning environment that contributes to high-quality learning. The Hawai'i Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) and "Here to Help" were the two (2) primary initiatives that support timely identification and response to student needs with interventions and support. The HMTSS is a student-centered, data-driven, team-based decision-making framework for achieving positive outcomes for every student through a layered continuum of evidence-based practices. In HMTSS, students are provided targeted support for well-being and mental health based on their needs. "Here to Help" is a multi-year plan to train and coach staff to support student well-being and to provide equitable access to mental and physical health for all students in schools statewide.</p>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Department continued its efforts to scale up inclusive practices across the state. The work that is done through the Professional Learning Network (PLN) demonstrates the increase in the LRE percentage for students who are served inside the regular class for more than 80% of the day. The PLN is comprised of 55 CA representatives across the state. During monthly meetings, the ESB provides opportunities for learning and building capacity for the implementation of inclusive practices. To broaden the teacher knowledge, free online inclusive practices and credit courses were developed for CA teachers. Detailed information can be found at <https://inclusion.hawaiipublicschools.org/home/pde3-learning-opportunities>.

Through inclusive education, students are given the opportunity to learn alongside their peers; thus, the development of specially designed instruction and instructional strategies that provide access to content is essential in determining a student's LRE. Research demonstrates that "the vast majority of special education students (80-85%) can meet the same achievement standards as other students if they are given specially designed instruction, appropriate access, supports and accommodations, as required by IDEA" Thurlow, Quenemoen, & Lazarus (2009). The Department continues to provide ongoing learning opportunities to school and CA teachers to enhance their knowledge of specially designed instruction and evidence-based practices to address student language and literacy. One of the pillars of inclusive practices is a sense of true belonging where students' cultural backgrounds follow them throughout the school day. To achieve this sense of belonging, the Department continues to prioritize HMTSS.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in ED*Facts* file specification FS089.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home)}}{\text{(total \# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

Part	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	Target >=	35.00%	35.50%	35.50%	21.33%	22.00%
A	Data	27.34%	26.93%	28.44%	21.33%	20.45%
B	Target <=	23.30%	23.20%	23.20%	32.29%	31.00%
B	Data	27.99%	21.76%	23.82%	32.29%	38.34%
C	Target <=				1.26%	1.23%
C	Data				1.26%	0.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 6 is provided below.

The stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data since the establishment of the baseline to determine whether the Department made progress or had slippage, whether the targets needed to be adjusted, discussed current improvement strategies, and provided input on new improvement strategies. The data indicated slippage for preschoolers who attended a regular early childhood program and received the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program, an increase in the number of preschoolers who attended and received their special education services in a separate special education class, school, or residential facility, and a decrease in the number of preschoolers who attended and received their special education services at home.

Current strategies for improvement were shared with the participants:

- ECTA is providing TA to the Department to identify strategies to improve this indicator data.
- The IDC preschool toolkit has been shared with CAs.
- The ESB will continue to provide training to CAs around making decisions based on services, needs, and what is developmentally appropriate.
- The ESB will continue to work with CAs on the itinerant service model.
- The Hawai'i State Early Childhood Inclusion Partnership Group was established in 2023 to address inclusion with agency representatives from the University of Hawai'i, Hawai'i Department of Education, Head Start, Executive Office on Early

Learning, Department of Health, Early Intervention, Parents and Children Together; Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawai'i and ECTA.

- In November 2023, the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services issued guidance on "Policy Statement on Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in Early Childhood Programs". This guidance is available at <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/policy-statement-on-inclusion-11-28-2023.pdf>. A review of this guidance was shared with the interagency group.
- The next step is to create an action plan based on recommendations from the Policy Statement for States.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- The strategies currently implemented are effective, and more time is needed to collaborate with community partners to address preschool LRE with actionable items.
- No modifications of the targets were recommended.
- Work with families to strengthen transitions.
- Provide training on preschool LRE to CA staff.

Targets

Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	21.33%
B	2020	32.29%
C	2020	1.26%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	22.75%	23.50%	24.25%	25.00%
Target B <=	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%	27.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.20%	1.17%	1.14%	1.11%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	656	887	337	1,880
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	91	155	73	319
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	291	354	123	768
b2. Number of children attending separate school	4	2	2	8
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0	2	1	3
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	10	6	1	17

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	319	1,880	20.45%	22.75%	16.97%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	779	1,880	38.34%	30.00%	41.44%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	17	1,880	0.60%	1.20%	0.90%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable

During the SY 2022-2023, Hawai'i experienced closures in its Head Start classrooms (Head Start is the largest early childhood program provider in the state of Hawai'i) due to not being able to meet the enrollment criteria and increased staff turnover following the COVID-19 pandemic, thus limiting the options for early childhood programs. The National Head Start Association conducted a survey midway through the 2022-2023 program year that shows the Head Start and Early Head Start workforce remains in crisis. Chronic low compensation, challenging classroom conditions, and opportunities with employers who pay more continue to create a need that demands immediate action.

In November 2023, the Department of Health and Human Services and Administrator for Children and Families proposed to add new requirements to the Head Start Program Performance Standards (HSPPS) to support and stabilize the Head Start workforce, including requirements for wages and benefits, breaks for staff, and enhanced supports for staff health and wellness and enhance several existing requirements across Head Start Programs.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable

In comparing the data from the previous year to this reporting year, there was an increase in the number of preschool children placed in separate special education classes. During discussions with early childhood providers and CA staff, they reported that preschool children are enrolling with a gap in their learning opportunities.

Preschool enrollment has gradually been increasing post-COVID-19 pandemic. With this increase, staff across the state have reported preschool children are entering the Department with their first experience as learners. Historically, these children would have engaged in general education in early childhood environments.

The Department received TA from ECTA to address inclusive practices for preschool-age children and the need for children to participate with typically developing peers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2018	Target >=	73.00%	74.00%	74.00%	66.00%	68.00%
A1	62.01%	Data	63.59%	62.01%	69.66%	65.68%	54.74%

A2	2018	Target >=	51.00%	52.00%	52.00%	45.00%	46.00%
A2	44.28%	Data	47.99%	44.28%	43.13%	41.20%	45.62%
B1	2018	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	68.00%	70.00%
B1	65.56%	Data	67.37%	65.56%	69.79%	68.07%	55.54%
B2	2018	Target >=	55.00%	56.00%	56.00%	51.00%	52.00%
B2	49.53%	Data	53.82%	49.53%	45.02%	42.65%	40.46%
C1	2018	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	68.00%	70.00%
C1	63.90%	Data	93.16%	63.90%	71.56%	68.21%	56.37%
C2	2018	Target >=	58.00%	59.00%	59.00%	41.00%	42.00%
C2	40.11%	Data	91.33%	40.11%	39.00%	37.32%	46.20%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%
Target A2 >=	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%
Target B1 >=	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%
Target B2 >=	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%
Target C1 >=	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%
Target C2 >=	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%	46.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 7 is provided below.

The stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data since the establishment of the baseline to determine whether the Department made progress or had slippage, whether the targets needed to be adjusted, discussed current improvement strategies, and provided input on new improvement strategies.

During the discussion, they suggested increasing the target for 7A2. While the Department exceeded the target of 47%, the Department determined not to increase the 7A2 Outcome target for FFY 2022 until additional data is obtained in order to identify whether this increase is appropriate. The stakeholders did not suggest making any modifications to the 7B Outcome targets. Further, they suggested increasing the 7C2 Outcome target. The Department determined not to increase 7C2 Outcome targets for FFY 2022 until additional data is obtained in order to identify whether this increase is appropriate.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Continue providing PD on language learning and literacy to Complex Area staff.
- Utilize TS Gold progress monitoring data for programmatic decisions.
- Continue to conduct Transdisciplinary Play-Based Assessments training for Complex Area Staff.
- Additional time is needed for collaboration between community partners to address preschool outcomes.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

748

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7	0.94%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	241	32.22%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	121	16.18%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	215	28.74%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	164	21.93%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	336	584	54.74%	70.00%	57.53%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	379	748	45.62%	47.00%	50.67%	Met target	No Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4	0.53%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	249	33.29%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	154	20.59%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	203	27.14%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	138	18.45%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	357	610	55.54%	72.00%	58.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	341	748	40.46%	53.00%	45.59%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	7	0.94%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	244	32.62%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	103	13.77%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	218	29.14%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	176	23.53%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	321	572	56.37%	72.00%	56.12%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	394	748	46.20%	43.00%	52.67%	Met target	No Slippage

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The Department continues to use Teaching Strategies GOLD (TS GOLD) as the instrument to gather preschool outcome data for Indicator 7. TS GOLD is an online assessment tool that converts student progression data into the seven (7) point scale of the Child Outcomes Summary Form. TS GOLD is aligned with the preschool reporting requirements of the Office of Special Education Programs and with the Hawai'i Early Learning and Development Standards (HELDS). Preschool students with disabilities with a rating of six (6) or seven (7) are considered to be functioning at a level that is "comparable to same-aged peers."

The Department requires all Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Teachers to understand and implement the required implementation procedures to collect progress data used in generating outcome ratings in TS GOLD for reporting in Indicator 7. Annually, the 619 Preschool Resource Teachers, provide special education technical support to the ECSE teachers, with training on how to collect, record, and input student data into TS GOLD and improve student outcomes. To obtain outcome scores, student performance data from a variety of sources is collected by the ECSE teachers within two (2) months of entry into or exit from the preschool program. The results are calculated by TS GOLD for the reporting school year, with the Department reviewing the data to report to OSEP and analyze for programming purposes.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Department continues to promote the Language and Literacy initiative, started in 2020, and the professional development of complex area staff to support ECSE teachers. Further, professional learning communities for SLPs and District preschool resource teachers continued to be implemented to focus on supporting evidence-based strategies and practices for preschool students with disabilities. Additional strategies used to increase performance include the establishment of special-interest groups to support teachers and expanding the use of transdisciplinary play-based assessments to obtain a more comprehensive and accurate assessment of a child's abilities, which can help determine student eligibility and special education programming toward improving student outcomes.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

Include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs.

These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 8 is provided below.

The stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data since the establishment of the baseline to determine whether the Department made progress or had slippage, whether the targets needed to be adjusted, discussed current improvement strategies, and provided input on new improvement strategies.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Parents need to have the same message about the importance of participating in the survey from elementary through high school.
- Survey results need to be valued by school staff and parents.
- Demonstrate data online and make it meaningful to parents.
- Include survey data results in the school performance.
- Add the method of having the survey read to the parent.
- Reduce the number of questions in the current survey.
- Make information more accessible.
- Send emails to parents after a meeting to remind them of participating in the survey.
- Embed a checkmark on the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) that the opportunity to take the survey was provided to the parents.
- Afford the parents the opportunity to take the survey over the phone. Parents may take the survey online at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/altlogin.php> or utilize the QRcode in the Parent Involvement Survey Handout accessible at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/handout.php>.

In the Spring of 2023, a workgroup was created to review the current Parent Survey, analyze surveys from other states, and provide recommendations for a revised survey to increase the response rate, particularly for underrepresented groups, and support program implementation. The new revised survey is anticipated to be released in SY2024-2025.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	51.78%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	54.00%	54.00%	60.00%	51.78%	54.00%
Data	54.88%	57.42%	58.20%	51.78%	54.48%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
881	1,447	54.48%	56.00%	60.88%	Met target	No Slippage

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

The Department continues to use the Parent Involvement Survey consisting of a 25-item rating scale, the Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education and Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). Upon completion of a student's initial or annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting, the parents of a student aged 3 through 21 (preschool and school-age) are given the opportunity to respond to the Parent Involvement Survey.

All public schools, including charter schools, are required to provide parents with the opportunity to take the Parent Involvement Survey after an initial or annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting. Parents may take the survey online, available at <http://www.hiparentsurvey.com>, or via a paper copy with a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. All returned surveys for students ages 3-21 between July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023, are combined, processed, aggregated, and analyzed.

The Department uses one survey for parents of all grade levels, including parents of preschool children, which resulted in 1,447 surveys returned and 881 surveys reporting schools facilitated parental involvement, yielding an overall response rate of 7.26%. Of the 1,447 returned surveys across all age groups, 909 (63%) came from parents of preschool children. Since the survey instrument and distribution methodology were identical for all age groups, the data for preschool and school-age surveys were combined and analyzed using the same procedures.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

19,920

Percentage of respondent parents

7.26%

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	5.85%	7.26%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

To determine representativeness, an over-representation was based on a discrepancy of at least three (3) percentage points greater than the Department's percentage in any given race/ethnicity or disability group. Conversely, underrepresentation was established as a difference of three (3) percentage points or less than that of the Department's percentage in any race/ethnicity or disability group. Differences of less than three (3) percentage points between respondents' and the Department's percentages are not considered significant.

When conducting a comparison of the response rate data against the composition of the state-level demographic data for students with disabilities, the data suggests that students identified as 'Hispanic/Latino,' 'Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,' and 'Asian' had lower participation rates in the survey. In terms of disability categories, survey returns from students with disabilities, including 'Other Health Impairment' and 'Specific Learning Disability' also had lower participation rates. Although there were categories in both the race/ethnicity and disability groups that were not representative, there was no discernable difference in the weighted and unweighted survey results (95% confidence interval) with regard to the percentage reported on the indicator.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

At the December 8, 2023, SPP/APR stakeholder meeting, a review, analysis, and a discussion was held on Indicator 8 data and strategies for improvement. As Indicator 8 data historically has been disaggregated by race/ethnicity, grades, disability category, and other demographic characteristics, it was determined that the Department will continue to disaggregate in the same manner. For this analysis, in complying with the new requirements for representativeness of survey respondents, Hawai'i is including race/ethnicity and disability category as the demographic categories to measure representativeness of children ages 3 through 21 who are receiving special education services.

Data from the rating scales obtained from the SEPPS instrument were analyzed through the Rasch measurement framework. The analysis produces a measure for each survey respondent on a scale from 0 to 1,000. Each measure reflects the extent to which the parent indicated that schools facilitated that parent's involvement. The measures of all respondents were averaged to yield a mean measure reflecting the overall performance of the state of Hawai'i about schools' facilitation of parent involvement. OSEP requires that the states' performance be reported as the percentage of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement. Deriving a percent from a continuous distribution requires the application of a standard or cut score. The Department elected to apply the standard recommended by a nationally representative stakeholder group convened by NCSEAM. The recommended standard, established based on item content expressed in the scale, was operationalized as a measure of 600. Thus, the percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated their involvement was calculated as the percent of parents with a measure of 600 or above on the SEPPS. The Department's mean measure on the SEPPS is 640, with a standard deviation of 160. The standard error of the sample mean is 4.2. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 631.5–648.0. This means there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state mean is within this range. The data was also weighted and analyzed by race/ethnicity and disability category. The weighted data for disability category had the same mean measure of 640 as the unweighted data, while the figure, when weighted by race/ethnicity, was 646. The percentages on the indicator for the data weighted by race/ethnicity and disability category were both 62%. Race/ethnicity and disability of students for whom surveys were returned were analyzed and compared to the Department's total population of children receiving special education services to determine if the data collected are, in fact, representative of this population. Demographic data for the Department's population were obtained from the Department's 2022 Child Count for EdFacts file of children receiving special education services. To obtain demographic data from respondents, the survey asked parents to self-report race/ethnicity and disability via items 28 and 29 of the survey. While some race/ethnicity groups were represented proportionally in the data collected when compared to the Department's total population of children receiving special education services, 'Hispanic or Latino' and 'Native Hawai'ian or Other Pacific Islander' were found to be underrepresented in the sample by 11.08% and 9.55%, respectively. On the other hand, the groups identified as having 'Two or more races' and 'White' were overrepresented in the data collected by 10.21% and 8.07%, respectively. The survey respondents represented most disability groups in proportion to the Department's population percentages. However, there were exceptions, with three groups overrepresented in the sample as follows: 'Speech or Language Impairment' (12.01%), 'Autism Spectrum Disorder' (7.72%), and 'Multiple Disabilities' (5.56%). In contrast, two groups were underrepresented in the sample: 'Specific Learning Disability' (15.63%) and 'Other Health Impairment' (8.95%).

The demographics of the children for whom parents are responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics

The Department took the following steps to increase survey response representation.

- The Parent Involvement Survey Handout is available in 16 languages to introduce parents with understanding the survey.
- Complex Areas and schools were provided access to view the return rate for their respective area so as to provide better feedback on the number of survey returns.
- Schools are utilizing various strategies to allow parents to take the survey, such as having an electronic device to take the survey after the meeting, following up with an email, etc.
- In the Spring of 2023, a workgroup was created to review the current Parent Survey, analyze surveys from other states, and provide recommendations for a revised survey with the purpose of increasing the response rate and supporting program implementation.
- The new revised survey is anticipated to be released in SY2024-2025.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Since the establishment of the baseline in School Year (SY) 2020, the Department has implemented the following strategies to increase the response rate and ensure the representativeness of all groups of parents in this data collection.

SY 2020-2021

- An online survey was released to provide greater access and opportunity for parents to respond to the survey.
- The Parent Involvement Survey Handout was developed to provide additional information and answer commonly asked questions, such as how to access the survey. For a copy of the parent handout, please visit <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/handout.php>.

SY 2021-2022

- The Parent Involvement Survey Handout was translated into 16 languages, including English.
- The online survey was expanded to include parents' ability to respond in Hawaiian, Marshallese, Spanish, and Tagalog.
- Additional translated paper surveys continued to be available for parents to use as a reference when completing the online English version.
- Quarterly reports on the return response rate were shared to provide feedback to schools and complexes on the number of survey returns.
- In collaboration with SPIN and SEAC, an infographic was developed to support parents in better understanding the purpose of the survey and how to access the survey. For more information on the infographic, please visit SEAC's page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Indicator-8-Parent-Involvement-Survey.pdf> or the Department's site at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NwGxeg38yvafKJuhIJTYtDFjMU7wNmeb/view>.

SY 2022-2023

- The ability to self-monitor the return rates of schools and complex areas was provided to District Educational Specialists, school principals, or their designees.
- Schools are utilizing various strategies to allow parents to take the survey, such as having an electronic device for parents to take the survey after the meeting, following up with an email, etc.
- In the Spring of 2023, a workgroup consisting of various stakeholder role groups, including parents and community partners, was created to review the current Parent Survey. The workgroup analyzed surveys from other states and provided recommendations for a revised survey to increase the response rate, particularly for underrepresented groups, and support program implementation.
- The revised survey is anticipated to be released on SY 2024-2025.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

The Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS) was developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to provide states with a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the extent to which parents perceive that schools facilitate their involvement. Data from the rating scales obtained from the SEPPS instrument were analyzed through the Rasch measurement framework. The analysis produces a measure for each survey respondent on a scale from 0 to 1,000. Each measure reflects the extent to which the parent indicated that schools facilitated that parent's involvement. The measures of all respondents were averaged to yield a mean measure reflecting the overall performance of the state of Hawai'i in regard to schools' facilitation of parent involvement. OSEP requires that the states' performance be reported as the percentage of parents who reported that schools facilitated their involvement. Deriving a percent from a continuous distribution requires the application of a standard cut score. The Department elected to apply the standard recommended by NCSEAM. The recommended standard, established based on item content expressed in the scale, was operationalized as a measure of 600. Thus, the percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated their involvement was calculated as the percent of parents with a measure of 600 or above on the SEPPS.

The data collection process gave every parent of a child with a disability (aged 3–21) in Hawai'i the opportunity to complete the survey. In total, 19,920 surveys were distributed, and 1,447 surveys were returned, yielding an overall response rate of 7.26%. All returned surveys provided valid responses, and the number of returned surveys exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines (e.g., <https://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>).

The percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement, calculated as the percentage of respondents with a SEPPS measure at or above the adopted standard of 600, is 61% unweighted (881 respondents had a measure at or above 600 of the 1,447 surveys received). Sixty-one percent (61%) of parents of students with disabilities in Hawai'i had a measure high enough to support the claim that schools facilitated parent involvement at the level deemed desirable and appropriate by the Department. This is Hawai'i's official data for FFY 2022.

The Department's mean measure on the SEPPS is 640, with a standard deviation of 160. The standard error of the sample means is 4.2. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 631.5–648.0. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state mean is within this range. The data was also weighted and analyzed by race/ethnicity and primary disability. The weighted data had a similar mean measure of 646 when weighted by race/ethnicity and 640 by primary disability. To obtain a mean value of SEPPS measures that are weighted with respect to the race/ethnicity of the population, the following procedures were followed. First, the mean SEPPS measure of each race/ethnicity category (i.e., White, Black/African-American, etc.) was obtained for the sample. Then, the sample mean for each race/ethnicity category was multiplied by the proportion of the population classified as the particular race/ethnicity category. Finally, the category-level products (sample mean for the category multiplied by population for the category) were summed to yield the final weighted mean.

A similar procedure was used to obtain a weighted percentage meeting the criterion of 600, with the exception that the sample mean for each race/ethnicity category was replaced by the sample percentage meeting the criterion of 600 for each race/ethnicity category. Similarly, a mean that was weighted by primary disability followed analogous procedures with the exception that the categories corresponded to primary disability rather than race. The results of the analysis indicate the weighted data had a mean measure of 646 and 640 when weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, respectively. As a result, the obtained sampled, weighted mean value of SEPPS is an unbiased estimate of the true population mean. When comparing the response rate data against the composition of respondents and target populations, the data indicates there is no identification of nonresponse bias in the respondent groups. Further, when conducting a comparison of the response rate data against the composition of the state-level demographic data for students with disabilities, the data suggests that students identified as 'Hispanic/Latino' and 'Native Hawai'ian or Other Pacific Islander' had lower participation rates in the survey. In terms of disability categories, survey returns from students with disabilities, including 'Other Health Impairment' and 'Specific Learning Disability,' were also underrepresented. Although these groups were underrepresented in the participation rate, the unweighted official result is within a 95% confidence interval for the special education student population in Hawai'i. To summarize the Department's official results, 881 (61% unweighted) parents out of 1,447 respondents perceived that schools facilitated their involvement. This is within the 95% confidence interval for the true population mean in Hawai'i, which ranges between 631.5–648.0 (59% to 64%). The weighted analysis of potential nonresponse bias had a mean measure of 646 (62%) and 640 (62%) when weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, respectively. In other words, the percent of parents at or above the standard value of 600 on the SEPPs by racial/ethnic category fell within the 95% confidence interval for each race/ethnicity. As a means of reducing bias, the Department will continue to engage in improvement activities targeting those groups identified as underrepresented and offer both paper and web-based surveys in multiple languages.

The Department took the following steps to increase survey response representation.

- The Parent Involvement Survey Handout is available in 16 languages to introduce parents with understanding the survey.
- Complex areas and schools were provided access to view the return rate for their respective area so as to provide better feedback on the number of survey returns.
- Schools are utilizing various strategies to allow parents to take the survey, such as having an electronic device for parents to take the survey after the meeting, following up with an email, etc.
- In the Spring of 2023, a workgroup was created to review the current Parent Survey, analyze surveys from other states and provided recommendations for a revised survey with the purpose of increasing response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented and support program implementation. The new revised survey is anticipated to be released in SY2024-2025.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The Department addressed the representativeness for FFY 2022 and included its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Please refer to the sections above.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Measurement:

Hawai'i is a single District state, which means the SEA and LEA are the same entity and are reported as one district.

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

(0 districts/1) x 100% = 0%

State Definition of Disproportionate Representation (Tier I):

Any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective disability and group size signifies disproportionate representation.

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

For disproportionate representation, the state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over-identified by conducting a file review for each student.

The Department's Methodology:

The first tier is a statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial and ethnic groups. In the statistical analysis of disproportionate representation, risk ratios are calculated based on the racial/ethnic group category concerning all racial and ethnic groups in Hawai'i for children aged 5 enrolled in Kindergarten through 21 served under IDEA. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, the Department applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to a sample of student files from the groups that were identified with disproportionate representation on Tier I to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under the Department's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's QA 23-01, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

N-size: A group of students, based on the expected state average rate of a disability for that group, needs to be 10 or more. When expected numbers based on the state average for a group are less than 10, the analysis of risk ratios is inappropriate, as variations of one (1) or two (2) cases would cause the risk ratios to fluctuate excessively.

The Department's Process for Identifying Disproportionality:

The Department's process for identifying disproportionality involves a two-tier method of analysis applied to 618 data, as reported to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Child Count consistent with 34 CFR §300.173. This process of analysis helps to identify disproportionate representation that may be the result of inappropriate identification.

Historically, beginning in School Year (SY) 2010-2011, the Department disaggregated race/ethnicity data into the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups: 1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; 2) American Indian or Alaska Native; 3) Asian; 4) Black or African American; 5) Native Hawai'ian or Other Pacific Islander; 6) White; and 7) Two (2) or more races. The Department, in School Year 2012-2013, collected three (3) years of data with the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups, allowing for three (3) years of data that are needed to recalculate the confidence intervals the Department uses for Tier I analysis of Disproportionate Representation.

The Department's Tier I uses statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial/ethnic groups by disability category. Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education concerning the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawai'i. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on group size.

The Department's Tier II consists of a two-part analysis, a review relating to over-identification. From the racial/ethnic groups identified in Tier I, a representative sample of student files are reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine if students were appropriately identified by 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. Policies, practices, and procedures are reviewed, as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under the Department's general supervision process.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over-identified by conducting a file review for each student in the sample.

For FFY 2022, the Department used a sample size determined by a 95% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation in the Tier II analysis. In the case of indicator 9, there were two (2) groups that were disproportionately represented (Hispanic or Latino (HI) and Native Hawai'ian and other Pacific Islanders (PI)), with 876 students in the HI group and 862 students in the PI group (students identified in SY 2022-2023). To ensure appropriate policies and procedures in the identification of students with disabilities are conducted appropriately, the Department reviewed a random sample of files from these two groups of students, exceeding the 95% confidence level and 10% margin of error. The Department conducted a review of 152 (HI) and 154 (PI) student files.

All student files included in the sample for indicator 9 were identified randomly and made available for the review team. Each student was reviewed using the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine whether each student was appropriately identified based on 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. None of these files indicated inappropriate identification of students with disabilities in the indicator 9 groups reviewed.

Should a student record indicate inappropriate identification, then policies, practices, and procedures would be reviewed, as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under the Department's general supervision process. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under the Department's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's QA 23-01, Reporting on correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Measurement:

Hawai'i is a single District state, which means the SEA and LEA are the same and reported as one district.

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet a State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

(0 districts/1) x 100% = 0%

State Definition of Disproportionate Representation (Tier I):

Any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective disability and group size signifies disproportionate representation.

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

When disproportionate representation is identified, the state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over-identified by conducting a file review for each student.

The Department's Methodology:

The first tier is a statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial and ethnic groups. In the statistical analysis of disproportionate representation, risk ratios are calculated based on the racial/ethnic group category concerning all racial and ethnic groups in Hawai'i. The risk ratio is then compared to its respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, the Department applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to a sample of student files from the groups that were identified with disproportionate representation on Tier I to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under the Department's general supervision process consistent with the OSEP's QA 23-01, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

N-size: A group of students, based on the expected state average rate of a disability for that group, needs to be 10 or more. When expected numbers based on the state average for a group are less than 10, the analysis of risk ratios is inappropriate, as variations of one or two cases would cause the risk ratios to fluctuate excessively.

The Department's Process for Identifying Disproportionality:

The Department's process for identifying disproportionality involves a two-tier method of analysis applied to 618 data, as reported to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Child Count consistent with 34 CFR §300.173. This process of analysis helps to identify disproportionate representation that may be the result of inappropriate identification.

Beginning with School Year (SY) 2010-2011, the Department disaggregated race/ethnicity data into the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups: 1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; 2) American Indian or Alaska Native; 3) Asian; 4) Black or African American; 5) Native Hawai'ian or Other Pacific Islander; 6) White; and 7) Two (2) or more races. In SY 2012-2013, the Department collected three (3) years of data with the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups, allowing for three (3) years of data that are needed to recalculate the confidence intervals the Department uses for Tier I analysis of Disproportionate Representation.

The Department's Tier I uses statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial/ethnic groups by disability category. Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education concerning the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawai'i. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on group size.

The Department's Tier II consists of a two-part analysis, a review relating to over-identification. From the racial/ethnic groups identified in Tier I, a representative sample of student files are reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine if students were appropriately identified by 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. Policies, practices, and procedures are reviewed, as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under the Department's general supervision process.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

The Department analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over-identified by conducting a file review for each student in the sample.

For FFY 2022, the Department used a sample size determined by a 95% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation in the Tier I analysis. In the case of Indicator 10, the disproportionately represented ethnic groups by ethnicity in SY 2022-2023 were: Specific Learning Disability (SLD), Other Health Impairment (OHI), and Emotional Disability (ED) for Hispanic/Latino students; OHI, Speech or Language Disability (SLI), and Autism (AUT) for White, and SLD, OHI, and Intellectual Disability (ID) for Native Hawai'ian or Other Pacific Islander students. The sample sizes were the following: Hispanic/Latino students had 72 (SLD), 56 (OHI), and 24 (ED) students found eligible; White students had 53 (OHI), 53 (SLI), and 48 (AUT) eligible students, and for Native Hawai'ian or Other Pacific Islander there were 72 (SLD), 52 (OHI), and 30 (ID) students.

All students in the analysis samples for Indicator 10 were identified randomly and made available for the review team. Each file for these students in the analysis sample was reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine whether each student was appropriately identified based on 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. None of these files indicated inappropriate identification of students with disabilities in the Indicator 10 groups reviewed.

Should a student record indicate inappropriate identification, policies, practices, and procedures would be reviewed, as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under the Department's general supervision process. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under the Department's general supervision process consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, replaced with the OSEP QA 23-01, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	93.77%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.20%	95.39%	92.52%	96.56%	98.52%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
4,388	4,193	98.52%	100%	95.56%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

The evaluation and eligibility processes in Hawai'i must be completed within 60 calendar days pursuant to Hawai'i Administrative Rules (HAR) §8-60-33(c)(1). This means public schools have 60 calendar days to complete the initial evaluation and determine eligibility. In comparison to FFY 2021 to FFY 2022, there was an increase of 10% in initial evaluations. In analyzing the evaluations that were not completed within the 60-day timeline, 76% of overdue initial evaluations were due to the parents not being available and the parents requesting to hold the eligibility determination meeting after the 60-day timeline. The Department is collaborating with CA staff and community partners to actively engage parents in order to complete an evaluation within a timeline to ensure students receive services promptly.

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

195

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Total Number of initial evaluations by Eligibility and 60-Day Timeline in SY 2022-2023:

- A total of 4388 initial evaluations were received.
- 195 initial evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 95.56% of initial evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

Number of Days Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 195 initial evaluations were completed beyond timelines.

- 120 within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 49 within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 17 within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 9 beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 195 initial evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 98 Parent not available.
- 19 Provider's report not available.
- 13 Provider not available.
- 51 Parent request.
- 14 Other

IDEA Eligible:

- A total of 3664 initial evaluations were IDEA eligible.
- 150 (4.09%) of IDEA-eligible initial evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 3514 (95.91%) of IDEA-eligible initial evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

IDEA Eligible - Number of Days Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 150 initial evaluations found IDEA eligible were completed beyond timelines.

- 93 within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 38 within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 13 within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 6 beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 150 initial evaluations found IDEA eligible were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 80 Parent not available.
- 15 Provider's report not available.
- 8 Provider not available.
- 36 Parent request.
- 11 Other

IDEA Ineligible:

- A total of 724 initial evaluations were found IDEA ineligible.
- 45 (6.22%) IDEA ineligible initial evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 679 (93.78%) IDEA ineligible initial evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

IDEA Ineligible - Number of Days Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 45 IDEA-ineligible initial evaluations were completed beyond timelines.

- 27 within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline
- 11 within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 4 within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 3 beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

IDEA Ineligible Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 45 IDEA ineligible initial evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 18 Parent not available.
- 4 Provider's report not available.
- 5 Provider not available.
- 15 Parent request.
- 3 Other.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The Department monitors the entire system of individual complexes and individual schools. The data for Indicator 11, Child Find, was retrieved through the Department's statewide electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) for all students receiving initial evaluations in SY 2022-2023. eCSSS is the database used by the Department to track students who receive support and services. The data is aggregated and analyzed to determine whether initial evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline. In accordance with HAR Chapter 60, §8-60-33, and 34 C.F.R. § 300.301(c)(1)(i), the initial evaluation shall be conducted within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation; and shall determine if the student is a student with a disability under sections §8-60-2 and §8-60-39; and the educational needs of the student.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
27	27	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The Department identified 27 findings across the complexes based on a total of 59 child-specific cases of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation. Once the Department issued the written notification of noncompliance to the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists and the Principals of these 27 complexes submitted subsequent data of all initial evaluations conducted in the given complex.

The Department reviewed the subsequent data from all 27 complexes through the eCSSS, and verified that each of the 27 complexes achieved 100% compliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The Department identified 27 findings across the complexes based on a total of 59 child-specific cases of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation. The Department reviewed each of the files of these 59 eligible and ineligible students through the eCSSS database. It verified that all 59 individual records and all eligible students had an IEP developed, although late. The written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists and the Principals of the 27 complexes of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, replaced by OSEP QA 23-01.

Once the Department verified that each of the 59 individual cases of noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification and verified that all subsequent data was 100% correct on the 27 complexes, it issued a written notification closing the noncompliance for all 27 complexes.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The Department reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021. Please refer to Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 section above.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	90.90%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.98%	93.27%	85.86%	79.07%	90.57%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	352
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	29

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	259
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	32
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	3
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	259	288	90.57%	100%	89.93%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

29

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Reasons for Delays: The factors impacting compliance with having the IEP developed and implemented by age three were transition notices were received late from Part C, and schools did not conduct eligibility meetings in a timely manner upon receipt of the Part C Transition Notice.

There were 29 children (10.07%) included in (a) but not in (b), (c), (d), or (e) that did not have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

Closer examination revealed the following:

- Fourteen (14) children (0.05%) were referred from Part C with less than the required 90 days. There was no noncompliance on the part of the schools, and schools were unable to complete the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP processes prior to the child's third birthday.
- Fourteen (14) children (0.05%) were delayed in the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP development process.
- One (1) child (0.001%) was timely referred, found ineligible, and then referred once more and found eligible after the child's 3rd birthday.

Range of Days Beyond Age 3

The number of days beyond the child's third birthday ranged from 1 to 131 days.

of Days Eligibility/Services were Delayed Beyond the Child's Third Birthday and # of Cases

1-10 Days - 8 cases, including one (1) student found ineligible, however not determined by the 3rd birthday

11-30 Days - 6 cases

31-60 Days - 9 cases

60 Days or greater - 6 cases

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data for Indicator 12 is generated from the data in the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database, "Preschool Services by Age 3." This report pulls data from individual student files of all children aged three (3) who were referred for an initial evaluation from Part C during the school year 2022-2023. The report includes the following information for each child:

- Birthdate
- Date the school received the referral
- Number of days the referral was received prior to the child's 3rd birthday
- Date the parent signed consent for the initial evaluation
- Date the evaluation is projected to be completed (In Hawai'i, evaluations are considered complete when services are available; 60 days from the consent.)
- Referral source (Part C) - Transition Notice date
- Date the initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) was held
- Date services were made available

The data from the report generated for SY 2022-23 was reviewed and analyzed by the Monitoring and Compliance Branch to ensure the accuracy of the information.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2022, to promote strengthening early childhood systems, the Department, in conjunction with the Department of Health, Part C, Early Intervention and Home Visiting, established monthly meetings to increase communication and collaboration. In addition, the Department, in partnership with the Department of Health, was awarded the opportunity to be a state cohort to receive technical assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center and DaSy, The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems. Support in the development of data-driven systems thinking capacity for the state was set to begin in FFY 2023, with both agencies focused on improving Child Find procedures and processes towards increasing the percentage of children referred by Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
20	20	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

The Department identified findings in 20 complexes, based on a total of 28 child-specific cases of noncompliance for the children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3 and were found eligible for Part B but did not have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday. In keeping with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02 Prong 2, replaced by OSEP QA 23-01, to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing the requirement of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays, the Department reviewed subsequent files for students referred from Part C to Part B and verified that 100% of these subsequent files were compliant, consistent with §34 CFR 300.324(b). In accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, replaced by OSEP QA 23-01, the Department reviewed each individual case of previously noncompliant files to verify that the correction was completed.

- Each individual case of noncompliance is corrected; and
- Each complex area that did not meet the 100% compliance demonstrated evidence of achieving 100% compliance based on a review of child-specific updated data.

The 20 complexes were notified by the Department in writing, confirming noncompliance has been corrected and verified.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected

The Department issued findings of noncompliance in 20 complexes, based on a total of 28 child-specific instances of noncompliance. The Department reviewed the 28 instances in the 20 complexes and verified all of those children who were still enrolled at the time of the correction had an IEP developed, although late (after their third birthday). The written notification informed the 20 Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists and School Principals of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, replaced by OSEP QA 23-01.

Each individual case of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. A subsequent review of each individual case of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction was conducted, and the individual cases were verified to be in compliance with 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.600(e) and 303.700(e).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The Department reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021. Please refer to the FFY 2021 findings outlined in the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 section above.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2)

has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	76.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	64.62%	69.21%	13.57%	14.12%	18.52%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
131	574	18.52%	100%	22.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) online database is used across the Department to document and track supports and services provided to students eligible for special education and related services. For all IEPs with a transition plan developed from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023, the Department used a 99% confidence level and a confidence interval of 5 to determine a random selection of IEPs of students ages 16 and above in all of Hawai'i's public schools.

For Indicator 13 monitoring, the Department reviewed the random selection of IEPs to examine the data using the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B and made compliance decisions.

In order to be considered in compliance with Indicator 13, an IEP must have demonstrated compliance with the eight (8) specific requirements:

1. The IEP must include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that address education, training, employment, and independent living (as appropriate);
2. The postsecondary goals are updated annually;
3. The postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessment;
4. The transition services in the IEP will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals;
5. The transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals;
6. There is/are annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs;
7. There is evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed; and
8. There is evidence that a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services was invited to the IEP Team meeting (if appropriate) with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Department continued to show growth in meeting all eight (8) compliance requirements for Indicator 13, up to 22.82% from 18.52% in FFY 202. An IEP is determined noncompliant if it does not meet one (1) or more of the eight (8) requirements. Upon further review of the Department's data, each of the requirements shows an upward trend from FFY 2021.

Secondary transition continues to be a priority area for the Department and SEAC. The Department is committed to improving transition service planning for our students with disabilities and continues to partner with our community agencies, including the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), as well as receive Technical Assistance (TA) from OSEP-approved TA centers such as NTACT:C.

During SY 2022-2023, the Department implemented the following activities to strengthen transition services and programs and build capacity with parents, community partners, and Department staff.

- Provided professional development, guidance, and support on targeted Indicator 13 compliance requirements, which included reviewing the data, conducting a root cause analysis, and determining strategies for improvement.
- The Department, in collaboration with community agencies, continued to utilize Quarterly Transition Teacher Meetings and the Secondary Transition website to disseminate transition resources. The website can be accessed at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/secondarytransition/home>.
- At the March 2023 Hawai'i Special Education Conference, the Department, in collaboration with NTACT:C, conducted a session on Transition Assessments. For more information, please visit <https://ikealulike.sched.com/event/1Ga96/transition-assessments-where-it-all-begins-in-person>.
- A Transition Assessment website was developed to prioritize and promote the use of age-appropriate transition assessments. For more information, please refer to the site at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/transitionassessmenthawaiidoe/home>. Transition assessment kits were disseminated to schools statewide.
- The Department also developed the School-Based Enterprise to Work-Based Learning Project for schools to develop necessary job skills to increase employment opportunities for students with disabilities.
- To further advance appropriate transition planning, the Department met with Principals, CAS, and CA leadership teams to discuss the relevancy of Indicator 13, identify areas for improvement, and provide feedback on activities to increase student outcomes.
- On December 8, 2023, the annual stakeholder engagement meeting was held with educational/community/state agency partners to review the target, determine whether the Department made gains or had slippage, review current initiatives, and solicit input on improvement activities to strengthen transition planning for improved outcomes for youth with disabilities.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- Start earlier than high school; approach transition planning starting at least at the middle school level.
- Continue to provide transition planning training annually (at the start of the school year), especially for new teachers.
- Conduct in-person training to reinforce and support continuous learning for the teachers.
- Provide training on best practices for IEP meetings, addressing transition, student engagement, and advocacy for families, students, and school staff.
- Address transition goals at the beginning of the IEP development process instead of at the end since the IEP should be geared towards meeting their overall goals for the future.
- Support teachers and students with building student self-determination and advocacy skills.
- Educate families (including the student) in understanding the differences between a diploma and a certificate; they can contribute to transition planning and decision-making for courses of study and transition services. Build the capacity of school staff so they are able to articulate this information clearly.
- Ensure appropriate assessments are being conducted to gather transition information (preferences, interests, strengths, and needs (PINS)) in the areas of education, training, employment, and independent living.
- Provide schools with a variety of assessment options and training on how to utilize them.
- Streamline training in transition assessments in all grades.
- Offer transition electives or provide instruction for students to address soft skills, job skills, and interview skills to prepare them for college and work.
- Support school teams to have knowledge of outside agency connections to guide IEP teams to make informed transition planning decisions.
- Begin awareness of DVR earlier (as early as age 14) for students to benefit from services such as pre-employment transition services.
- Ensure schools/teachers/counselors/administrators are aware of DVR, their services and resources, and how students can access and benefit from them

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
41	41		0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

The Department identified findings of noncompliance in 41 complexes based on 462 individual files of students with IEPs aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the Indicator 13 requirements. Thus, the Department issued 41 findings of noncompliance statewide. Once the Department issued the written notification of noncompliance to the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists and the Principals of these 41 complexes submitted subsequent data to the Department of students with IEPs aged 16 years or older.

The Department reviewed the subsequent data from all 41 complexes through the eCSSS, and verified that 100% of these subsequent files were compliant.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected

The Department identified individual findings of noncompliance in 41 complexes based on 462 files of students aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the Indicator 13 requirements. The Department verified that each of the 462 individual cases of noncompliance in 41 complexes was corrected within one year of notification unless the student was no longer within the Department's jurisdiction.

Once the Department verified that each of the 462 individual cases of noncompliance were corrected within one year of written notification and verified that all subsequent data was 100% correct on the 41 complexes consistent with OSEP Memo 23-01, it issued a written notification closing the noncompliance for all 41 complexes.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The Department reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021. Please refer to Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 section above.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2020	Target ≥	35.00%	40.00%	40.00%	19.78%	23.10%
A	19.78%	Data	35.17%	34.15%	31.05%	19.78%	21.69%
B	2020	Target ≥	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	70.69%	73.70%
B	70.69%	Data	85.69%	79.95%	72.73%	70.69%	69.19%
C	2020	Target ≥	87.00%	88.00%	90.00%	75.32%	78.90%
C	75.32%	Data	93.05%	88.35%	80.45%	75.32%	78.82%

FFY 2021 Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	26.40%	29.70%	33.00%	36.30%
Target B ≥	76.70%	79.70%	82.70%	85.70%
Target C ≥	82.40%	86.00%	89.50%	93.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and

6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 14 is provided below.

Stakeholder Feedback on Improvement Strategies:

- No modifications were suggested to the targets. Reassess targets next year based on data collection and current trends.
- Continue to increase collaboration with agency partners to provide relevant and appropriate transition services and resources to students, including updating Department & DVR Guidelines and connections for employment, expanding partnerships with Community Living Programs to achieve independent living goals, and providing guidance on college opportunities for students with disabilities.
- Include more soft skills preparation for college, employment, and independence.
- Expand Work-Based Learning Experiences and Career and Technical Education (CTE) opportunities for students with disabilities.
- Empower students in learning to be self-advocates.
- Provide training for staff on services and transition planning, including utilizing assessment to determine appropriate services based on individual needs.
- Expand transition planning to begin earlier (middle school).
- Provide training/information to parents/families on post-school options.

- Expand outreach and information regarding the post-school outcomes survey to prepare students/families to respond one year after exiting.
- Extend the survey window; begin accepting survey responses earlier (summer).

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,225
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	751
Response Rate	61.31%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	198
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	289
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	54
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	67

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	198	751	21.69%	26.40%	26.36%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	487	751	69.19%	76.70%	64.85%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	608	751	78.82%	82.40%	80.96%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	<p>In FFY 2022, the Department did not meet its target and saw slippage for measurement B: Youth enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. Based on the response rates, 33 additional responses indicating competitive employment would have resulted in non-slippage for measurement B. Upon a closer analysis of respondents that indicated they had not been employed since leaving high school (18%), the top responses were "In school/job training/other education programs" (41.62%), "Preferred not to answer" (17.19%), "Other" (16.29%), and "Unable to work due to my disability" (10.86%). Respondents who selected "Other" were provided the opportunity to include additional comments; top responses included due to disability and inability to find employment.</p> <p>During FFY 2022, the Work Study program hosted by the Department and DVR ceased. Both of the agencies are currently working on developing new guidelines to engage youth in work-study programs. DVS reports that they faced a reduction in the number of referrals to their agency.</p> <p>Between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022, there was a 61.33% increase in the number of respondents for measurement C (FFY 2021: 75, FFY 2022: 121). There was also a 17.16% increase in the number of respondents for measurement A (FFY 2021: 169, FFY 2022: 198). Between these two groups, there was a total of 30.74% increase. Although there was a decrease in respondents who indicated they had</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>been competitively employed within one year of leaving high school, the increase in the number of respondents that met the criteria for measurements A and C more than offset the decrease in measurement B. Additionally, the impact of the Maui wildfires on data collection, specifically in the Complex Area on Maui, may have also contributed to the decrease in measurement B. In prior years, most survey respondents from that Complex Area met the criteria for measurement B (FFY 2021: 68.42%; FFY 2022: 52.94%). While the decrease in respondents between years (30.77% decrease from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022) would not have offset the results enough to result in non-slippage, it could have resulted in more positive results for the measurement.</p> <p>The Department attributes this slippage, in part, to the long-term impacts of the economic recovery as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the economic measures to avert a potential recession. The U.S. economy has slowed its consumer spending, which has direct impacts on the tourism industry which Hawai'i relies on heavily as a source of employment. This may have impacted student alumni's ability to find competitive employment, which led them to seek out alternate employment. The Department also believes that, as a result, students may have decided to enroll in other postsecondary education or training, which both showed progress in FFY 2022.</p>

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Response Rate	61.44%	61.31%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Analysis of data of the respondents to the survey used the -3/+3% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group, based on three demographics: race/ethnicity (the seven federal categories), type of exit (graduation with a regular diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, and dropout), and disability categories.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

The Department analyzed data of survey respondents using the -3/+3% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group based on three demographics (disability categories, race/ethnicity, and exit reason). The respondent demographic for disability categories was within the -3/+3% margin, indicating respondents from all disability categories are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. The demographic representativeness regarding race/ethnicity showed Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders were slightly above the +3% upper boundary, at +3.11%. For type of exit, students who exited with a General High School diploma were also slightly above the upper boundary at +3.11%. All other student groups were representative based on the methodology used.

Based on the return rate of surveys and the comparison of the composition of respondents and target populations, these two groups were only fractionally above the accepted upper limit. The Department does not believe there was any nonresponse bias in this year's results.

The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

To ensure the representativeness of all groups of students in this data collection, the Department used the same four main strategies used in previous years to help survey administrators focus on a representative response rate of the target population. First, to prioritize the accessibility of the survey, the Department allows students to take the survey via paper copy or electronic copy or to complete the survey via phone. Second, the Department operates a data dashboard with live data at the State, CA, and School levels for staff to track the progress of completion rates by state, school, CA, disability category, race/ethnicity, and type of exit throughout the data collection window. Third, the Department sends out two benchmark reports during the data collection window, showing each school's respondents' representation, which helps motivate CA and school staff to reach out to their student population and provide them with the information needed to target outreach to ensure representativeness. The fourth strategy is a long-term process by which CAs and schools continue to engage students and families during their final year of high school in preparation for future data collection of post-school outcomes by collecting contact information and providing information related to the purpose and process of the survey so they can better anticipate activities. In conducting surveys, CA and school staff are provided the opportunity to share best practices related to specific strategies when making contact with student alumni. As a result of CA and school staff sharing, the Department has developed a "Hear from your Peers" resource that highlights strategies from the field and provides sample email templates and scripts to reach out to former students and families.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The response rate increased from 58.25% in FFY 2020 to 61.43% in FFY 2021. However, there was a slight decrease in the response rate in FFY 2022, to 61.31%. The Department implemented the same strategies used in the last few years, which have helped improve the response rate for the post-school outcome survey since it was first used in FY2019 (FY2018 response rate: 36.46%). This year's data collection start date coincided with the start of the Maui fires and possibly impacted the FFY 2022 response rate, as there was a 21.74% decrease in the number of responding students from Maui. If the response rate in the Maui Complex Area had remained consistent between FFY 2021 and FFY 2022, it would have resulted in a response rate of 61.71% in FFY 2022.

To ensure the representativeness of all groups of students in this data collection, the Department used the same four main strategies used in previous years to help survey administrators focus on a representative response rate of the target population. First, to prioritize the accessibility of the survey, the Department allows students to take the survey via paper copy or electronic copy or to complete the survey via phone. Second, the Department operates a data dashboard with live data at the State, Complex Area (CA), and School levels for staff to track the progress of completion rates by state, school, CA, disability category, race/ethnicity, and type of exit throughout the data collection window. Third, the Department sends out two benchmark reports during the data collection window, showing each school and CA's response rates and aggregate representativeness data, which helps motivate CA and school staff to reach out to their student population and provides them with the information needed to target outreach to ensure representativeness.

The fourth strategy is a long-term process by which CAs and schools continue to engage students and families during their final year of high school in preparation for future data collection of post-school outcomes by collecting contact information and providing information related to the purpose and process of the survey so they can better anticipate activities. In conducting surveys, CA and school staff are provided the opportunity to share best practices related to specific strategies when making contact with former students. As a result of CA and school staff sharing best practices, the Department has developed a "Hear from your Peers" resource that highlights strategies from the field and provides sample email templates and scripts to reach out to former students and their families.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

The Department examined the response rates for FFY 2022 by the following demographic groups: race/ethnicity (the seven federal race/ethnicity categories), types of exit (graduated with a regular diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, and dropped out), and federal disability categories. Using the -3/+3% methodology to compare the composition of the target and respondent groups using these categories, two specific groups were overrepresented in two categories.

Using this methodology, the data are representative of disability categories. However, regarding race/ethnicity, the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders respondents were slightly above the upper margin (+3%), at +3.11% when compared to the target population demographic. When examining the data by type of exit, students who exited school with a General High School diploma (GHS) were also slightly above the upper margin, at 3.11% when compared to the target population demographic.

Based on the return rate of surveys and the comparison of the composition of respondents and target populations, these two groups were fractionally above the accepted upper limit. The Department does not believe there was any nonresponse bias in this year's results. To better understand nonresponse bias in future data collections, the Department plans to add a pre-survey question for non-respondents to report the reason they chose not to participate in the survey.

Based on the data collected, the Department did additional analysis to determine if the number of respondents who declined to participate in the survey could have impacted its response rates as it relates to representativeness. Ten students declined to participate, as indicated through an "additional comments" selection as part of the survey. As a result of the ten student alumni who declined to participate in the survey, the Department determined that their participation would have negatively impacted the demographic group type of exit and resulted in a slightly higher percentage of students overrepresented (3.14%) for students that exited school with a General High School diploma (GHS). However, for race/ethnicity, their participation would have resulted in a representative sample.

The Department will continue to implement its four survey response rate strategies, which were successfully implemented in the previous two years, resulting in an increase in the response rate year over year and which resulted in survey respondents being representative in the three demographic categories in the two previous APRs. For the FFY 2023 APR, the Department, during training to be provided to CA and school staff, will share the data trends for the last three years, including the specific data related to the three demographic groups, the tools that are provided to them to analyze their CA and school performance, emphasizing the need to improve survey respondent representativeness.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	38
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/15/2023	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs
The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH
LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council
The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education
These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 15 is provided below.

During the School Year 2021-2022, MAC contracted with WestEd, a nonprofit public research and development agency. A WestEd team with expertise in the continuous improvement of the Department's general supervision system under IDEA engaged in a review of the Department's dispute resolution system. As part of the review process, WestEd organized survey instruments to collect responses from stakeholders, including parents, parent organizations, SEAC, District Educational Specialists (DESs), Complex Area Superintendents (CASs), and other Department staff regarding the Department's dispute resolution system. The survey responses allowed WestEd to utilize meaningful stakeholder involvement to inform its recommendations for improving the Department's dispute resolution system.

During SY 2022-2023, the WestEd team and the MAC staff held meetings with SEAC members, Department staff, and parents statewide. The participants' feedback was to revise the Department's website related to special education matters to make it more accessible to parents and community members. Based on the feedback from the stakeholders, the Department revised its special education public website. The Dispute Resolution page was updated with family resources. For additional information, please visit <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/disputeresolution/Pages/default.aspx>. The targets for this indicator were not changed.

The Department and the stakeholders worked together to revise the resolution session summary and agreement form to make it more accessible and ensure the required information in order for the Department to fulfill its general supervision responsibility was in place. A Special Education Due Process Hearing Cover Letter was created to make it more accessible for parents and community partners. For a copy, please visit <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/RequestImpartialDueProcessHearing-CoverLetter.pdf>.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	64.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	45.00%	45.00%	60.00%	66.00%	68.00%
Data	89.74%	59.57%	64.00%	29.73%	47.37%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6	38	47.37%	70.00%	15.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

There were 43 due process complaints filed for SY 2022-2023, where 38 conducted resolution meetings. Six of the 38 resolution meetings resulted in settlement agreements. Compared to SY 2021-2022, 45 due process complaints were filed, and 38 resolution meetings were conducted. Eighteen of the resolution meetings resulted in settlement agreements.

There was an increase in hearings adjudicated from 8 in SY 2021-2022 to 14 in SY 2022-2023. The settlement agreements are outside the Department's control, and the Department does not incentivize parties to resolve disputes through settlement agreements. This year, the Department had more hearings that went to decisions than settlements based on the specifics of each case. By reviewing the data, there does not appear to be any specific reason why the cases were unable to be resolved through a settlement agreement.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

15 - OSEP Response**15 - Required Actions**

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	6
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	4

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 16 is provided below.

The Department makes mediation available to parents and schools at no cost through the Mediation Center of the Pacific (MCP). MCP is a (501)(c)(3) not-for-profit corporation that is in its forty-fourth year of operation. Its mission is to provide high-quality mediation and dispute-resolution services that are affordable and accessible.

During SY 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, the Department continued working with WestEd, a nonprofit public research and development agency, to improve the Department's GSS. As a part of the improvement activities, the Department reviewed and revised the mediation model form and designed a one-page document for staff, parents, community and state agency partners, and parent advocacy groups. The Department scheduled various sessions with SEAC members and provided opportunities to engage parents and other stakeholders in providing their input in reviewing and revising these documents. These materials are made available on the Department's Dispute Resolution public page at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/disputeresolution/Pages/default.aspx>.

In addition, the Department's Dispute Resolution public page was updated to make it more accessible to parents and other stakeholders. CADRE: The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education resource, "IDEA Special Education Mediation Parent Guide," was also made available to the parents and community partners.

During the SPP/APR Principal Meetings, a copy of the mediation form and one-page document were shared with staff, as well as the importance of utilizing mediation to resolve disputes. Furthermore, through the Mediation Center of the Pacific, the Department conducted conflict resolution training for school principals and district educational specialists. The participants were provided with practical skills to deal with disputes that solve the problem while maintaining dignity and preserving relationships.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=					

Data	0.00%	80.00%	42.86%	50.00%	66.67%
------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=				

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
1	4	6	66.67%		83.33%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

The Hawai'i State Department of Education (Department) SiMR is the improvement of English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD) identified in the categories of Other Health Disability (OHD), Specific Learning Disability (SLD), and Speech or Language Disability (SoL) in grades 3 and 4. The Department's key measure (proficiency) for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is the percentage of 3rd and 4th-grade students, combined with eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL, who are proficient on the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) for ELA/Literacy.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Indicator 17 subset of students includes those identified as OHD, SLD, and SoL in grades 3 and 4 attending Hawai'i public schools, including those in public charter schools.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/10OQ6m3nt067y6LmZtkvgA9dw_GX92if_/view?usp=sharing

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2014	8.33%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of 3rd and 4th grade students combined, with eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL who are proficient on the SBA for ELA/Literacy	The total number of 3rd and 4th grade students, combined with eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL who took the SBA for ELA/Literacy	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
--	---	---------------	-----------------	---------------	--------	----------

206	1,858	11.32%	50.00%	11.09%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
-----	-------	--------	--------	--------	---------------------	-------------

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

Department School Year 2022-2023 Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) in English Language Arts/Literacy.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

The SBA data is collected through the Department's Longitudinal Data System (LDS). The LDS provides reports and dashboards where teachers and administrators can access student academic progress and performance data.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

The additional data collected to assess progress toward the SiMR is the Median Growth Percentile (MGP) of 4th-grade students with OHD, SLD, and SoL eligibility categories on the SBA for ELA/Literacy. The MGP is calculated by taking each student's individual Student Growth Percentile (SGP), ordering them from lowest to highest, and identifying the middle score. The MGP provides a more sensitive analysis of student progress, and the state target is sixty (60). The Department's statewide MGP of 4th-grade students with OHD, SLD, and SoL eligibility categories on the SBA for ELA/Literacy for FFY 2022 is 37.5. Although the Department did not meet the MGP target set at 60, Complex Areas (CAs) and schools continue to work toward this aggressive target.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1aZCSLhMuHaMwKeRDmyPZrL0-Rw2oWK3s>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The reporting period for the SSIP occurs between July 30 and June 1 of each year. All SSIP infrastructure improvement strategies are designed to support the tri-level system of the Department. Typically, the Department State Office (i.e., the Exceptional Support Branch [ESB]) works to build the capacity and knowledge of CA leaders, who, in turn, strive to build the capacity of educators and administrators within their CAs. The Department also works collaboratively and simultaneously with the CA and school-level leaders. This approach has been elevated to intentionally engage all tri-level stakeholders in collaborative engagement and participation. The Department strives to systematically provide infrastructure improvement strategies in targeted areas for all CAs. In addition, the Department of State Offices provides tailored technical assistance for CAs based on specific requests for support.

The ESB implemented the following improvement strategies using the tri-level systems of support. Support is provided by the ESB to the CAs and those who support the schools.

Ongoing Technical Support:

CA District Educational Specialist (DES) Meetings:

Six (6) DES meetings were held throughout SY 2022-2023. ESB continued to focus on topics relevant to the SiMR population. Topics included discussion around state priorities, student performance, targeted and focused evaluations to support interventions, the Language and Literacy Initiative, high-leverage practices, and the foundations of specially designed instruction. DESs developed Project Plans with a focus on the SiMR population. The meetings also provided ESB with one of several opportunities to support DESs in discussing the implementation of their Project Plans, which included budget, staffing, and activities to support improved literacy outcomes for their SiMR population directly.

Ongoing Technical Support: CA Project Plans:

The ESB requested project plans for all CAs to address their goals to improve language and literacy outcomes for their SiMR population. They were also required to address the use of funds, accountability, and staff utilization. The ESB monitored and consulted with CAs on the implementation of plans on an as-needed basis.

Language and Literacy Initiative

Adhering to the DOE tri-level system, the ESB supported CAs in the development of the Language and Literacy Initiative. The Language and Literacy Initiative aims to provide targeted professional learning and coaching on effective language and literacy instruction for teachers to improve the outcomes of the SiMR population. The ESB provided funding for hiring three CA literacy coaches to lead this initiative in their CAs. The ESB facilitated professional development for the literacy coaches on effective language and literacy instruction by purchasing and coordinating training in LETRS Early Childhood and LETRS Volume 1 and 2. All coaches completed the program with mastery. In addition, the coaches were provided with year-long training on evidence-based coaching strategies by Dr. Jennifer Pierce. This training was augmented with training on effective literacy coaching offered by the Exceptional Support Branch. The literacy coaches met quarterly to plan for the launch of the language and literacy initiative to be implemented at the school level in FFY 2023.

Early Childhood Language and Literacy Initiative

Aligned with the goal of the Language and Literacy Initiative, the focus of the Early Childhood Language and Literacy Initiative is to provide targeted professional learning and coaching on effective language and literacy instruction for teachers to improve the outcomes of preschool-age children with language disorders with the hope that this will reduce the achievement gap when the children begin their academic careers. The ESB began this by forming district/complex level teams with the goal of bringing the foundational knowledge of language and literacy to the preschool teachers in the schools. Seven SLP/RT teams (32 participants) were created. Each team had a minimum of one Speech-Language Pathologist (SLP) and one Resource Teacher (RT). Teams were provided with training using the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling for Early Childhood (LETRS -EC) curriculum. This training aimed to ensure that all participants had a shared understanding of the foundational knowledge needed for language and the connection to literacy development. Other professional development topics included coaching practices, evidence-based screening and assessment tools, and evidence-based interventions. Additionally, team members reviewed and analyzed IEPs for evidence of language and literacy student needs and goals to determine professional development needs at the schools they support.

Specialty-Designed Instruction (SDI) Professional Learning Opportunities:

CAs and schools were provided with professional learning opportunities to enhance CA leads and teachers' knowledge of evidence-based structured literacy instruction aligned to the implementation of SDI specifically related to student goals and objectives on language and literacy.

University of Hawai'i-Manoa (UHM) - Reading Intervention Program

In collaboration with the University of Hawai'i-Manoa (UHM) Special Education program, the ESB entered into a Memorandum of Agreement to create a Reading Interventionist Program to train State-licensed special education teachers or dual-certified teachers to become eligible for certification as Reading Interventionists. Tuition and costs associated with the program were paid for by ESB. For additional information, please visit <https://coe.hawaii.edu/sped/programs/reading-interventionist/>.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

Ongoing Technical Support:

As a result of DES meetings and other meetings to support complex areas, all CAs developed Project Plans that addressed fiscal management and accountability, staff utilization, monitoring, and services redesigned to support improving literacy outcomes for their SiMR population directly. These Project Plans were collaboratively reviewed by staff from the ESB to ensure that goals were targeted and focused on strategies aligned with improving reading proficiency and were reasonable and achievable.

CA Project Plans:

CA staff engaged in the following activities to support their respective schools:

- Provided teachers with professional development in foundational reading instruction;
- Used ongoing assessments, such as iReady, Imagine Learning, Lexia Core 5, STAR, etc., to identify students who may need interventions and provide the interventions based on the identified area(s) of need;
- Ensured the fidelity of implementation of foundational reading instruction and evidence-based interventions; and
- Provided ongoing coaching to support school-wide efforts to support all teachers needing additional guidance.

Each activity included a measurement instrument, identified lead personnel, a projected timeline, and ongoing status updates. The Project Plans were reviewed to ensure that data and relevant information were collected and used to identify appropriate activities to address the needs of the schools.

Language and Literacy Initiative:

The short-term and intermediate outcomes addressed professional development. Achievements included fully-trained and knowledgeable literacy coaches to support the teachers in their CAs. The literacy coaches' knowledge was measured by pre and post-assessments of content mastery throughout the LETRS program. In addition, the literacy coaches' knowledge and effective implementation of coaching practices were assessed using instruments developed by the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI). To bring about systemic changes, long-term goals also included the active recruitment of teachers who provide instruction for the SiMR population. The literacy coaches recruited 39 teachers to participate in the LETRS professional development for FFY 2023-2024. These teachers are located at 13 different elementary schools. Understanding the need to address foundational language and literacy skills, the literacy coaches recruited 13 early childhood elementary teachers to participate in the Early Childhood LETRS professional development program. These teachers are located at nine different Department schools.

Early Childhood: Improving Language and Literacy Skills

Addressing professional development, the short-term outcome of the Early Childhood Language and Literacy group was that all 32 participants completed the LETRS for the Early Childhood course, which built their foundational knowledge about language and literacy. They used the foundational skills as the framework to research appropriate language and literacy evidence-based interventions to share with preschool instructional personnel. Teams focused on the evidence-based practices of shared reading, which integrate all language and literacy development domains. All teams were provided professional development on specific intervention strategies, tools, and resources to promote language and literacy foundations. The ESB anticipates that these efforts in Early Literacy skills will lead to a change in instructional practices, which will lead to improved literacy outcomes or lessen the achievement gap when these children are assessed for reading proficiency.

SDI Professional Learning Opportunities:

Professional development opportunities were provided on SDI to build the knowledge and skills of complex area staff and schools. Participants were provided with pre-post measures to assess their learning and the efficacy of the training. Not all participants achieved mastery, and ESB intends to work with complex area DES to determine if the structure of this particular training supports system change or if it can be built into other training to get to the root cause of poor reading proficiency of students with disabilities.

UH-Manoa Reading Interventionist Program

This program is related to professional development for teachers and sustainability to specifically address reading proficiency. The first cohort of eighteen participants completed the program during this reporting period. Participants provide reading and writing interventions to SWD at their respective schools or train teachers in their complex areas. At the time of reporting, nine participants passed the KPEERI exam, while the remaining participants will complete the exam by the next reporting period. At the school level, ESB anticipates that trained teachers will provide SWD with the appropriate targeted and focused interventions for students to improve reading proficiency. For those teachers at the complex level, it is anticipated that

ongoing professional development will be provided to classroom teachers along with follow-up and technical assistance as needed, resulting in improved reading proficiency. The ESB acknowledges that it is too early to determine if this strategy will work; however, it is anticipated that it will result in sustainability at the CA and School.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

DES Meetings:

Monthly DES meetings will continue to provide professional learning on topics identified as areas of needed support in the field. The following topics will be included during SY 2023-2024:

- The Science of Reading;
- Developing Effective SDI;
- Expanding Stakeholder Engagement;
- Delivering High-Quality Preschool Instruction; and
- Foundations of Executive Function Skills.

The anticipated outcome will be that DESs will have the knowledge and expertise to support their CAs in providing evidence-based instruction for the SIMR population to meet the goals of the SSIP.

CA Project Plans:

Successful implementation of activities and impact on student outcomes for each CA's FFY 2022 Project plan will be assessed to determine areas for needed improvement. The anticipated outcome will be that this assessment will be used to correct and/or adjust planning. CAs will provide more targeted support and coaching for teachers in effective language and literacy instruction to support our SIMR population directly.

Language and Literacy Initiative:

In FFY 2023, the literacy coaches will each select a cohort of special education teachers who service the SIMR population to participate in the LETRS professional learning program. They will also provide ongoing job-embedded coaching to support the teachers in the application of their newly acquired skills and to ensure implementation fidelity. Plans to recruit more CAs in the initiative will be finalized. While teachers have the foundational knowledge, it is important that they have the knowledge and skills to intervene appropriately. Therefore, the ESB will focus on providing training on evidence-based interventions using the science of reading framework.

Early Childhood: Improving Language and Literacy Skills

Professional learning around coaching practices will be extended to SY 2023-2024 as participants become more proficient with language and literacy interventions. To improve language and literacy outcomes, ESB will continue to support SLP/RT teams in:

- Using appropriate EB practices;
- Using appropriate assessment tools and data analysis to target improved language literacy outcomes;
- Obtaining baseline and progress monitoring data; and
- Connecting language and literacy interventions to the provision of services in the least restrictive environment.

Specially-Designed Instruction Professional Learning Opportunities:

The ESB will revisit how to embed SDI into other learning opportunities.

UH-Manoa Reading Interventionist Program

The ESB anticipates that a second cohort of reading interventionists will complete the program and provide services to students during the next reporting period. With additional staff knowledgeable about the evidence-based interventions that specifically target reading, overall reading proficiency will improve at both the CA and school levels.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

- Coaching
- Guided Play
- Multi-sensory Language Instruction
- Narrative Intervention
- Shared Reading Approaches
- Speech to Print Approach

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Coaching: A collaborative relationship where the coach and coachee (teacher, parent, para-professional, etc) engage in a systematic process of setting goals and developing solutions. It is an EBP that creates sustained educator practice change and improves student outcomes.

Guided Play: An adult playing with children while scaffolding and modeling specific literacy and language skills.

Multi-Sensory Language Instruction: The use of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic-tactile pathways simultaneously to enhance memory and learning of language.

Narrative Interventions: A language intervention that involves the use of telling or retelling stories. Narrative intervention can be an efficient and versatile means of promoting a large array of academically and socially important language targets that improve children's access to the general education curriculum and enhance their peer relations.

Shared Storybook Reading: This EBP is used to help children access text. It provides repeated exposures to new words, allows one to provide explicit definitions of new words, presents new words in a meaningful text or theme rather than in isolation, and has adults encourage children to use words in conversation in whole groups, small groups, or one-on-one. Shared reading encompasses a variety of interactive experiences in which an adult reads a book to children, models proficient skills, and guides the children in discussing aspects of the book.

Speech to Print: This EBP emphasizes the role of sound-letter associations in a child's ability to decode and comprehend written text effectively. It emphasizes phonemic awareness, the perception of the speech sounds that form words, and its relevance to the mastery of letters (i.e., phoneme-to-grapheme relationship).

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Coaching: By building relationships with the classroom teachers, it is anticipated that the coach will be able to support the teacher and provide feedback, model, and demonstrate instructional practices that will target the student's specific needs. By targeting the specific student needs, there should be improved reading proficiency. For the early language and literacy group, coaching parents is expected to provide the parents/caregivers with the tools and strategies to embed language into daily routines, resulting in improved language skills. It is intended that embedding coaching into all professional development will provide teachers/providers with additional support in the delivery of evidence-based reading and writing instruction. It is anticipated that this additional support will result in improved proficiency for the SiMR.

All of the EBPs listed below are based on building a strong language foundation, which is required in order for students to be successful readers and writers. Since language is the foundation of reading and writing, these EBPs were selected based on strong research that emphasizes the connection between language and literacy. It is intended that policies and programs, along with the instructional personnel, will change instructional practices (i.e. building the language foundation to improve reading and writing proficiency).

Multi-Sensory Language Instruction: Recognizing that students have different ways of learning and require language input in many different ways will improve teacher instructional practices by providing them with the strategies to address the diverse needs of students.

Narrative Interventions: This is a practice that can impact learning at many different levels. It is clear that students with disabilities do not have enough opportunities to practice expressing what they know and have learned. Using narrative interventions provides them with a structured means of "telling their story," which can positively impact them both academically and socially. This is a language-based strategy that supports students in the development of both oral and written language. It is an effective strategy that can be used across all age and grade levels and is an efficient means of addressing academics, behavior, and social skills.

Shared Storybook Reading: This is a means to help children gain knowledge about reading and writing, not through reading and writing, but rather through observing and participating in informal literacy events using conversations. This EBP helps children gain important literacy prerequisite skills (i.e., print awareness, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, and the vocabulary used to describe literacy constructs - read, spell, read, etc.). By using shared reading with young children with disabilities, it is anticipated that the foundational language skills will be addressed at a young age, and students will not encounter reading difficulties when they begin to learn to read.

Speech to Print: This is an EBP that will change instructional practices. Many teachers are teaching reading in a traditional manner (teaching from letter to sound rather than sound to the letter). The traditional manner of teaching phonics is flawed and is an inefficient way to teach students. By changing teacher practices and using speech to print, students will have a better chance at learning to read and spell, advancing them to a higher level of literacy proficiency.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

ESB is in the process of training and providing PD to literacy coaches and SLP/RT teams. Tools are being developed to monitor the fidelity of implementation and assess change in practice.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

NA

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

During the next reporting period, literacy coaches will develop rubrics and observational tools as they observe the implementation of literacy practices in the classroom. The anticipated outcomes will be the growth of teachers' knowledge of effective language and literacy practices by participating in the LETRS professional learning program and a change in instructional practices in the classroom to support literacy proficiency among the SiMR population. ESB will observe coaches in the classroom and collect coaching fidelity data using the "Coaching Fidelity Rubric" developed by NSCI. Coaches were provided with extensive coaching training by Jennifer Pierce based on the criteria outlined in the rubric.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

During this reporting period, the ESB facilitated professional development for the literacy coaches on effective language and literacy instruction and coaching practices. All coaches completed their training and have demonstrated implementation fidelity, which allows ESB to move forward with the plan to support coaches in their training of classroom teachers.

Coaches will begin to train and observe their CA elementary teachers. Coaches will provide professional development on Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) professional learning curriculum and the Lively Letters program (a supplemental evidence-based program designed to address the language and literacy needs of a wide range of PK-2 students with learning differences). In addition, they will provide embedded coaching and ongoing individualized classroom support. All participants will be monitored and evaluated using coaching fidelity tools developed by the National Center for Systemic Improvement.

By implementing evidence-based language and foundational literacy strategies with fidelity, improving parent and child language and literacy interactions, and establishing a sustainable system to achieve this, it is intended there will be improved student proficiency in language and literacy assessments. Assessments, observations, and fidelity checklists will be used to evaluate teacher performance and expected outcomes for the new SiMR population.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department continues to use the Leading by Convening framework as the primary mechanism to engage parents in supporting the Department in improving outcomes for our students with disabilities. More specifically, engaging parents and educational and community partners in soliciting input on target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies, and understanding the evaluation processes through the following:

1. Monthly meetings with SEAC members, parents, community partners, higher education experts, parent advocacy groups, and collaborating state agencies;
2. Monthly DES meetings;
3. Quarterly Transition meetings with multi-agency collaboration;
4. CCCs monthly meetings focusing on the collaboration of serving children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs;
5. SPP/APR meetings with school principals, CASs, and CA staff; and
6. Meetings with DESs and CA staff to build capacity related to specific indicators.

Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting to discuss SPP/APR indicators before the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The Department uses a standard process across all compliance and results indicators to solicit broad stakeholder input on the final review of SPP/APR indicators. The process includes capacity-building, as it allows the diverse groups of participants to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Participants are engaged in the following activities:

- a. Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine the Department's progress and/or slippage;
- b. Compare the Department's performance to the targets and determine whether adjustments need to be made;
- c. Discuss current strategies for improvement; and
- d. Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

In addition to supporting the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator are created in partnership with the SEAC and the SPIN to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to provide additional information on SPP/APR to parents and other educational and community partners through the SPP/APR public webpage. In addition, the Department has developed Feedback forms to engage stakeholders in providing their input.

The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/sppapp/Pages/default.aspx> and the

Furthermore, SEAC has also developed an SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

Below is a description of key partner groups engaged in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR feedback process and other special education-related matters.

IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

The SEAC is the State-established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities and the Department's priorities by sharing information, listening to community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other family resources can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawai'i State Department of Health funding the SPIN to provide support to the SEAC and training and TA on special education matters to parents/community partners throughout the state. Additional information can be found on the SPIN website at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

CCCs

The CCCs serve children and families, including those with disabilities and mental health needs, through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs, led by parents and professional co-chairs, assist families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of seventeen councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

LDAH is a nonprofit organization that supports and educates parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities consistent with federal law policy. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council website at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

The Department considers the broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders critical to both accountability and decision-making to have genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement. The Department continues partnering with stakeholders to expand community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Additional input specifically related to Indicator 17 is provided below.

Input was received from both internal and external stakeholders. On December 8, 2023, the Department hosted a meeting where parents, educational partners, and community members were invited to review performance since the establishment of the baseline, review targets, determine whether they needed to be revised, and discuss improvement strategies. During the discussion, the group inquired about a justification of how the focus of SIMR was developed in 2014 during the first phase of SSIP and recommended a possible revision to the SIMR focus. Current strategies for improvement were shared with the group.

Stakeholder Feedback on Strategies for Improvement:

- a. Train parents/community members alongside teachers.
- b. Address the length of training and retraining due to teacher turnover.
- c. Provide a specific list of Reading interventions to parents and the community.
- d. Use a model school that is having higher success and share it with the other schools.
- e. Concern was brought regarding inconsistency in schools using various core curricula, and perhaps unvetted programs may be used in the classroom.
- f. Include cultural assessments.
- g. Review and revise the current focus for SIMR.
- h. Revise the SIMR measurement based on growth and more frequent measurements, such as curriculum-based measures, not statewide assessments.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

The ESB has implemented a variety of strategies to engage Indicator 17 stakeholders during FFY 2022. The ESB has solicited feedback and recommendations from CA DESs in the development of professional learning materials. In addition, to better communicate with classroom teachers, the ESB has created weblinks for several programs containing resources and materials to support teachers. The ESB has actively participated in SPIN (parent organization) activities, including participating in their conference planning and facilitating several conference sessions. Members of the ESB also presented at the Pac Rlm conference, engaging with the larger disability community.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

The group expressed the concern that the focus of the SIMR is not broad enough and recommended revisions to broaden the focus. Further, the group expressed concerns related to the measurement of SIMR being focused on SBA. They suggested broadening the measurement to include growth and the use of more frequent measurements such as curriculum-based measures.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

SLPs in all complex areas address oral language development by explicitly teaching discourse skills and including all elements of the foundational language skills young children need. Progress monitoring data indicates growth in language; however, it is too early to determine the impact this growth will have on reading and writing skills for the SIMR population. Due to the positive growth in oral language and the high correlation between oral language and reading achievement, this ESB will continue to promote this evidence-based practice.

The Early Childhood Language and Literacy group will be working with ECTA to obtain additional guidance on improvement activities to engage parents - particularly as it relates to working with parents as partners in improving language and literacy skills.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

During the FFY 2023, the ESB is planning targeted professional development in prioritizing relevant and substantive goals, collecting baseline data, and monitoring progress. It is expected that providing professional development on the critical skills students need to achieve academically will assist teachers in targeting the priority skills students need to increase reading outcomes. It is also expected that with the Reading Interventionist cohort, there will be some improvement in areas where these teachers are implementing evidence-based reading interventions.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

The Department continued to face staffing shortages for special education teachers and related service providers. The ESB is working with the Office of Talent Management to address recruitment issues, particularly in identifying specific areas where there is the highest need for specialized instructional personnel. Exploring the use of itinerant teachers for Early Childhood.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

NA

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Brikena White, D.Ed.

Title:

Administrator, IDEA Team - Monitoring and Compliance Branch

Email:

brikena.white@k12.hi.us

Phone:

(808) 307-3600

Submitted on:

04/24/24 3:31:37 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Hawaii 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)
65.00%

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	20	8	40.00%
Compliance	20	18	90.00%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2)	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	92%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	13%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	90%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	17%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	89%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Grade	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 4	97%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment	Grade 8	93%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	25%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 4	89%	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	14%	0
Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	Grade 8	87%	1

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	16	1
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**	70	1

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator (3)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4)	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	95.56%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	89.93%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	22.82%	YES	0
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100.00%		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric

Hawaii

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	1	1
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	26

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	21
Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	26.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	26
B. 618 Grand Total	26.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	52.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	8/30/2023
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	2/21/2024
Part B Exiting	C009	2/21/2024
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	2/21/2024
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	1/10/2024
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	11/15/2023
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i>	5/3/2023

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

Hawaii

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	17
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	10
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance	5
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines	10
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	4
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	1
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	3

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	10
(2.1) Mediations held.	6
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	1
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	1
(2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.	5
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	4
(2.2) Mediations pending.	1
(2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held.	3

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	43
(3.1) Resolution meetings.	38
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	6
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	14
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited).	2
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	12
(3.3) Due process complaints pending.	9
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	20

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

(4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed.	2
(4.1) Expedited resolution meetings.	2
(4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements.	1
(4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered	0
(4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending.	0
(4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	2

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

Hawaii

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Keith Hayashi
Superintendent
Hawaii Department of Education
1390 Miller Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Superintendent Hayashi:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Hawaii needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Hawaii's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Hawaii's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Hawaii).

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Hawaii's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your Hawaii-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Hawaii's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Hawaii is required to take. The actions that Hawaii is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Hawaii's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated Hawaii's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the Hawaii's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Hawaii's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

Hawaii's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §300.604(a), if a State or Entity is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State or Entity of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State or Entity address the areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance and require the State or Entity to work with appropriate entities;
- (2) direct the use of State-level funds on the area or areas in which the State or Entity needs assistance; or
- (3) identify the State or Entity as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's IDEA Part B grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Hawaii of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\)](#) | [OSEP Ideas That Work](#), [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Hawaii to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Hawaii should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs Hawaii to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. We strongly encourage Hawaii to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which it received a score of zero. Hawaii must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Hawaii received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Hawaii took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Section 616(e)(7) and 34 C.F.R. §300.606, Hawaii must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement actions, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and through public agencies.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, Hawaii must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in Hawaii on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Hawaii's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Hawaii must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, Hawaii must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Hawaii's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates Hawaii's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with Hawaii over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Hawaii Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.