

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2021**

Hawaii



PART B DUE February 1, 2023

**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 Hawaii State Department of Education (Department) is submitting its Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2021 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 stakeholder input.

Hawaii's K-12 public education school system was founded on October 15, 1840 by King Kamehameha III. The State of Hawaii Board of Education (BOE) is the authorized policy-making body of the Hawaii K-12 public education system. The BOE consists of nine voting members, who serve without pay and are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the state Senate and two non-voting members – a public high school student selected by the Hawaii State Student Council and a military representative appointed by the senior military commander in Hawaii. Pursuant to the Hawaii 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 Hawaii 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. The Department oversees 294 public schools, including public charter schools and serves over 171,600 students. Ten percent (10%) of the total student population receive special education, ten percent (10%) of students are English Learners, and 50% of students are eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch. The most common languages spoken other than English are Ilocano, Chuukese, Marshallese, Tagalog, Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin, and Samoan.

The Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC), under the Office of the Deputy Superintendent, monitors all public schools, including public charter schools, to ensure compliance with IDEA and the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR) Chapter 60. The Exceptional Support Branch (ESB), under the Office of Student Support Services, 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 the HAR Chapter 60. Policies and procedures are posted and disseminated on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>. The Department meets with the state's IDEA advisory panel, Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), monthly to share updates on special education programs, procedures, and policies.

The Department is grounded in the Na Hopena A'o (HA), a framework of outcomes that reflects Hawaii's 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 Hawaii (BREATH or HA) in ourselves, students, and others. With a foundation in Hawaiian values, language, culture, and history, HA reflects the uniqueness of Hawaii and is meaningful in all places of learning. Learn more about HA at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/StudentLearning/HawaiianEducation/Pages/HA.aspx>.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic challenges, the Department took action and targeted its efforts and resources to re-engage students in in-person learning, determining the extent of learning loss, identifying social, emotional, and mental health concerns, and addressing chronic absenteeism. Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) funds authorized by the American Rescue Plan (ARP) were utilized to support the safe reopening of schools, mitigate student learning loss to address the academic impact of lost instructional time, summer learning and enrichment programs, comprehensive afterschool programs and evidence-based interventions to address students' academic, social and emotional needs and target subgroups of students who struggled during the pandemic such as students with disabilities. Schools implemented small-group instruction, intervention blocks, tutoring, out-of-school-time programs, academic coaching, personalized activities, and behavioral and social-emotional assessments to identify student needs and develop appropriate supports and interventions.

The Department continues to work collaboratively with its partners, stakeholders statewide, and TA centers to fulfill its commitment to all students to be college and career ready when they exit the public school and ensures 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.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Overall, the SY 2021-2022 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 community, thus these challenges should be considered when reviewing and examining performance data for each indicator.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The Department implements a General Supervision System (GSS) that promotes continuous improvement in educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities, identifies noncompliance, and ensures verification of noncompliance in accordance with federal regulations. The implementation of GSS is accomplished through the collaborative work of the MAC and the ESB. To achieve improved outcomes, the ESB provides

direction, PD, and TA on program implementation and improvement, while the MAC ensures the Department meets the requirements of both IDEA and the HAR, Chapter 60 regulations, and provides targeted support related to these requirements. The Department worked in collaboration with both internal and external stakeholders and technical assistance providers to improve its GSS. The Department explored grounding assumptions and developed a shared vision that aligns the GSS with the Department's vision of "Hawaii's students are educated, healthy, and joyful lifelong learners who contribute positively to our community and global society."

Components of the Department's GSS

The following eight (8) components are addressed in the Department's GSS. While each component is specific and unique, all are interconnected and addressed simultaneously:

1. SPP/APR
2. Data on Processes and Results
3. Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
4. Fiscal Management
5. Integrated Monitoring Activities
6. Sustaining Compliance and Improvement
7. Targeted TA and PD
8. Effective Dispute Resolution

SPP/APR

The submission and implementation of the SPP/APR is a collaborative effort of the MAC and the ESB. The MAC collects, examines, evaluates, reports data, and continuously monitors the implementation of the IDEA and HAR Chapter 60 in all public schools including charter schools. The ESB provides leadership in the planning, development, coordination, implementation, and evaluation of programs and services to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education (FAPE).

Data on Processes and Results

Using the SPP/APR indicators, a data collection and analysis process has been designed to measure each indicator, identify areas of priority for the Department, and determine levels of support. Schools regularly update their student information data, which is then verified. The MAC aggregates, examines, analyzes, and reports on the collected data. This data is used to identify progress for each CA on the SPP/APR indicators. To build the capacity of CA teams, the MAC and the ESB facilitate Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with the CAs in analyzing their data to inform improvement efforts. Through the Department's improvement plan in the SPP/APR and performance data, ongoing state activities are used for program improvement and progress measurement. TA and PD are available for CAs to target areas of focus determined by their data.

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The Department's policies and procedures are established primarily through the IDEA, the HAR Chapter 60, and the Hawaii State Board of Education Policy. An electronic copy of the HAR Chapter 60 can be accessed at <https://boe.hawaii.gov/policies/AdminRules/Pages/AdminRule60.aspx>. An electronic copy of the Hawaii State Board of Education Policy can be accessed at <https://boe.hawaii.gov/policies/Pages/Board-Policies.aspx>. Effective implementation of the HAR and the IDEA is ensured through the entire GSS as well as through annual assurances regarding policies, procedures, and implementation of the IDEA and the HAR requirements.

Fiscal Management

Fiscal and resource management of federal IDEA funds are monitored at 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.

Integrated Monitoring Activities

Integrated monitoring activities are achieved through a differentiated accountability and support system. The MAC and the ESB collaborate on providing 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 the development and implementation of SPP/APR.
- 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.
- 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 in place.
- Issue findings and ensure noncompliance findings are corrected in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.
- Require meetings with the CA team to monitor improvement activities and expected outcomes.

Sustaining Compliance and Improvement

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 requirements, and performance;
- Identifying noncompliance from a variety of sources;
- Issuing findings of noncompliance, as appropriate, in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02;
- Ensuring correction in a timely manner;
- Verifying and following up to ensure data reported reflect actual practice; and
- Providing TA and PD to meet the requirements of IDEA.

Targeted TA & PD

Across all tiers of support, the ultimate purpose is to improve educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities. Although the accountability and support activities vary across the three (3) tiers of support, the Department is committed to aligning its TA with critical components of

evidence-based professional learning. Specifically, the Department is guided by Learning Forward's 7 Standards for Professional Learning: learning communities, leadership, resources, data, learning designs, implementation, and outcomes.

Effective Dispute Resolution

Several mechanisms are available through the Department to assist in resolving disputes. The processes are mediation, impartial due process hearing requests, resolution sessions, and written complaints.

Technical Assistance System:

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

The Department has multiple mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based TA and support to all CAs. The ESB and the MAC manage all TA activities related to the implementation of IDEA Part B. The ESB and the MAC have teams of subject matter experts in instruction, behavior, program planning, and IDEA regulations. Data from various 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 written guidance, standing meetings, PLCs, and agency collaboration. Examples of the Department's TA include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

District Educational Specialist (DES) Monthly Meetings

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

The meetings held during SY 2021-2022 includes the following topics:

- Indicator 14 - Post-School Outcomes Survey Completion
- Exit and Discipline Data Verifications
- Noncompliance Findings
- Extended School Year
- Language and Literacy Initiative
- IDEA Project Plans
- Home Hospital Instruction
- Fiscal Responsibility and Allowable Costs
- Spotlight on Deaf, Hard of hearing, Deaf-Blind
- SPP/APR Stakeholder Engagement Meeting
- Assistive Technology
- Fiscal Monitoring IDEA Grant Funds
- Alternate Assessment
- Statewide Assessments Accessibility & Accommodations
- Indicator 8 - Parent Involvement Survey
- Indicator 11 - Initial Evaluation Delay Reasons
- Intensive Program Supports Section
- Hot Topics and Case Law 2021 and Early 2022: COVID and Non-COVID by Julie Weatherly, Esq.
- Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Data
- The Foundations of Specially Designed Instruction

Monthly Meetings with Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework is utilized to engage stakeholders in monthly meetings as a part of the TA system. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community partners include the SEAC, Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), and the Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council).

Compliance and Monitoring TA Sessions

In efforts to increase transparency, collaboration, and data-driven decision making to improve results for students with disabilities in Hawaii and meet the requirements of IDEA, data-driven discussion TA sessions are differentiated for each CA team, based on their priority areas and unique needs, to address their CA specific data and connect it to compliance requirements and improvement strategies. The rich discussions using the CA data supports CA teams in reviewing current performance, studying data trends, identifying areas for improvement, discussing root causes on low performance indicators, examining programs, and exploring strategies to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Early Intervention Part C Collaboration

To promote networking and strengthen early childhood partnerships, programs, and systems, the Department has regularly scheduled monthly meetings with Part C staff (Early Intervention and Home Visiting). To address recruitment and retention issues, pre-service, inservice system, and workforce systemic issues as it pertains to early childhood, the Department participates in the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) quarterly meetings with stakeholders from Hawaii State Department of Health, Early Intervention, Headstart, Executive Office of Early Learning (EOEL), and higher education. The ESB Educational Specialist (ES) is the co-lead on the committee for retention and recruitment while the MAC ES is the co-lead on the committee for evaluation. The MAC ES also attended the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC) intensive TA leadership institute in August 2022.

Guidelines and Handbooks

The Department developed and updated guidelines, handbooks, and informational flyers to inform and clarify special education processes and procedures, compliance requirements, and implementation of evidence-based practices.

Examples of topics include, but are not limited to:

- Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and Deaf-Blind
- Incarcerated Adult Students
- Online Instruction for Students with Disabilities
- Post Secondary Transition
- Preschool-Early Learning
- Related Services
- Residential Facilities

- Visual Disabilities including Blindness
- Extended School Year Guidelines
- Post Secondary Transition Handbook
- Transportation
- Hawaii Public Charter School Guidelines

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, but are not limited to, the following:

- Procedural Safeguards Notice for Parents and Students
- Parent Involvement Survey - Indicator 8
- Special Education Mediation: Resolving Conflicts Between Parents and Schools
- Options to Support Teachers Involved in the Individualized Education Program Process
- Deaf/Hard of Hearing and Deaf-Blind Communication Plan
- Extended School Year Guidelines for Students with Disabilities
- New Procedures for Offering a Free Appropriate Public Education for Eligible Students Withdrawn from School
- Private School Participation Project

Infographics for Parent(s)/Legal Guardian(s) and Community Partners

In partnership with SEAC, 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 <https://spinhawaii.org/spin-mac-office-infographics/>.

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 service providers have the skills to improve results for children with disabilities. The Department utilized a root cause analysis process where staff from the state and CA collaborated to develop targeted PD.

Inclusive Practices

Over the past five (5) school years, the Department, in collaboration with Stetson and Associates conducted inclusive practices implementation training and consultation to schools statewide in the initiative titled, Hui Pu Project. Several scale up strategies were provided to support CA training to ensure all teams have the skills to support schools in effective implementation of inclusive practices. A statewide inclusive practices conference was held and five (5) inclusive practices demonstration sites were added. Monthly Professional Learning Network (PLN) meetings with CAs were held to develop plans to scale up the initiative and a tiered system of support for each CA. In addition, several PDs and modeling opportunities were offered to CAs.

Indicator 13 Compliance Targeted CA/School Training

The Department continued to provide PD to each CA and their schools on Indicator 13 requirements to build their capacity in writing effective transition plans that meet the 100% federal compliance requirements.

Hawaii Statewide Assessment Program (HSAP) Training Conference

A session on Indicator 3 was held at the Hawaii State Assessment Program (HSAP) Conference. The session provided CAs and schools with information about the IDEA monitoring and reporting, a description of Indicator 3 statewide participation and performance of students with IEPs, a review of longitudinal data, and sought input from stakeholders on targets and strategies for improvement.

Focused TA for CAs

A root cause analysis tool was developed to support teams with data-driven decision making. Direct and personalized TA was provided to each CA to assist them in the process of identifying the root causes of proficiency rates in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) population in their CAs. A copy of the Data Analysis Tool can be accessed at https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FtkM4nJJYf7_FpykIDjNBAlgLoAhBlg_/edit.

Foundational Literacy PLCs

Foundational Literacy PLCs were made available for all CAs. The PLCs provided CA leads with direct instruction on evidence-based foundational literacy instruction to assist them with building capacity in their complex areas. This model provided the CA leads with the knowledge and skills needed to provide direct instruction to K-3 classroom teachers. Ongoing support was provided to both the CA leads and the classroom teachers on fidelity of implementation.

Foundational Literacy Early Childhood PLCs

Bi-monthly PLCs were provided to speech-language pathologist (SLP) coordinators and district resource teachers to support the implementation of evidence-based instructional practices related to the development of academic language skills and emergent literacy. The PLCs provided the leads with current research on the science of reading and writing and connections to language. The leads are using this knowledge to work with SLPs in their CAs to ensure that information gathered through assessments and evaluations allow them to collaborate and support teachers in the development of functional and academic language skills.

PLCs Regarding Students with Visual Impairments

To improve services to students with visual impairments, quarterly meetings for teachers of the visually impaired were held. Resources on a variety of topics such as assistive technology accessible materials were shared.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and

SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

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

YES

Number of Parent Members:

16

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 on a monthly basis on the topics that are to be discussed and presented at each SEAC meeting. Each stakeholder meeting presentations/materials are provided to the participants and posted on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

Meetings were held over a one (1) year period, culminating with December 9, 2022 with a focus on the priority indicators identified by SEAC. The meeting was attended by 64 stakeholders representing the Department, and community agencies with a total of 16 parents. At this meeting, stakeholders attended small breakout sessions to engage in rigorous discussion around data trends, improvement activities, and progress towards the targets.

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-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>
- SEAC SPP/APR Resources Page website: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

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 partners with SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, CCCs, and other groups to engage a broader group of parents and community members and increase the capacity of diverse groups to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. In monthly meetings with representatives from these organizations, Leading by Convening strategies are utilized. Through Leading by Convening, the Department is able to inform, network, and collaborate with parents and community groups to build their capacity and transform practices and outcomes.

To inform a broader and diverse group of parents and other stakeholders, the Department partners with SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, CCCs to jointly develop infographics, designed to be accessible and informative to a broader group of parents. The following links show examples of such infographics:

- SPP/APR Resource Page: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- Infographics: <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

To network with a broader diverse group of parents and other stakeholders, the Department partners with SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, CCCs to reach a broader group of parents. The Department collaborates with them to reach out to parents, and invite them to stakeholder meetings. As an example, using the FFY 2021 SPP/APR invite, please follow this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>.

To collaborate with a broader diverse group of parents and other stakeholders, the Department partners with SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, CCCs to facilitate the engagement of the broader group of parents and other stakeholders in an annual culminating SPP/APR meeting, and in other specific indicator meetings as needed. We jointly developed a process that helps parents and other stakeholders learn about each SPP/APR indicator, and provide strategies for improvement to the Department. The process below is implemented with Department staff and SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, CCCs members as facilitators in small breakout groups. The facilitators engage the small group participants in the following activities:

- Review indicator data since the establishment of the baseline and determine whether the Department made progress or had slippage.
- Compare performance to the targets.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit other ideas for improvement strategies.
- Share out.

The Department is utilizing collaboration with an informed broad and diverse group of parents to inspire change in the development of implementation activities leading to improved outcomes. As an example, for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR culminating meeting held in December 9, 2022, the diverse group of stakeholders were subdivided into small groups and engaged in the capacity building and input process for the following groups of indicators:

- Group 1 – Graduation (Indicator 1), Drop Out (Indicator 2), and Suspension and 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)

Presentation materials and meeting notes are available on the following websites:

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

The Department recognizes the importance of family engagement for student achievement, social development, and a strategy for sustainable long-term student success. The Department continues to partner with SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, and the CCCs to ensure that all communities within Hawaii have access to and opportunity for stakeholder engagement.

Soliciting Public Input:

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

Beginning from January 2022 through December 2022, monthly SEAC meetings, open to the public, were conducted where special education matters including the SPP/APR information was shared and reviewed. During these meetings, the Department staff and stakeholders reviewed indicator data trends, targets, and baselines and discussed improvement activities. In addition to soliciting input during these meetings, the Department collaborated with SEAC to publish the presentations and feedback activities on their website <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

SEAC Meeting Dates and Agenda Items:

The meetings and agendas are posted on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/meetings/agendas/>. Please see below a sample of the various topics presented.

January 14, 2022

- Follow up discussion on the Part B Stakeholder Meeting held on December 10, 2021
- COVID Policies Update
- Overview of DVR Services to Students with Disabilities

February 11, 2022

- Update on the Implementation of Confidentiality Requirements under FERPA, HIPAA, and IDEA
- Report by the PostSecondary Workgroup
- Discussion on Legislation Related to Students with Disabilities

March 11, 2022

- Overview of Assistive Technology for Students with Disabilities
- Discussion on the Implementation of IDEA Confidentiality Regulations under IDEA including Parent Observation
- Dialogue on Supports Needed for Students with Disabilities Transitioning from Private Schools

April 8, 2022

- Confidentiality and IDEA Part B
- Classroom Observations and the ESSA Requirements for Parent and Family Engagement
- Feedback from Hawaii Association of Independent Schools on Expelled Private School Students

May 13, 2022

- Hazel Health Mental Health Update
- Due Process Report for School Year 2020-21
- SEAC Annual Report Discussion

August 12, 2022

- 2022 OSEP Determination

September 9, 2022

- Dispute Resolution System Improvement
- SEAC Leadership Team suggestions for Further Action on:
 - Promotion of Prevention/Early Intervention Materials (i.e. CADRE resources)
 - Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Barriers to Due Process Safeguards

October 14, 2022

- SEAC's proposal to create a Hawaiian Dispute Resolution video
- Feedback from the Policy, Innovation, Planning and Evaluation Branch (PIPE) on Proposed Parent Harassment Legislation

November 18, 2022

- Update on Secondary Transition Data and Improvement Activities - Indicator 13
- Trauma Informed Care Practices of the Child & Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD)

December 9, 2022

- Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) and State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Virtual Meeting
- The agenda and materials to each of the sessions can be accessed at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-stakeholder-meeting/>.

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.

In addition to meetings and discussions with stakeholders, the results of each stakeholder engagement meeting/activity were made available to the public using the following methods:

- The Department's website under the FFY 2021 Stakeholder Meeting, December 9, 2022 section <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>
- SEAC's 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 2020 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 2020 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 revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.

The FFY 2020 SPP/APR was posted on the Department's website at https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2020.pdf within a week of submission to OSEP of its revised version submitted during the clarification process in April 2022, 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 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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 2020 SPP/APR

Throughout the year, TA was received from various TA providers in areas such as general supervision, policies and procedures, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), secondary transition, dispute resolution, and IDEA Part B data collection, reporting, and analysis. The assistance provided by the various TA centers was valuable in assisting the Department address areas of need and next steps for improvement. Consistent with Section

616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §300.604(a), and in response to the directive in the OSEP Determination letter for the Department to report on: (1) the TA sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that TA. As a result, the Department requested and received TA from the following TA Centers:

Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)

The CIFR provided TA to the ESB staff regarding fiscal and resource management of federal IDEA funds monitored by the state. A fiscal planning process was developed for CAs to ensure the IDEA Part B funds were used to address PD and implementation of literacy Evidence-Based Practices (EBPs). As a result, the Department collaborated with CIFR to develop a fiscal monitoring risk assessment tool (GSS Fiscal Monitoring Form) to assess how CAs use the IDEA Part B funds.

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 special education current matters more specifically on how other states addressed the COVID-19 pandemic subsequent consequences towards recovery. In addition, teams from both ESB and MAC attended the NASDSE conference on October 18-21, 2021 engaged with current research and practices in topics of specially designed instruction, fiscal, monitoring, evidence-based practices, and data collection and reporting. As a result, the Department used the resources and information shared through the conference and networking with special education directors throughout the nation in the development of Hawaii's post-COVID-19 recovery efforts.

WestEd Director Monthly Calls

WestEd holds monthly meetings that are tailored to capacity building of state leaders towards improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Hawaii's Special Education Director participated in the monthly calls, which resulted in shared ideas and information on state use of American Rescue Plan (ARP) and Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) funds to address student learning loss and received guidance on various fiscal, compliance, and performance best practices.

Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)

The Department participated in monthly 619 ECTA sponsored calls and the combined ECTA/NASDSE monthly calls. The Department utilized the TA to develop guidance documents and resources related to preschool environments and the provision of services for preschool children. In addition, ECTA provided consultation related to the proposed legislation to extend Part C services to age five.

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

The NTACT:C builds the capacity of state agencies to use data-based decision making processes, strengthen interagency partnerships and provide quality professional development to improve opportunities and outcomes for students with disabilities related to secondary transition. The Department in partnership with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) attended the TA monthly calls. As a result, the Department developed postsecondary training modules, provided training at the statewide agency collaboration quarterly secondary transition meetings, and developed a data collection system for the Department and DVR State specialists. For more information on the Department's efforts to improve secondary transition for students with disabilities, visit the website at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/secondarytransition/home>.

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) Cross-State Learning Collaboratives

The NCSI facilitates four (4) Learning Collaboratives that bring states together to form networks of shared leadership and peer support focusing on priority topics related to improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The Department participated in the Results-Based Accountability and Support (RBAS) learning collaborative. The RBAS learning collaborative focuses on the development, implementation, and evaluation of RBAS (general supervision) systems to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The Department used the resources and tools to continue to improve its GSS. The Department explored ways to integrate dispute resolution data into a state's overall GSS. The Five Ways to Effectively Use Dispute Resolution Data in State GSS to Improve Implementation of IDEA (<https://ncsi-library.wested.org/resources/768>) was used to improve dispute resolution data collection and integration within the GSS. Furthermore, the Department engaged in discussions related to monitoring and support for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10; leveraging the GSS to advance equity; improving the stakeholder engagement process; and using appropriate rewards and sanctions.

Coordinated Technical Assistance from NCSI, National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), and IDEA Data Center (IDC)

The NCSI, NCEO, and IDC continued to provide an integrated approach to assisting the Department in the implementation of the SSIP. As a result, the Department increased capacity with CA leads and scaled up the literacy initiative as the primary improvement activity to improve early skills and future academic success.

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:

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Annual Conference, October 18-21, 2021

The Department presented on: a) Building capacity to support transition from school to community. The Hawaii team shared how the Department utilized the SPP/APR data to drive practice and build capacity in developing effective transition plans. b) Working together for Hawaii's students and families. This presentation was a collaborative effort between the Department, IDC, NCEO and NCSI. The team shared their collaboration towards aligning TA with SSIP goals.

The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE): National Symposium on Dispute Resolution, October 28-29, 2021

The Hawaii team utilized the information shared at the symposium to improve its internal procedures related to the dispute resolution system.

NTACT:C Career Technical Education (CTE)/Special Education/Vocational Rehabilitation Virtual Conference, November 18, 2021

The Department utilized the information shared to improve collaboration between CTE programming and the development of transition plans for students with disabilities.

IDEA Data Center – Interactive Institute 2022 – Building and Sustaining a Culture of High-Quality Data, June 6-7, 2022

This conference provided the team with professional development and support to continue to improve the processes and data collection to ensure data is consistent, accurate, and timely, and it is utilized to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Summit, November 15-16, 2022

The Hawaii team benefited from participating in the Summit and utilized the information, tools, and resources to improve the development of the FFY 2021 document, increase stakeholder engagement and develop data protocols for each indicator.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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 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.

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 EDFacts 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	87.00%	88.00%	90.00%	83.00%	72.24%
Data	59.49%	65.29%	64.01%	63.41%	72.24%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they

would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVTzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 1 and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they provided feedback for improvement on the following areas:

1. reaching out to students earlier in their high school journey and having them articulate their needs,
2. addressing the needs of the whole family who may be having financial or employment difficulties,
3. seeking out students who have dropped out and finding a way to bring them back to the school community,
4. including students in the general education classroom with support, and
5. promoting access to grants that focus on Hawaiian cultural practices to increase graduation rates for students who are of Native Hawaiian descent.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	928
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	183

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	53
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	167

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
928	1,331	72.24%	73.00%	69.72%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

As data indicates, the graduation rate for students with IEPs dropped by 2.52 percentage points. This small downward trend is attributed to the educational disruption schools, families, and students faced with the COVID-19 pandemic, and this disruption continued as the focus was on staffing, safety, and remediation of learning loss.

There was a slight increase in the number of students exiting the Department from 1722 in SY 19-20 to 1817 in SY 20-21. In SY 20-21, there was an increase of students who exited with a certificate (183 students) compared to SY 19-20 (115 students). When the number of students who exited with a certificate was disaggregated by disability category, 46% were identified with Intellectual Disability (ID) in SY 20-21 as compared to SY 19-20 where 28% were identified with ID.

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, Hawaii has one set of standards for all youth with and without disabilities in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

All Hawaii 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

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 Department continued to engage in activities that support an increase in graduation rate for all students including students with disabilities. ESSER III funds were utilized to support the safe reopening of schools and to mitigate student learning loss resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools continued to implement evidence-based programs such as the Panorama Education, Inc. (Panorama) Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) student assessment survey for grades 3 to 12. All schools were provided with the Panorama Student Success Platform integrating the SEL student assessment survey results with an early warning dashboard. Early warning dashboard includes the following components and tools: attendance, academics, and behavior. This platform was made available to all schools to assist with implementation of the Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS). The Department partnered with Hazel Health, a statewide supplemental resource for schools to incorporate in their HMTSS array of services to help meet the mental health needs of all students. To ensure students who are homeless are identified and immediately enrolled in accordance with the McKinney-Vento Act, the Department deployed full-time community liaisons in each complex area, who connect with agencies and resources.

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 EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

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 data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' Common Core of Data.

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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	16.64%	14.00%	11.00%	11.00%	14.93%
Data	14.53%	14.89%	16.82%	12.38%	14.93%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during

the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC held a collaborative meeting where both internal and external stakeholders reviewed the data and targets for FFY 2021 and discussed improvement activities. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

As data indicates, the Department saw a decrease in the dropout rates. The stakeholders reviewed the strategies for improvement established during the FFY 2021 SPP/APR stakeholder engagement meetings, and suggested for the Department to track the outcomes as a result of the implementation of the Hawaii Multi-Tiered of Support strategies. Furthermore, the following additional strategies were suggested:

1. reaching out to students earlier in their high school journey and having them articulate their needs,
2. addressing the needs of the whole family who may be having financial or employment difficulties,
3. seeking out students who have dropped out and finding a way to bring them back to the school community,
4. including students in the general education classroom with support, and
5. promoting access to grants that focus on Hawaiian cultural practices to decrease drop out rates for students who are of Native Hawaiian descent.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	928
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	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 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	183
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	53
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	167

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
167	1,331	14.93%	14.00%	12.55%	Met target	No Slippage

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)

The Department continued to engage in activities that support a decrease in the drop out rate for all students including students with disabilities. ESSER III funds were utilized to support the safe reopening of schools and to mitigate student learning loss resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools continued to implement evidence-based programs such as the Panorama Education, Inc. (Panorama) Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) student assessment survey for grades 3 to 12. All schools were provided with the Panorama Student Success Platform integrating the SEL student assessment survey results with an early warning dashboard. Early warning dashboard includes the following components and tools: attendance, academics, and behavior. This platform was made available to all schools to assist with implementation of the Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS). The Department partnered with Hazel Health, a statewide supplemental resource for schools to incorporate in their HMTSS array of services to help meet the mental health needs of all students. To ensure students who are homeless are identified and immediately enrolled in accordance with the McKinney-Vento Act, the Department deployed full-time community liaisons in each complex area, who connect with agencies and resources.

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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDvtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal

law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 3A and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in the 95% target for this indicator for FFY 2021. The 95% participation rate requirement originates from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, the United States' national education law and commitment to equal opportunity for all students.

The group discussed the fact that historically the Department has had high participation rates. The feedback received from the stakeholders include the following strategies for improvement:

1. Embed easier questions (even if not included in the score), so students can start the test with a feeling of success.
2. Match accommodations indicated in the supplementary aids and services to those in statewide assessments.
3. Provide training to teachers on accommodations and use of those accommodations in the classroom.
4. Prepare students before they take the test.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,484	1,500	1,154
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,282	1,199	755
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	19	25	11
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	119	138	114

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,484	1,500	1,154
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,291	1,228	780
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	19	7	6
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	117	137	110

*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.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,420	1,484	89.49%	95.00%	95.69%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,362	1,500	75.33%	95.00%	90.80%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	880	1,154	54.90%	95.00%	76.26%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,427	1,484	90.01%	95.00%	96.16%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,372	1,500	76.77%	95.00%	91.47%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	896	1,154	54.51%	95.00%	77.64%	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 2020 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 are also posted 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

<https://arch-prod-reports-repository.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/essa/2022/999ESSARpt.pdf>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting at the link

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SY 2021-2022 reflects the first full year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges further negatively impacting the social-emotional development of students, the wellbeing of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. The disruption and stress caused by COVID-19 had an impact on student participation rate on statewide assessments. Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) funds authorized by the American Rescue Plan (ARP) were utilized to support the safe reopening of schools, mitigate student learning loss to address the academic impact of lost instructional time, summer learning and enrichment programs, comprehensive afterschool programs and evidence-based interventions to address students' academic, social and emotional needs and target subgroups of students who struggled during the pandemic such as students with disabilities. Schools implemented small-group instruction, intervention blocks, tutoring, out-of-school-time programs, academic coaching, personalized activities, and behavioral and social-emotional assessments to identify student needs and develop appropriate supports and interventions.

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 EDFacts 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	17.00%	19.00%	21.00%	23.00%	25.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%	22.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	5.00%	7.00%	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior

to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 3B and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they provided feedback for improvement on the following areas:

- Increase Math/ELA resource rooms in addition to or in lieu of inclusion classroom, so they can get the baseline skills they need to access the curriculum.
- Increase tutoring services.
- Focus on literacy from preschool to grade 3.
- Provide a consistent curriculum to students who transfer to another school.

- Address chronic absenteeism.
- Employ literacy coaches at the school level.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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 regular assessment	1,301	1,224	766
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	113	102	87
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	1

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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 regular assessment	1,310	1,235	786
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	125	41	17
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	0	0

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	114	1,301	8.89%	12.00%	8.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	104	1,224	8.34%	10.00%	8.50%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	88	766	16.61%	17.00%	11.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The Department did not meet its target for grade 4 reading assessment and had a slippage of .13 percentage points. The data for FFY 2021, reflects the first full school year of in-person learning following the pandemic and assessment waivers. In School Year 2021, the Hawaii public schools 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 2020 and FFY 2021 data is not appropriate.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The Department did not meet its target for grade HS reading assessment and had a slippage of 5.12 percentage points. The data for FFY 2021, reflects the first full school year of in-person learning following the pandemic and assessment waivers. In School Year 2021, the Hawaii public schools 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 2020 and FFY 2021 data is not appropriate.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	126	1,310	7.48%	14.00%	9.62%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	41	1,235	3.01%	8.00%	3.32%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	17	786	1.84%	5.00%	2.16%	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 2020 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 are also posted 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> or at <https://arch-prod-reports-repository.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/essa/2021/999ESSARpt.pdf>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting at the link

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SY 2021-2022 reflects the first full year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges further negatively impacting the social-emotional development of students, the wellbeing of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. The disruption and stress caused by COVID-19 had an impact on students' readiness to fully engage in-person instruction, which likely had a negative impact on the proficiency rate on statewide assessments. Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) funds authorized by the American Rescue Plan (ARP) were utilized to support the safe reopening of schools, mitigate student learning loss to address the academic impact of lost instructional time, summer learning and enrichment programs, comprehensive afterschool programs and evidence-based interventions to address students' academic, social and emotional needs and target subgroups of students who struggled during the pandemic such as students with disabilities. Schools implemented small-group instruction, intervention blocks, tutoring, out-of-school-time programs, academic coaching, personalized activities, and behavioral and social-emotional assessments to identify student needs and develop appropriate supports and interventions.

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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 3C and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they reviewed current strategies, discussed last year's activities, and provided feedback for improvement in the following areas:

- Provide professional learning opportunities for teachers who work with students with severe cognitive disabilities.
- Examine the curriculum currently being used in schools to ensure it meets the needs of students with severe cognitive disabilities.

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	119	138	114
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	51	32	36

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

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	117	137	110
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	44	33	41

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	51	119	39.84%	54.00%	42.86%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	32	138	34.29%	46.00%	23.19%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	36	114	40.20%	39.00%	31.58%	Did not meet target	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 11.1 percentage points. The FFY 2021 data reflects the first full school year of in-person learning following the pandemic and assessment waivers. The numerous pandemic-related challenges across Hawaii's public schools had an impact on instruction and learning loss for all students, widening the pre-existing achievement gaps, more so for students with significant cognitive disabilities, which may explain the slippage for grade 8 reading assessment. Students with severe cognitive disabilities often have a

range of vulnerabilities that include health problems, comorbid physical disorders and social disadvantage and the stresses associated with the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated their ability to focus on learning and adapt to changes, such as; daily routines and support structures during the return to the first full school year of in-person learning post pandemic.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The Department did not meet its target for grade HS reading assessment and had a slippage of 8.62 percentage points. The FFY 2021 data reflects the first full school year of in-person learning following the pandemic and assessment waivers. The numerous pandemic-related challenges across Hawaii's public schools had an impact on instruction and learning loss for all students, widening the pre-existing achievement gaps, more so for students with significant cognitive disabilities, which may explain the slippage for grade HS reading assessment. Students with severe cognitive disabilities often have a range of vulnerabilities that include health problems, comorbid physical disorders and social disadvantage and the stresses associated with the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated their ability to focus on learning and adapt to changes, such as; daily routines and support structures during the return to the first full school year of in-person learning post pandemic.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	44	117	47.62%	53.00%	37.61%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	33	137	30.56%	44.00%	24.09%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	41	110	33.33%	41.00%	37.27%	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 math assessment and had a slippage of 6.47 percentage points. The FFY 2021 data reflects the first full school year of in-person learning following the pandemic and assessment waivers. The numerous pandemic-related challenges across Hawaii's public schools had an impact on instruction and learning loss for all students, widening the pre-existing achievement gaps, more so for students with significant cognitive disabilities, which may explain the slippage for grade 8 math assessment. Students with severe cognitive disabilities often have a range of vulnerabilities that include health problems, comorbid physical disorders and social disadvantage and the stresses associated with the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated their ability to focus on learning and adapt to changes, such as; daily routines and support structures during the return to the first full school year of in-person learning post pandemic.

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 2020 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 are also posted in the following links:

Proficiency

<https://adc.hidoe.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> or at <https://arch-prod-reports-repository.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/essa/2021/999ESSARpt.pdf>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting at the link

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SY 2021-2022 reflects the first full year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges further negatively impacting the social-emotional development of students, the wellbeing of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. The disruption and stress caused by COVID-19 had an impact on students' readiness to fully engage in-person instruction, which likely had a negative impact on the proficiency rate on

alternate assessments. These stresses and disruptions created conditions such as changes of daily routines, support structures in conjunction with limited understanding that in result negatively impacted the progress and development for students with severe cognitive disabilities.

Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) funds authorized by the American Rescue Plan (ARP) were utilized to support the safe reopening of schools, mitigate student learning loss to address the academic impact of lost instructional time, summer learning and enrichment programs, comprehensive afterschool programs and evidence-based interventions to address students' academic, social and emotional needs and target subgroups of students who struggled during the pandemic such as students with disabilities. Schools implemented small-group instruction, intervention blocks, tutoring, out-of-school-time programs, academic coaching, personalized activities, and behavioral and social-emotional assessments to identify student needs and develop appropriate supports and interventions.

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 EDFacts 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 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	39.00	37.00	35.00	33.00	31.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	41.00	39.00	37.00	35.00	33.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	42.00	40.00	38.00	36.00	34.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	34.00	32.00	30.00	28.00	26.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	30.00	28.00	26.00	24.00	22.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	25.00	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to

increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 3D and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they provided feedback for improvement on the following areas for improvement:

- Targeted small-group instruction

- Tiered support within Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support
- Tutoring
- Programs provided beyond the school day (after school, weekends, intersessions or summer)
- Academic Coaching
- Personalized activities, and other support

FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

04/05/2023

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,971	12,521	9,989
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,301	1,224	766
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	6,606	6,288	5,986
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	7	3	2
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	113	102	87
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	2	1

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

04/05/2023

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	13,046	12,607	10,152
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,310	1,235	786
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,916	3,868	2,609
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	1	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	125	41	17
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	1	0	0

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8.76%	50.98%	37.15	39.00	42.22	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	8.50%	50.24%	42.63	41.00	41.75	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	11.49%	59.95%	48.14	42.00	48.46	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The Department has been addressing the student achievement gap and the equity issues regarding student achievement prior to the pandemic. Throughout FFY 2021, numerous pandemic-related challenges negatively impacted the social-emotional development of students, the well-being of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. In line with national trends, the COVID-19 quarantine and isolation requirements for students resulted in an increase in chronic absenteeism, which contributed to students' academic and social/emotional/behavioral growth and development. The disruption and stress caused by the pandemic further widened the pre-existing achievement gap for 4th grade students with disabilities in reading assessment.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	9.62%	45.36%	28.25	34.00	35.74	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	3.32%	30.69%	21.72	30.00	27.37	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	2.16%	25.70%	25.99	25.00	23.54	Met target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The Department has been addressing the student achievement gap and the equity issues regarding student achievement prior to the pandemic. Throughout FFY 2021, numerous pandemic-related challenges negatively impacted the social-emotional development of students, the well-being of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. In line with national trends, the COVID-19 quarantine and isolation requirements for students resulted in an increase in chronic absenteeism, which contributed to students' academic and social/emotional/behavioral growth and development. The disruption and stress caused by the pandemic further widened the pre-existing achievement gap for grade 4 students with disabilities in math assessment.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SY 2021-2022 reflects the first full year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges further negatively impacting the social-emotional development of students, the well-being of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. The disruption and stress caused by COVID-19 had an impact on students' readiness to fully engage in-person instruction, which likely had a negative impact on the proficiency rates on statewide assessments.

Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER III) funds authorized by the American Rescue Plan (ARP) were utilized to support the safe reopening of schools, mitigate student learning loss to address the academic impact of lost instructional time, summer learning and enrichment programs, comprehensive afterschool programs and evidence-based interventions to address students' academic, social and emotional needs and target subgroups of students who struggled during the pandemic such as students with disabilities. Schools implemented small-group instruction, intervention blocks, tutoring, out-of-school-time programs, academic coaching, personalized activities, and behavioral and social-emotional assessments to identify student needs and develop appropriate supports and interventions.

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 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 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 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts 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 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) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≤	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and

advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 4A and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

The feedback received from the stakeholders include the following:

1. Provide professional development to school administrators on mindset related to suspensions and expulsions and the impact on a student's future success.
2. Employ alternatives to suspensions, such as peer mediation.
3. Cap suspensions for middle and high school students.
4. Include students with IEPs in the general education classroom with support.

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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

Hawaii is a single District State, which means that SEA and LEA are the same; therefore, Hawaii 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 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. This means, the Department is considered to be identified as having a significant discrepancy when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is 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 for analysis.

In analyzing the FFY 2021 data, the Department used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted in November 2021 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2020- 2021. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

FFY 2021

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

State's Rate for Children with Disabilities:

7 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 20,017 (Total number of special education children) = 0.03%

State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:

18 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 156,673 (Total number of children without disabilities) = 0.01%

Rate Difference = (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children without disabilities)
0.03% - 0.01% = 0.02 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 0.02 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 by race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in the SY 2020-2021 is less than the previous year. This reduction is due to the extraordinary circumstances of school campus closures in SY 2020-2021 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 national pandemic of COVID-19.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.

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 because the Department DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2021.

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

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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), 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 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 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 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 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 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 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) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 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.

1

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0	0.00%	0%		N/A	N/A

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. This means, the Department is considered to be identified as having a significant discrepancy when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is 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 for analysis.

Methodology

Hawaii is a single District State, which means that SEA and LEA are the same; therefore, Hawaii 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 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 2021 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:

7 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 20,017 (Total number of special education children) = 0.03%

State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:

18 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 156,673 (Total number of children without disabilities) =

0.01%

Rate Difference= (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students without disabilities)
0.03% - 0.01%= 0.02 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 $(18/156,673) \times 100 = 0.01\%$
- 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 N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(18/156,673) \times 100 = 0.01\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).

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 $(18/156,673) \times 100 = 0.01\%$
- 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 N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(18/156,673) \times 100 = 0.01\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).

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 $(18/156,673) \times 100 = 0.01\%$
- 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 N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(18/156,673) \times 100 = 0.01\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).

White

- 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 $(18/156,673) \times 100 = 0.01\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5).

Summary

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in FFY 2021, there were very few cases of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days for each race/ethnicity group. As such the Department did not meet the minimum N-cell size of five (5) children in each race/ethnicity category in order for the data to be included for analysis. Therefore, the Department DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2021 by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days as the rate difference for each race/ethnicity is not applicable due to the n size being less than five (5).

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 the SY 2020-2021 is less than the previous year for each racial/ethnic group. This reduction is due to the extraordinary circumstances of school campus closures in SY 2020-2021 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 national pandemic of COVID-19.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 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.

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 DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2021 by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with disabilities.

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

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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 EDFacts 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	47.00%	52.00%	57.00%	57.00%	50.71%
A	50.71%	Data	37.33%	40.63%	43.86%	47.95%	50.71%
B	2020	Target <=	16.00%	15.00%	14.00%	14.00%	16.30%
B	16.30%	Data	20.40%	18.94%	17.15%	16.41%	16.30%
C	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	0.96%
C	0.96%	Data	1.15%	1.11%	1.21%	1.07%	0.96%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Target B <=	15.80%	15.30%	14.80%	14.30%	13.80%
Target C <=	0.96%	0.95%	0.95%	0.94%	0.94%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDvtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 5 and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they provided feedback for improvement in the following areas:

- Increase the messaging regarding the benefits of inclusive education at the school level.
- Ensure teams collect and analyze data for decision making.
- Provide career and technical education opportunities to students with severe cognitive disabilities in the inclusive settings to support their post school goals.
- Consider having the inclusive practices team attend the School Community Council meetings to inform the school regarding the needs of special education students to improve student support and services in their learning environment.
- Utilize evidence-based practices in the inclusive environment.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	17,816
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,361
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,889
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	126
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	24
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	66

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,361	17,816	50.71%	53.00%	52.54%	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	2,889	17,816	16.30%	15.80%	16.22%	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]	216	17,816	0.96%	0.96%	1.21%	Did not meet target	Slippage
Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable						
C	In the school year 2021-2022, students returned back to campus from the in-person, virtual and hybrid learning models used to support students during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic such as infections and quarantines continued to contribute to students' mental health and social emotional state. These drastic challenges may explain the reason for the increase of 23 students in Homebound/Hospital from SY 2020-21 to SY 2021-22.						

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SY 2021-2022 reflects the first full year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges further negatively impacting the social-emotional development of students, the well-being of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. The Department issued guidance for IEP teams to address any learning loss. Schools were required to use the monitoring data results to determine the extent of learning loss and provide appropriate services and interventions as needed to compensate for learning loss. Addressing learning loss resources for students with disabilities can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>.

To increase the inclusion rate, over the past five (5) school years, the Department, in collaboration with Stetson and Associates conducted inclusive practices implementation training and consultation to schools statewide in the initiative titled, Hui Pu Project. Several scale up strategies were provided to support CA training to ensure all teams have the skills to support schools in effective implementation of inclusive practices. A statewide inclusive practices conference was held and five (5) inclusive practices demonstration sites were added. Monthly Professional Learning Network (PLN) meetings with CAs were held to develop plans to scale up the initiative and a tiered system of support for each CA. In addition, several PDs and modeling opportunities were offered to CAs.

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 EDFacts 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 – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	34.50%	35.00%	35.50%	35.50%	21.33%
A	Data	27.54%	27.34%	26.93%	28.44%	21.33%
B	Target <=	23.40%	23.30%	23.20%	23.20%	32.29%
B	Data	24.53%	27.99%	21.76%	23.82%	32.29%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.

- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVTzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 6 and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they provided feedback for improvement on the following areas:

- Develop a resource specific for Hawaii based on the IDC Preschool Environments Toolkit which can be accessed at <https://ideadata.org/preschool-toolkit/>.
- Work with parent partners to make the information in the Tool Kit understandable to parents in Hawaii.
- Create a blended preschool classroom using various state funds.
- Establish universal preschool, so all children can be included.

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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	22.00%	22.75%	23.50%	24.25%	25.00%
Target B <=	31.00%	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%	27.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.23%	1.20%	1.17%	1.14%	1.11%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	609	890	340	1,839
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	76	204	96	376
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	257	328	107	692
b2. Number of children attending separate school	5	1	4	10
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2	1	0	3
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	2	5	4	11

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 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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	376	1,839	21.33%	22.00%	20.45%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	705	1,839	32.29%	31.00%	38.34%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	11	1,839	1.26%	1.23%	0.60%	Met target	No Slippage

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

In the school year 2021-2022, students returned back to campus from the in-person, virtual and hybrid learning models used to support students during the COVID-19 pandemic. The subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic such as infections and quarantines continued to contribute to students' mental health and social emotional state. These drastic challenges may explain the reason for the increase of 58 students who required a structured environment such as a separate class to support their social/emotional and academic needs. Furthermore, there was a reduction of 7.5% in enrollment of children ages 3-5 Preschool from SY 2020-21 to SY 2021-2022.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In legislative session 2021-2022, Hawaii legislature passed Act 257, which allocated \$200,000,000 towards providing the infrastructure to support Act 46. The House of Representatives has been committed to enabling our youngest keiki to be provided with pre-kindergarten. In 2020, the Legislature passed Act 46, which created a goal to expand preschool access to all 3- and 4-year olds who are unserved with targets of 50% by December 31, 2027, and 100% by December 31, 2032. This gradual growth of a public preschool program will provide increased inclusion opportunities for preschool students with disabilities.

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 2 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2018	Target >=	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	74.00%	66.00%
A1	62.01%	Data	76.70%	63.59%	62.01%	69.66%	65.68%

A2	2018	Target >=	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	52.00%	45.00%
A2	44.28%	Data	58.74%	47.99%	44.28%	43.13%	41.20%
B1	2018	Target >=	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	68.00%
B1	65.56%	Data	79.89%	67.37%	65.56%	69.79%	68.07%
B2	2018	Target >=	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	56.00%	51.00%
B2	49.53%	Data	59.21%	53.82%	49.53%	45.02%	42.65%
C1	2018	Target >=	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%	68.00%
C1	63.90%	Data	87.18%	93.16%	63.90%	71.56%	68.21%
C2	2018	Target >=	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	59.00%	41.00%
C2	40.11%	Data	78.74%	91.33%	40.11%	39.00%	37.32%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	68.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%
Target A2 >=	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%
Target B1 >=	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%
Target B2 >=	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%
Target C1 >=	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%
Target C2 >=	42.00%	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%	46.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

In 2021, the Department in collaboration with stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data for Indicator 7 and set/reset baseline and targets for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 7 and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they provided feedback for the following improvement strategies:

- Provide parents with resources (e.g. packets) to work with their children at home to support student growth.
- Work with SEAC partners to get information packets out in various languages.
- Be culturally sensitive when reaching out to families.
- Add parental engagement in the process towards improving preschool outcomes.
- Expand the current infographic developed to be translated into other languages.
- Conduct professional development on language development for teachers.
- Develop a process for parents to be able to communicate concerns and understand the progress or process.
- Teach parents on what instruction was taught in the classroom so the parent can follow up at home.
- Help teachers and parents develop skills around coaching.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

697

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	8	1.15%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	245	35.15%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	126	18.08%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	180	25.82%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	138	19.80%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	306	559	65.68%	68.00%	54.74%	Did not meet target	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>	318	697	41.20%	46.00%	45.62%	Did not meet 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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	261	37.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	154	22.09%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	172	24.68%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	110	15.78%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	326	587	68.07%	70.00%	55.54%	Did not meet target	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>	282	697	42.65%	52.00%	40.46%	Did not meet target	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	14	2.01%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	229	32.86%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	132	18.94%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	182	26.11%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	140	20.09%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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>	314	557	68.21%	70.00%	56.37%	Did not meet target	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>	322	697	37.32%	42.00%	46.20%	Met target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	In the school year 2021-2022, students returned back to campus from the in-person, virtual and hybrid learning models used to support students during the COVID-19 pandemic. The subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic suggest significant setbacks in the areas of social/emotional, communication, academic and behavior skills for preschool students with disabilities. More specifically, preschool students faced isolation and social deprivation which may have impacted their social/emotional growth. In addition, the educational disruption led to a 7.5% decrease in preschool enrollment and thereby a decrease in social-emotional skills development and outcomes of the preschool students who exited the early childhood special education program.
B1	In the school year 2021-2022, students returned back to campus from the in-person, virtual and hybrid learning models used to support students during the COVID-19 pandemic. The subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic such as: reduced opportunities for social interaction, disruption to the continuity of learning, reduction in face-to-face teaching and instructional time, negatively impacted the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills including early language communication for students with disabilities.
B2	In the school year 2021-2022, students returned back to campus from the in-person, virtual and hybrid learning models used to support students during the COVID-19 pandemic. The subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic such as: reduced opportunities for social interaction, disruption to the continuity of learning, reduction in face-to-face teaching and instructional time, impacted the students' ability to function at grade level expectations in the area of knowledge and skill acquisition.
C1	In the school year 2021-2022, students returned back to campus from the in-person, virtual and hybrid learning models used to support students during the COVID-19 pandemic. The subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic suggest significant setbacks in the areas of social/emotional, communication, academic and behavior skills for preschool students with disabilities. More specifically, preschool students faced isolation and social deprivation which resulted in limited opportunities to develop, practice, model and maintain appropriate behavior skills.

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 Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

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

The Department has adopted the Teaching Strategies GOLD (TS GOLD) as the instrument to gather preschool student outcome data for Indicator 7. TS GOLD is an online assessment, aligned with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) preschool outcomes and the Hawaii Early Learning and Development Standards (HELDS). TS GOLD converts student progress information into the seven (7) point scale on the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Children with ratings of six (6) or seven (7) are considered to be functioning at a level "comparable to same-aged peers."

The Department requires all Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teachers to understand and implement the procedures on gathering student progress data that is used to generate outcome ratings used for Indicator 7. The training is conducted annually by the 619 Preschool Resource Teachers

who are responsible for supporting the ECSE teachers with collecting, entering and recording student data, and improving student outcomes. To obtain outcome scores, student developmental level data is collected by the ECSE teachers within two (2) months of entry as well as prior to exiting the ECSE program. The results are calculated by TS GOLD for the identified school year and the Department uses those results to report to OSEP and inform program implementation.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In school year 2021-2022, the Department has continued efforts to improve early childhood outcomes with maintaining the Language and Literacy Initiative started in 2020, which focuses on building foundational language and literacy skills of early childhood teachers towards increasing the usage of evidence-based oral language and foundational literacy strategies through professional learning communities (PLCs). In addition, the Department has offered professional development on the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS), a program to master the fundamentals of reading instruction, phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, writing and language to teachers across the state. Additionally, advance training has been planned to target early childhood staff, such as select preschool resource teachers and speech-language pathologists working with the early childhood population towards tying the language and literacy connection for preschool students with disabilities.

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 2 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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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 primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 8 and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021.

However, they provided feedback for improvement on the following areas:

- Include a QR code or link to the parent involvement survey in the Procedural Safeguards Notice.
- Involve the Parent Community Network Centers, a resource at the school for engaging family and school staff with the community, to share information about the survey with the parents of students with disabilities.
- Explore other ways to gather parent satisfaction in addition to the Parent Survey.
- Incentivize parents to complete and submit the Parent Survey.
- Provide awareness at the School Community Council Meetings, where the leadership of the school and community meet to discuss student achievement and school improvement.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	51.78%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	53.00%	54.00%	54.00%	60.00%	51.78%
Data	56.55%	54.88%	57.42%	58.20%	51.78%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≥	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
626	1,149	51.78%	54.00%	54.48%	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 uses 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. The Parent Involvement Survey is available online (<http://www.hiparentsurvey.com/>) or via a paper copy with self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. All returned surveys for students ages 3-21 between July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022, 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 1,149 surveys returned and 626 surveys reporting schools facilitated parental involvement, yielding an overall response rate of 5.85%. Of the 1,149 returned surveys across all age groups, 214 (18.6%) of those 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.

19,655

Percentage of respondent parents

5.85%

Response Rate

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	5.88%	5.85%

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

During School Year 2021-2022, the Department implemented the following strategies to increase the response rate and ensure representativeness of all groups of parents in this data collection. To increase Parent Survey response rate, the Department expanded the online survey for parents to respond in the following languages: Hawaiian, Marshallese, Spanish and Tagalog. Additional languages continue to be available by using the translated pdf version as a reference while completing the online English version. The Department will continue to update the online survey to make it available for parents to respond in other languages without having to use the pdf version as a reference. Furthermore, the Department translated the parent handout in 15 languages other than English. This handout was developed to provide parents with questions and answers to help with the understanding of the purpose of the survey and its importance. The handout can be found at <https://www.hawaiiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/Parent%20Involvement%20Survey%20Handout.pdf>.

Quarterly reports with response rate were shared with each CA and school. Based on the feedback from stakeholders, for School Year 2022-2023, the Department is revising the frequency of monitoring and sharing the return rate for each school and CA from quarterly to daily. This will encourage schools and CAs to develop strategies that will foster parents to complete and submit the survey which eventually will increase parental involvement towards improving program implementation. In addition, the Department will work with each CA to ensure a device is made available at the school level for the parents to take the survey after a meeting is completed. Lastly, in the Spring of 2023, a workgroup is planned to review the current Parent Survey, analyze surveys from other states and provide recommendations for a possible revision with the purpose of increasing response rate and support program implementation.

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 Hawaii in regard to schools' facilitation of parent involvement. OSEP requires that the states' performance be reported as the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement. Deriving a percent from a continuous distribution requires application of a standard of 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 report 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 Hawaii the opportunity to complete the survey. In total, 19,655

paper surveys were distributed, and 1,149 surveys were returned, yielding an overall response rate of 5.8%. 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 54.48% unweighted (626 respondents had a measure at or above 600 of the 1149 surveys received). Fifty-four point forty-eight percent (54.48%) of parents of students with disabilities in Hawaii 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 Hawaii's official data for FFY 2021.

The Department's mean measure on the SEPPS is 624 with a standard deviation of 155. The standard error of the sample means is 4.6. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 614.6–632.5. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state mean, 624, is within this range. To prevent the impact of a potential nonresponse bias, the data was weighted and analyzed by two demographic characteristics of the children receiving special education services in the State: race/ethnicity and primary disability. The weighted data had a similar measure of 624 and 625 when weighted by race/ethnicity and by primary disability respectively.

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 624 and 625 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 doing a comparison of 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 Hawaiian 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 95% confidence interval for the special education student population in Hawaii.

To summarize, the Department's official results, 626 (54.48% unweighted) parents out of 1149 respondents perceived that schools facilitated their involvement is above the mean response of 624 (54.31%). This is within the 95% confidence interval for the true population mean in Hawaii, which ranges between 614.6–632.5 (53.49 to 55.05%). The weighted analysis of potential nonresponse bias had a mean measure of 624 (54.31%) and 625 (54.40%) 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 offer both paper and web-based surveys in multiple languages. The Department expanded the online survey for parents to respond in the following languages: Hawaiian, Marshallese, Spanish and Tagalog. Furthermore, the Department translated the parent handout in 15 languages other than English. This handout was developed to provide parents with questions and answers to help with the understanding of the purpose of the survey and its importance. The handout can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/Parent%20Involvement%20Survey%20Handout.pdf>.

Quarterly reports with response rate were shared with each CA and school. Based on the feedback from stakeholders, for School Year 2022-2023, the Department is planning to implement the following strategies to increase representatives in the response rate:

- Revise the frequency of monitoring and sharing the return rate for each school and CA from quarterly to daily. This will encourage schools and CAs to develop strategies that will foster parents to complete and submit the survey which eventually will increase parental involvement towards improving program implementation.
- Collaborate with each CA to ensure a device is made available at the school level for the parents to take the survey after a meeting is completed.
- Continue to work with the CCCs and various disability organizations and parent groups to promote awareness of the survey in the communities to bolster representation.
- Steer a statewide workgroup to review the current Parent Survey, conduct research of surveys used nationwide, and make recommendations on a possible revision of the survey with the purpose of increasing response rate and support program implementation.

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding 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.

On December 9, 2021 a stakeholder meeting was conducted to review, analyze and discuss Indicator 8 data and strategies. 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 the purposes of this analysis, in complying with the new requirements for representativeness of survey respondents, Hawaii 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 Hawaii in regard to schools' facilitation of parent involvement. OSEP requires that the states' performance be reported as the percent 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 report 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 624, with a standard deviation of 155. The standard error of the sample mean is 4.6. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 614.6–632.5. 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 disability category. The weighted data had a similar mean measure of 625 when

weighted by race/ethnicity and by disability category.

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 2021 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 Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander' were found to be underrepresented in the sample by 17.68% and 9.04%, respectively. On the other hand, the groups identified as having 'Two or more races' and 'Asian' were overrepresented in the data collected by 20.18% and 4.56%, 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' (11.74%), 'Autism Spectrum Disorder' (8.03%), and 'Multiple Disabilities' (6.50%). In contrast, two groups were underrepresented in the sample: 'Specific Learning Disability' (20.82%) and 'Other Health Impairment' (9.99%).

The demographics of the parents 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

Based on the feedback from stakeholders, for FFY 2022, the Department will implement the following strategies to increase representativeness in the response rate:

- Revise the frequency of monitoring and sharing the return rate for each school and CA from quarterly to daily. This will encourage schools and CAs to develop strategies that will foster parents to complete and submit the survey which eventually will increase parental involvement towards improving representativeness and program implementation.
- Collaborate with each CA to ensure a device is made available at the school level for parents to respond to the survey after a meeting is completed.
- Continue to work with the CCCs, various disability organizations, and parent groups to promote awareness of the survey in the communities to bolster representation.
- Steer a statewide workgroup to review the current Parent Survey, conduct research of surveys used nationwide, and make recommendations on a possible revision of the survey with the purpose of increasing response rate and support program implementation.
- Expand the online survey for parents to respond in the following languages: Hawaiian, Marshallese, Spanish, and Tagalog.

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

To determine representativeness, an overrepresentation was based on a discrepancy of at least 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 3 percentage points or less than that of the Department's percentage in any race/ethnicity or disability group. Differences of less than 3 percentage points between respondent and Department 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' and 'Native Hawaiian 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' also had lower participation rates. Although these groups had lower participation rates, the unweighted official result is within 95% confidence interval for the special education student population in Hawaii.

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)

The school year 2021-2022 reflects the first full year of in-person learning with the numerous lingering COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges that negatively impacted the social-emotional development of students, the wellbeing of staff and a rise in chronic absenteeism. Despite these challenges, the survey return rate remained similar to the school year 2020-2021.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - 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.

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, etc. 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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.

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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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:

Hawaii 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 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 over-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.

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 Hawaii for children aged 5 who are 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 Memorandum 09-02, 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 state average for a group is 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.

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 Hawaiian 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 group 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 Hawaii. 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.

Beginning in FFY 2020, the reporting requirements changed for states to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data to include children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Because of this data requirement change, the Department established a new baseline using FFY 2020 data. For FFY 2021, 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 for indicator 9, there were two (2) groups over-identified (Hispanic or Latino (HI) and Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders (PI)), with 808 students in the HI group and 742 students in the PI group (students identified in SY 2021-2022). To ensure appropriate policies and procedures in the identification of students with disabilities are conducted appropriately, the Department reviewed additional files, exceeding the 95% confidence level, 10% margin of error, having conducted a review of 137 (HI) and 139 (PI) student files.

All students in the analysis samples for indicator 9 were identified randomly and made available for the review team. Each file for all 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 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 Memo 09-02, 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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, etc. 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 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

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.

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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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:

Hawaii 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):

For over-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.

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 Hawaii. 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 Memorandum 09-02, 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 state average for a group is 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 Hawaiian 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 group 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 Hawaii. 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.

Beginning in FFY 2020, the reporting requirements changed for states to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data to include children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Because of this data requirement change, the Department established a new baseline using FFY 2020 data. For FFY 2021, 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 for Indicator 10, the over-identified ethnic groups by ethnicity in SY 2021-2022 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 for White, and SLD, OHI, ED, and Intellectual Disability (ID) for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander students. The sample sizes were the following: Hispanic/Latino with 69 (SLD), 51 (OHI) and 22 (ED) students found eligible, White with 53 (OHI), 58 (SLI) and 47 (AUT) eligible students, and 71 (SLD), 43 (OHI), 19 (ED), 29 (ID) eligible students for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander initial eligibility students.

All students in the analysis samples for Indicator 10 were identified randomly and made available for the review team. Each file for all of 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, 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 the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, 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 2020

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 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.25%	95.20%	95.39%	92.52%	96.56%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3,995	3,936	96.56%	100%	98.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

59

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 2021-2022:

- A total of 3995 Initial Evaluations were received.
- 59 Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 98.52% 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 59 Initial Evaluations were completed beyond timelines.
- 24 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 25 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 8 were completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 2 were completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

- A total of 59 Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.
- 7 were delayed due to the provider not being available.
 - 23 were delayed due to the provider's report not being available.
 - 11 were delayed due to COVID-19.
 - 18 were delayed due to "other" reasons.

Eligible IDEA:

- A total of 3386 Initial Evaluations were IDEA eligible.
- 45 eligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 98.67% 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 45 Initial Evaluations found IDEA eligible were completed beyond timelines.
- 18 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 19 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 7 were completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 1 was completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

- A total of 45 Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.
- 5 were delayed due to the provider not being available.
 - 17 were delayed due to the provider's report not being available.
 - 8 were delayed due to COVID-19.
 - 15 were delayed due to "other" reasons.

Not Eligible IDEA:

- A total of 609 Initial Evaluations were IDEA ineligible.
- 14 ineligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 97.70% 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 14 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were completed beyond timelines.
- 6 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline
 - 6 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 1 was completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
 - 1 was completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

- A total of 14 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.
- 2 were delayed due to the provider not being available.
 - 6 were delayed due to the provider's report not being available.
 - 3 were delayed due to COVID-19.
 - 3 were delayed due to "other" reasons.

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 2021-2022. 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)

The percentage of evaluations conducted within timelines increased from 96.56% to 98.52% for this reporting period. The Department recognizes that the timeliness to complete initial evaluations within the 60 days was impacted by the subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department continues in its efforts towards improving the coordination of documentation (e.g. out of state evaluations and IEPs, private school reports, etc.) towards ensuring timely evaluations and eligibility.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
31	31	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

FFY 2020 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 31 complexes, based on a total of 113 cases of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation (60-day timeline, 34 CFR §300.301(c)). In keeping with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02 Prong 2, in order to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing the 60-day timeline, the Department reviewed subsequent 60-day timeline data collected through the eCSSS database and verified that 100% of these subsequent files were compliant, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

In accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the Department has verified for Indicator 11 each complex that was notified of noncompliance has demonstrated they have met the two prongs of correction within one year of the finding:

- each individual case of noncompliance is corrected; and
- each complex that did not meet the 100% compliance demonstrated evidence of achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.

The Department notified in writing the 31 complexes that noncompliance was corrected and verified.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

OSEP Memorandum 09-02 Prong 1: The Department identified findings in 31 complexes, based on a total of 113 instances of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation (60-day timeline, 34 CFR §300.301(c)). The Department reviewed the files of these 113 eligible and ineligible students through the eCSSS database and verified all had their evaluations completed, although late, and all eligible students had an IEP developed. Written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents and the District Educational Specialists of the 31 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. 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 satisfying Prong 2.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The Department has issued findings for the reported noncompliance in FFY 2020. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the Department reported the verification of correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The Department has also described the actions that were taken to verify the correction.

11 - OSEP Response**11 - 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.

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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.96%	94.98%	93.27%	85.86%	79.07%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	349
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.	269
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.	18
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	5
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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 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.	269	297	79.07%	100%	90.57%	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

28

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 primary factors affecting compliance with the requirement to have an IEP implemented by age three were that transition notices were received late from Part C and schools did not conduct the Request for Evaluation in a timely manner upon receipt of the Part C Transition Notice. Twenty eight children were included in (a) but not in (b), (c), (d), or (e).

The analysis as follows:

-13 children 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 children's third birthday.

-12 children were delayed in the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP development process.

-3 children were timely referred and met eligibility timelines; however, did not have an IEP implemented by the child's third birthday.

Range of Days Beyond Age 3

The number of days beyond the third birthday ranged from 1 to 138.

of Days Eligibility/Services were Delayed Beyond the Child's Third Birthday and # of Cases

- 1-10 Days - 6 cases
- 11-30 Days - 7 cases
- 31-60 Days - 8 cases
- 60 Days or greater - 7 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 this indicator is derived from a report in the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database, "Preschool Services by Age 3." This report pulls data from individual student electronic files and includes all children who reached age three and were referred for an initial evaluation during SY 2021-2022. For each child, the report includes:

- Birthdate - Date of the child's third birthday
- Date the school received the referral
- Number of days the referral was received prior to the third birthday
- Date the parent signed consent for the initial evaluation
- Date the evaluation is projected to be completed (In Hawaii, evaluations are considered complete when services are available; 60 days from consent.)
- Evaluation Status (IDEA eligible, IDEA ineligible, withdrawn, consent revoked)
- Referral Source (Part C) - Transition Notice - Date the initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) was held
- Date services were made available

The data from the report generated for SY 2020-2021 was reviewed and analyzed to ensure the accuracy of the information by the Monitoring and Compliance Branch.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The number of referrals from Part C to B has gradually decreased over the past 2 years, dropping from 565 (pre-Covid) to 402 and for SY 2021-22, 349 referrals. This is likely a result of the national pandemic of COVID-19, with parents opting out and refraining from having their child be referred from Part C to B. In discussions with the Department of Health, Part C has also seen a decrease in their number of referrals. The Department continues in its efforts to collaborate with Part C and the community towards improving the timeliness of transitions from Part C to Part B.

The Department in collaboration with Part C, Early Intervention and the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC) to address systemic issues of personnel shortages (e.g. speech-language pathologists, occupational and physical therapists, etc.) that can impact the timeliness of an assessment being conducted or an assessment report being completed.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
23	23	0	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

FFY 2020 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 23 complexes, based on a total of 72 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 Plan (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday. In keeping with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02 Prong 2, in order 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 of students who were referred from Part C to Part B and verified that 100% of these subsequent files were compliant, consistent with 34 CFR §300.124(b). In accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the Department has verified for Indicator 12 each complex that was notified of noncompliance has demonstrated they have met the two prongs of correction within one year of the finding:

- 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 updated data.

The Department notified in writing the 23 complexes that noncompliance was corrected and verified.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 1: The Department issued findings of noncompliance in 23 complexes. The Department reviewed the 72 instances in the 23 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), satisfying Prong 1 verification. Written notification informed the 23 Complex Area Superintendents and the District Educational Specialists 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.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 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 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

The Department has issued findings for the reported noncompliance in FFY 2020. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the Department reported the verification of correction of noncompliance consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The Department has also described the actions that were taken to verify the correction.

12 - OSEP Response**12 - 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.

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 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, etc.) 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 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	74.14%	64.62%	69.21%	13.57%	14.12%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
105	567	14.12%	100%	18.52%	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 Department used the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) to gather data for the State's monitoring of Indicator 13. The eCSSS 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 that were developed during July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022, the Department used 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 Hawaii'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)

Secondary transition continues to be a priority area for the Department. In response, the Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) and the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) provided a series of training to complex areas and schools on the eight areas required by Indicator 13 for compliant secondary transition plans. The Department is committed to improving transition service planning for our students with disabilities and will continue to partner with our community agencies as well as receive Technical Assistance (TA) from OSEP-approved TA centers.

On November 18, 2022, the Department engaged stakeholders in reviewing the overall performance for Indicator 13 and soliciting their feedback on improvement activities. The agenda can be accessed at <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>. A copy of the presentation can be accessed at <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/SEAC-November-18-2022-Indicator-13-Performance.pdf>.

In addition the Department shared with the stakeholders transition program updates which included the development of the secondary transition website. The website can be accessed at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/secondarytransition/home>.

Description of Stakeholder Input:

- The stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities:
- Start earlier than high school; approach transition training for intermediate level.
- Move away from the checkbox mentality - address best practices for IEP meetings.
- Streamline training in transition assessments in all grades.
- Offer transition electives for students - address job skills, interview skills, other things to prepare them for college, etc.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020

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	0

FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

Numerous COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges continued across Hawaii's public schools. The pandemic's impact had a severe impact on the physical and mental well-being of students, parents, teachers and community members. Many of the pandemic challenges affected not only schooling, but also had an effect on unemployment, career security and job educational opportunities. These conditions should be considered when examining Indicator 13 data.

The Department identified findings of noncompliance in 41 complexes based on 505 files of students with IEPs aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the requirements related to Indicator 13. Thus, the Department issued 41 findings of noncompliance statewide.

Written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendent and the District Educational Specialist for each of the 41 complexes of the noncompliance findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the OSEP Memorandum 09-02: (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Department, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

The Department reviewed verified that:

- each of the 505 individual cases in 41 complexes with a finding of noncompliance, reflected in the FFY 2020 data reported for this indicator, have been corrected, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Department; and

- the 41 complexes met the 100% compliance as determined by a subsequent data review, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Department, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

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 505 files of students aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the requirements related to Indicator 13. Individual student files identified as noncompliant were reviewed to verify correction of noncompliance. For students reported as no longer within the jurisdiction of the Department, the Department verified that the students exited (moved, graduated, or dropped out) to ensure the individual correction of noncompliance was no longer required.

The Department reviewed and verified that all 505 individual cases of noncompliance in 41 complexes were corrected consistent with the requirements of the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	26	26	0

FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

Written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendent and the District Educational Specialist for each of the 26 complexes of the outstanding noncompliance findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

The Department's Monitoring and Compliance (MAC) staff met with each of the 26 complexes to review their data and continued to monitor these 26 complexes to ensure 100% compliance is met on a review of subsequent data. The MAC and Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) staff provided extensive support and training to these 26 complexes on the requirements of Indicator 13.

The MAC reviewed subsequent data, and verified that the 26 complexes met the 100% compliance consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case of noncompliance* was corrected

All of the individual cases of noncompliance were corrected and reported in FFY 2020.

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 26 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in [FFY 2019 (and add other years, as needed)]: (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 2021 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 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

In FFY 2021, the Department reported on the correction and verification of correction of the remaining 26 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019. They were verified as corrected consistent with the requirements in OSEP Memo 09-02. The Department has issued findings for the reported noncompliance in FFY 2020. In FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the Department reported the verification of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. The Department has also described the actions that were taken to verify the correction.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - 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.

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 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 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, etc.).

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 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 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.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, 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	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target ≥	35.00%	35.00%	40.00%	40.00%	19.78%
A	19.78%	Data	36.34%	35.17%	34.15%	31.05%	19.78%
B	2020	Target ≥	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%	70.69%
B	70.69%	Data	85.04%	85.69%	79.95%	72.73%	70.69%
C	2020	Target ≥	87.00%	87.00%	88.00%	90.00%	75.32%
C	75.32%	Data	93.11%	93.05%	88.35%	80.45%	75.32%

FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A ≥	23.10%	26.40%	29.70%	33.00%	36.30%
Target B ≥	73.70%	76.70%	79.70%	82.70%	85.70%
Target C ≥	78.90%	82.40%	86.00%	89.50%	93.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior

to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

On December 9, 2022, the Department, in collaboration with SEAC, invited internal and external stakeholders to review the data and targets for indicator 14 and discuss strategies for improvement. The stakeholders did not suggest any changes in targets for this indicator for FFY 2021. For FFY 2021, the Department did not meet the set targets, as students who exited in SY 2020-2021 were still impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Stakeholders suggested the following strategies for improvement:

- Introduce the topic of transition while students are in elementary and intermediate schools.
- Encourage teachers to build relationships and routinely reach out to graduated students to see how they are succeeding in postsecondary settings.
- Offer alternate diplomas to special education students.
- Expand awareness that the Department collects data on what students are doing after high school.
- Offer more transition electives for students to address job skills, interview skills, prep for college, etc.

- Offer Post-School Outcomes flyers in other languages.
- Further analyze data for students who report they are not enrolled in postsecondary education or employed.

To promote community stakeholder awareness and engagement, SPIN developed additional infographics for select SPP/APR indicators, the Indicator 14 resource, and can be found on the SPIN's website of the SPP/APR stakeholder meeting at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-stakeholder-meeting/>.

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,268
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	779
Response Rate	61.44%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	169
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	370
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)	38
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).	37

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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	169	779	19.78%	23.10%	21.69%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	539	779	70.69%	73.70%	69.19%	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)	614	779	75.32%	78.90%	78.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	The numerous challenges and subsequent consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic continued to impact the performance of Indicator 14. Data indicates that while the Department did not meet its targets on the three measures, slight gains were made in measurements A and C. For measurement B, the Department had a slippage of 1.5 percentage points. This slippage may in part be caused by the increased enrollment in higher education (13 additional students). This is reinforced by responses to the question, "What is the main reason you have not worked since leaving high school?". In FY 2021, 17 students responded, "I am in school/ job training/other education program", compared to 10 in FFY 2020. Two other categories that saw increases included: "I can't work because of my disability" (FY2020: 23; FY2021: 33) and "I don't know how to find a job" (FY2020: 2; FFY2021: 6). The survey included an optional question asking respondents if COVID-19 impacted their plans since leaving high school. Respondents were allowed to select various reasons for why their post school activities were impacted. While the number of respondents slightly decreased, COVID-19 continued to impact the ability of student alumni to enroll in higher education, some other postsecondary education

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	or training program, to become competitively employed, or some other employment. In FFY 2021, 223 respondents (28.62%) indicated that COVID-19 has impacted their plans since leaving high school, compared to 272 respondents (38.14%) in FFY 2020. In FY 2021, 65 respondents (8.34%) selected they preferred not to answer, and 90 respondents (11.55%) skipped the question. This suggests that if these additional respondents had opted to respond, more would have reported being impacted by COVID-19 in one or more ways. Additional analysis related to the COVID-19 question indicates: - 54 of the respondents (24.21%) that participated in the optional question related to COVID-19 reported that they were not able to enroll in or complete a term in school, job training, or education program, -35 of the respondents (15.69%) reported they were unable to access education/training support services, -54 of the respondents (24.21%) reported they were unable to get a job, and -31 of the respondents (13.90%) reported they were not able to access employment support services. An additional 95 respondents selected that their post-school activities were impacted by "other reasons" not listed from the choices given, which constitutes 12.19% of all respondents. The selection of "other reason" prompted respondents to type in an individualized response. The most common responses were related to postponing plans due to the pandemic, difficulties with virtual learning, and social-emotional impacts. The COVID-19 pandemic continued to limit employment opportunities. Historically, tourism made up over 20% of the state's economy. However, travel restrictions for Asian visitors, most notably from Japan, continued to impact the visitor industry, more specifically hotels, retail and restaurants. The Japanese government finally lifted travel restrictions in October 2022. Oahu has been disproportionately impacted due to dependence on international visitors and the recent ban on transient vacation rentals which has resulted in fewer vacation rentals. Furthermore, younger workers were most impacted by raising unemployment rates as a result of the pandemic. (Source: https://tax.hawaii.gov/blog/10-changes-in-tourism-industry/).

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	2020	2021
Response Rate	58.25%	61.44%

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

A priority area for the Department has been to ensure the representativeness of all groups of students in this data collection. The Department operates a data dashboard with live data at the 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. The Department will continue to provide annual training that directs survey implementers to continually track representation of student groups within their respective School or CA Dashboard to ensure representativeness in next year's data collection. Additionally, the Department sends out benchmark reports during the data collection window which helps motivate CA and school staff and target outreach to ensure representativeness.

The response rate increased from 58.25% in FFY 2020 to 61.44% in FFY 2021. In addition to ensuring the representativeness of all groups of students in this data collection, the Department has also prioritized the accessibility of the survey for participation. The Department allows students to take the survey via paper copy, electronic/online copy, or to respond to the survey questions via phone. 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. Based on the feedback from 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 student alumni and families.

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. A survey informational flyer was developed to promote awareness of the post school outcome survey. A copy of the flyer can be accessed at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KQqie4ENvg5b3X3Obd0mzaaQk2hgwAxV/view?usp=sharing>. In addition, staff collect contact information prior to students exiting the Department to facilitate receiving responses one year after their exit.

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.

Implementation of the online survey and data dashboard has continued to increase the number of survey respondents. In FFY 2021, 779 of 1268 student alumni (61.44%) completed the survey compared to 713 of 1224 student alumni (58.25%) in FFY 2020. While the return rate increase was only 3.19 percentage points, the response rate continues to increase (FFY 2019: 19.11% increase; FFY 2020: 5.01% increase, FFY 2021: 5.46% increase).

The Department examined the response rates for FFY 2021 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 disability categories. Using the -3/+3% methodology to compare the composition of the target group and the respondent group using these categories, no specific group was under or overrepresented. Therefore, based on the return rate of surveys and the comparison of the composition of respondents and target populations, the Department does not believe there was any nonresponse bias in this year's results.

Reviewing the demographic analysis and results of the survey respondents, the Department believes the respondents are representative of the Hawaii leavers in SY 2020-21, and the results are a true value of the actual leavers. Based on the response rate and the representativeness of the three demographic characteristics of race/ethnicity, disability categories and types of exit, it is expected that any differences in outcomes across the various groups (e.g., if dropout or students with severe cognitive disabilities were underrepresented in our response, items A and perhaps B would be overestimated in our results, but that is not the case) did not cause any bias on the results.

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% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group, based on three demographics: race/ethnicity (the seven federal categories); types of exit (graduation with a regular diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, and dropout), and the disability categories. No group within these three demographic categories were identified as over or underrepresented in the respondent group. All categories within these three groups were within the +/-3% discrepancy rate.

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)

YES

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

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% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group, based on three demographics: race/ethnicity (the seven federal categories); types of exit (graduation with a regular diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, and dropout), and the disability categories.

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)

NA

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

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 EDFacts 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	38
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	18

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 primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse

group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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 stakeholders did not make any changes to the targets.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	64.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	44.00%	45.00%	45.00%	60.00%	66.00%
Data	43.59%	89.74%	59.57%	64.00%	29.73%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	68.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
18	38	29.73%	68.00%	47.37%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

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 EDFacts 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 resolution 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 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	9
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	5

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 primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVtzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at: <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

In accordance with OSEP instructions, the Department is not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations held is less than ten (10). Since School Year (SY) 20-21, the Department has worked with external and internal stakeholders to increase awareness, promote the use of mediation and educate parents. As a result, the Department's use of mediation increased from 4 mediations held in SY 20-21 to 9 mediations held in SY 21-22.

The Department recognizes the importance of mediation in resolving disputes and continues to work with community partners to devise a plan of action to increase the use of mediation across the State.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=					
Data	50.00%	0.00%	80.00%	42.86%	50.00%

Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=					

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	5	9	50.00%		66.67%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

NA

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to meet its 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) for Children with Disabilities.

Targets: In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, 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) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 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 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, 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., Feb 2022). 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 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

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 (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., 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 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023 for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) 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 Hawaii 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 Hawaii 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	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target> =	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

FFY 2021 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 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
202	1,785	10.54%	50.00%	11.32%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.

Department SY 2021-2022 Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA)

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.

The data demonstrates the proficiency of 3rd and 4th grade students combined (eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL) who took the SBA for ELA/Literacy in FFY 2020 was 10.54%. The data also demonstrates the proficiency of 3rd and 4th grade students combined (eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL) who took the SBA for ELA/Literacy in FFY 2021 was 11.32%. An analysis of the difference in proficiency levels between FFY 2020 and FFY 2021 reveals an increase in proficiency in FFY 2021 of 3rd and 4th grade students combined (eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL) of 0.78%.

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 eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL on the SBA for ELA/Literacy. The MGP is calculated by taking the individual Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for each student, then 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 eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL on the SBA for ELA/Literacy for FFY 2021 is 32. Although the Department did not meet the MGP target set at 60, Complex Areas 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:

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 Complex Area (CA) leaders, who, in turn, strive to build the capacity of educators and administrators within their CA. Occasionally, the Department will work collaboratively and simultaneously with both 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 State Offices provides tailored technical assistance for CA based on specific requests for support. The following infrastructure improvement strategies are examples of the tri-level systems of support implemented to address ELA proficiency of the SiMR:

Speech-Language Pathologist (SLP) and 619 Coordinators PLCs

The ESB is committed to starting with our youngest children to build strong foundational skills for early learners. Knowing that there is a strong reciprocal relationship between the development of oral language and the acquisition of reading and writing, monthly PLCs with Speech Language Pathologists (619) and preschool resource teachers (619) focused on professional development that demonstrated the need for explicit, targeted language and literacy instruction. Teams were also involved in reviews of evaluation findings and IEPs to determine if goals and the provision of services were aligned with student needs. Professional development needs were planned and outlined based on review findings.

Use of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Funds, American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARP) Funds, Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) ESSER III Funds

The ESB implemented a CA fiscal planning process to ensure CA IDEA Part B, ARP, and ESSER funds were used to address PD and implementation of literacy EBP. CAs identified personnel, projected timelines of completion, and measurement instruments to improve student outcomes in the areas listed below:

- Professional Learning opportunities on Foundational Reading Instruction for Students with Disabilities.
- Professional Learning opportunities on the development and implementation of specially designed instruction.
- Determine fidelity of implementation of specially designed instruction (SDI) and evidence-based interventions.
- Provide ongoing coaching to support school-wide efforts to support all teachers in need of additional guidance.

In addition, CAs used ARP and ESSER funds to provide summer learning opportunities to mitigate the negative effects of COVID in regards to ELA..

Inclusive Practices

The ESB is committed to serving all students in inclusive environments. Over the past five school years, the ESB, in collaboration with Stetson and Associates conducted inclusive practices implementation training and consultation to schools statewide in the initiative titled "Hui Pu Project." In FFY 2021, the ESB implemented several scale up strategies to support CA training to ensure all teams have the skills to support schools in effective implementation of inclusive practices. In FFY 2021, the ESB hosted a statewide inclusive practices conference and established 5 inclusive practices demonstration sites. The ESB hosted monthly Professional Learning Network meetings with CAs to develop plans to scale up the initiative across the CA. The ESB also hosted several professional development and modeling opportunities for CA teams.

DES Meetings

Seven (7) meetings were held throughout the school year. The meetings provided the DESs with opportunities to share strategies implemented to improve academic and functional outcomes for SWDs during FFY 2021. The specific topics covered to help DESs build the capacity of their CA staff regarding the SiMR was the introduction of the Language and Literacy Initiative, high leverage practices, and introduction to the foundations of specially designed instruction. The meetings also provided ESB with the opportunity to support DESs to refine their Project Plans to include staff and activities to directly support improved literacy outcomes for their SiMR population. Rosters and meeting notes are available.

Focused Technical Assistance for CAs

The ESB provided direct and personalized technical assistance (TA) to each CA to assist them in the process of identifying the root causes of proficiency rates in ELA and Math for the SiMR population in their CAs. CAs were taught how to use the Root Cause Analysis Template to determine areas of need and ESB met with each CA monthly as they completed their templates.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FtkM4nJJYf7_FpykIDjNBAIgL0AhBlg_/edit

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.

The following is a description of the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure activity.

Speech-Language Pathologist (SLP) and 619 Coordinators/Preschool RT PLCs.

100% of SLP and preschool resource teacher (PSRT) teams met monthly. Learning focused on the critical oral language and literacy foundational skills required to become proficient readers. Participants completed the professional development Language Essential for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) for Early Childhood curriculum. Teams established relationships with seven preschool classroom teachers and principals across the state. The purpose was to provide PSRT/SLP teams the opportunity to practice language and literacy strategies on selected students to ensure quality standards.. Outcome: participants had the opportunity to practice and develop their own skills with implementation of focused and targeted language and literacy skills, and explore building teacher/coach relationships. Participants used the Early Learners Assessment Tool to review assessment reports and IEPs of early learners. Suggestions for use of the tool were submitted to improve ease of use. Outcome: Tools helped participants focus and identify language and literacy areas that were/were not addressed in assessments and/or IEPs and appropriateness of provision of services in preschool environments.

Use of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Funds, American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARP) Funds, Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) ESSER III Funds

One-hundred percent (100%), or 15 of 15, CAs developed a CA Project Plan which addressed fiscal management and accountability, utilization of staff, and services that are redesigned to directly support improving literacy outcomes for their SiMR population. The CA Project Plans included activities such as (a) provide teachers with professional development on foundational reading instruction, (b) use ongoing assessment tools such as iReady, Imagine Learning, Lexia Core 5, STAR, etc., (c) ensure fidelity of implementation of foundational reading instruction and evidence-based interventions, (d) provide ongoing coaching to support school-wide efforts to support all teachers in need of additional guidance. Each activity includes a measurement instrument, identified lead personnel, projected timeline, and ongoing status updates. The CA Project Plans were developed in FFY 2021, and continue to be implemented in FFY 2022 and the upcoming years. To address the changing needs of the CA, CA Project Plans are reviewed and updated not less than annually.

Inclusive Practices (IP)

The FFY 2021 least restrictive environment (LRE) is 52.54% of SWD ages 6 through 21 are in the general education class 80% or more of the day. This is a 1.83% increase from FFY 2020 baseline. Nineteen (19) Online Inclusive Practices Courses, which include training on classroom accommodations and differentiated instruction are available through the Department PD platform (PDE3). Each CA has a Professional Learning Network (PLN) member to continue providing support to schools to ensure statewide capacity building efforts are maintained. Thirty-three PLN members have completed their training and are certified to present Step by Step Inclusive Training to Schools. Participating schools increased from 167 to 209 schools. Rosters and meeting notes are available.

DES Meetings

One-hundred percent (100%), or 15 of 15, developed a CA Project Plan which addressed fiscal management and accountability, utilization of staff, and services that are redesigned to directly support improving literacy outcomes for their SiMR population. The DES meeting covered topics such as the introduction of the Language and Literacy Initiative, high leverage practices, and introduction to the foundations of specially designed instruction. These topics helped the DESs design and refine their CA Project Plan regarding improving ELA performance. Rosters and meeting notes are available.

Focused Technical Assistance

To investigate root causes of ELA proficiency and Math scores for their SiMR population, One-hundred percent (100%), or 15 of 15 CAs used the Root Cause Analysis Template to assist in identifying the areas of need in the following: a) Personnel Capacity, b) Policy and Procedures, and c) Curriculum and Instruction.

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.

Speech Language Pathologist (SLP) and 619 Coordinators PLCs

Using the LETRS for Early Childhood Educators as the foundational model, the next step will focus on strategies to improve language and literacy based on the Science of Reading. Participants will also participate in the LLI training on effective coaching professional development. The anticipated outcome will be that 100% of SLP and 619 coordinators will use coaching strategies to address instructional practices with teachers and/or parents when developing student needs, IEP goals, and provision of interventions in naturally occurring environments and activities.

Use of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Funds, American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARP) Funds, Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) ESSER III Funds

Successful implementation of activities and impact on student outcomes for each CA's FFY 2021 Project plan will be assessed to determine areas for needed improvement. The anticipated outcome will be that use of this assessment will be used to course correct and/or adjust planning as needed so that the next step can be taken whereas the Department effectively directs funds to identified areas of need.

Inclusive Practices (IP)

Each CA PLN member will continue to provide support and training to schools to ensure statewide capacity building efforts that were instituted by Stetson and Associates are maintained. The next steps will include regularly scheduled meetings with PLN members to provide updates, share resources, and provide guidance. The ESB will continue to augment the Inclusive Practices online resource bank with resources for PLN members, the public, DOE leaders, and educators. These resources include free PDE3 non-credit courses, a public-facing Inclusive Practices website that houses the Inclusive Practices Conference Recordings, Parent Resources, and information on Spotlight Schools. Additionally in FFY 2022, ESB will host a series of Statewide learning opportunities for teachers and Educational Assistants as well as free credited Inclusive Practices courses on PDE3. The anticipated outcome will be that schools will continue to meet and/or exceed LRE targets set by the state.

DES Meetings

Monthly DESs meetings will continue to provide professional learning on topics identified as areas of needed support in the field. Topics will include the Science of Reading, identifying the root cause of students' learning gap, development of effective specially designed instruction, expanding stakeholder engagement, delivery of high quality preschool instruction. The anticipated outcome will be that DESs will have increased knowledge and skills in the selected topic areas to successfully provide guidance and TA to the special education providers.

Focused Technical Assistance

The ESB will continue to provide targeted support to meet the unique needs of each CA. Trends identified from the data collected from the Root Cause Analysis will be addressed. PLCs will be in full implementation in FFY 2022 as part of the Department's General Supervision universal support with a continued focus on student outcomes in language and literacy. The anticipated outcome is through the PLCs, the CA will be better informed to plan for the use of their IDEA funds, prioritize and leverage CA initiatives, and support schools with their academic and fiscal planning.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

The following evidence-based programs were implemented. These evidence-based programs addressed the Science of Reading components which are language comprehension and word recognition:

Read 180/System 44

Achieve 3000

Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI)

LETRS Professional Learning for Teachers

Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing Program

Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention

Lexia PowerUp Literacy

Reading Plus

Success for All

Sound Partners

The following evidenced-based practices were implemented:

Multi-sensory language instruction

Dialogic Reading

Guided Repeated Reading

Self-Regulatory Strategy Development

Summarization Strategies

Explicit vocabulary instruction

Systematic Phonological Awareness Training

Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS)

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Evidence-Based Programs (EBPs)

Read 180:

Blended learning reading intervention program for students in grades 4-12.

System 44:

Intervention program targeting foundational reading skills for students in grades 3-12.

Achieve 3000:

Supplemental online literacy program that provides nonfiction reading content to students in grades preK–12; focuses on building phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing skills.

Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI):

Multi-tiered program (Tier 1 and Tier 2) that targets teaching routines designed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of reading instruction in kindergarten, first, and second grade.

LETRS Professional Learning for Teachers:

Blended professional learning model for teachers to develop knowledge and application of effective language and literacy instruction.

Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing Program:

Intervention program that teaches students the oral-motor movements of phonemes and to verify the identity, number, and sequence of sounds in words.

Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention:

One-to-three small-group tutoring model taught by literacy specialists to struggling readers in grades K-2.

Lexia PowerUp Literacy:

Adaptive, blended learning model that provides explicit, systematic instruction to address gaps in foundational literacy skills.

Reading Plus:

Web-based literacy program for grades 3-12 that includes a valid and reliable assessment and is designed to strengthen reading comprehension, vocabulary, efficiency, and motivation.

Success for All:

K-5 reading curriculum that focuses on phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, and vocabulary development, beginning with phonetically-controlled mini-books in grades K-1.

Sound Partners:

One-to-one tutoring program that uses paraprofessionals as tutors. Students receive tutoring 30 minutes a day, 4 days a week, for 18-20 weeks focusing on phonics, phonemic awareness, sight words, and oral reading practice using decodable texts.

Evidenced-Based Practices

Multi-sensory language instruction:

The use of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic-tactile pathways simultaneously to enhance memory and learning of language.

Dialogic Reading:

The process of having a structured dialogue with children about the text they are reading.

Guided Repeated Reading:

Reading fluency intervention in which students orally read a single passage multiple times (with error correction) in order to reach a certain accuracy rate or criterion, or to complete a prescribed number of readings.

Self-Regulatory Strategy Development:

Intervention designed to improve students' academic skills through a six-step process that teaches students specific academic strategies and self-regulation skills.

Summarization Strategies:

Strategies to help students determine the most important ideas in a text passage and to consolidate supporting details.

Explicit vocabulary instruction:

Vocabulary instruction that provides students with both definitional and contextual information about a word, offers multiple exposures to the word, and engages students in active practice that fosters deep processing about a word's meaning and use.

Systematic Phonological Awareness Training:

Various activities that focus on teaching children to identify, detect, delete, segment, or blend segments of spoken words (i.e., words, syllables, onsets and rimes, phonemes) or that focus on teaching children to detect, identify, or produce rhyme or alliteration.

Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS):

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) is a peer-tutoring instructional program that supplements the primary reading curriculum. Two pairs of students work together on reading activities intended to improve reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

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.

Although schools reported using evidenced-based programs and evidenced-based practices, the data indicated there was minimal impact on the SiMR. It is evident that there needs to be changes to teacher/provider practices which include targeted and systematic approaches to address literacy issues based on the Science of Reading. In order to impact the SiMR, it is necessary for the Department to provide multiple means of support for multiple groups across the tri-level system (e.g., CA leaders, school-level leaders, teachers, specialized providers, administrators, parents, advocates, etc.). To make a significant impact on student performance, the Department will focus its efforts on building knowledge in the identification of individual student needs and use of strategies and activities that address individual interventions. This includes a focus on training, use of the universal screener, data analysis, and development of specially designed instruction in the areas of language and literacy development.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

The data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation to assess practice change was inconsistent. There was minimal evidence on the use of assessment data to identify which component regarding language comprehension and word recognition is lacking and the root cause of the deficit. This should then drive the discussion and determination of the specific intervention or EBP to address student specific language and literacy needs. In addition, observation checklists were used sporadically and therefore did not yield reliable data to assess teacher practice change to improve student academic performance. Therefore, in the next FFY, the Department will focus its efforts on providing effective teacher support such as coaching to ensure teachers understand how to assess, determine specific literacy needs, identify the appropriate EBP, and implement it to fidelity. This systemic approach should result in change in teacher practices which includes on-going data collection, use of evidence practices and changes in teacher/provider practices as a result of the intervention.

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.

The next steps for each evidence-based practice is that data will be collected by the participating Language and Literacy Initiative Literacy Coaches on foundational language and literacy skills. Activities will include training in the Science of Reading, analysis of data to determine what area of reading instruction needs to be targeted in instruction, development of specially designed instruction and observation of teacher practices. The anticipated outcome is that Literacy Coaches will demonstrate implementation fidelity of 90% or better on the EBPs aligned to the Science of Reading prior to conducting classroom teacher observations. Implementation fidelity of effective language and literacy instruction, and effective coaching strategies are

core components of the Language and Literacy Initiative's evaluation plan. Additional data will be collected to measure the following anticipated short term outcomes for the next reporting period as follows:

Short Term Outcomes (FFY 2022)

- Increased knowledge of effective language and literacy instruction and assessment for the Literacy Coaches.
 - Data Source: Pre-Post LETRS Assessments, LETRS formative assessments
- Increased Literacy Coaches understanding of effective coaching strategies.
 - Data Source: Coaching Strategies Assessments

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

Although schools reported using evidenced-based programs and evidenced-based practices, the data indicated there was minimal progress, a 2.99% increase from the 2014 baseline of 8.33% to 11.32% (FFY 2021) over a seven year period. To make a significant impact on student performance, the Department will focus its efforts on building knowledge of the Science of Reading and fidelity of implementation of EBPs. Activities, strategies and timelines will include the implementation of the Language and Literacy Initiative (LLI). There is strong evidence when young preschool age children are provided with appropriate oral language and literacy interventions, reading and writing challenges are minimized. Therefore, the SiMR will be expanded to include all LLI cohort students.

In order to assist teachers/service providers to deliver appropriate and targeted interventions, the assessment tool will be switched from the Smarter Balanced Assessment to universal screening tools. PD will include the systematic collection of universal screening data and using data to determine the areas of language and literacy instruction that needs to be targeted in order to develop specially designed instruction. The ESB will expand the LLI to ultimately provide this targeted support for all 15 CAs within the next five years. Therefore the SSIP will be modified in FFY 2022.

Language and Literacy Initiative (LLI) Description

LLI is a cohort program where dedicated Literacy Coaches participate in a two year training focused on language and literacy instructional practices, identification of areas of need based on assessment data and coaching. After the Literacy Coaches have demonstrated implementation fidelity, they will be prepared to observe and train their CA elementary teachers. Additionally, In order to increase understanding and application of evidence-based language and literacy instruction the CA elementary teachers will complete the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) professional learning curriculum*, the Lively Letters™ which is a supplemental evidence based program designed to address the language and literacy needs of a wide range of PK-2 students with learning differences, receive embedded coaching, and ongoing individualized classroom support from the Literacy Coaches. Professional learning will be based upon extant research on effective professional learning (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, Gardner, 2017) and 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 on language and literacy assessments. Assessments, observations, and fidelity checklists will be used to evaluate teacher performance and expected outcomes for the new SiMR population.

LLI Implementation Timelines

FFY 2021:

The ESB reviewed applications for the LLI submitted by CAs. A total of four CAs were selected to participate in the LLI Cohort 1. The four Literacy Coaches, one per CA were hired at the end of FFY 2021. During FFY 2021, the ESB planned for the rollout of the LLI in Fall of 2022.

FFY 2022:

The Department will provide PD to the Literacy Coaches on the following:

- How to implement the LETRS curriculum which includes EBPs on language and literacy.
- How to provide job-embedded coaching and effective collaboration between coaches (resource teacher/SLPs) and teachers.

FFY 2023:

- The new SSIP baseline data will be established. The data source is universal screener data (Fall, Winter, Spring) of students who are attending the LLI Cohort 1 CA elementary schools.

The Department will provide PD to the Literacy Coaches on the following:

- Improving parent engagement and the use of resources to support reading at home and encourage the use of language and literacy activities in daily activities.
- Conducting analysis of universal screener/assessment data, selection of intervention targets and development of specially designed instruction.
- How to implement "Lively Letters" an evidence based supplemental program that addresses the critical elements needed to acquire reading and spelling skills.

Cohort 1: Training and observations will be to the selected CA elementary schools. It is anticipated that each CA will have at least two participating schools where the Literacy Coaches will provide the following:

- LETRS curriculum training to their complex area elementary school teachers (teachers).
- Coaching to the teachers which includes data analysis, selection of appropriate interventions, provision of specially designed instructions, modeling, and feedback.
- Conduct classroom observations to ensure teachers are implementing EBPs to fidelity.
- Parent training regarding how to use literacy resources and/or embed language and literacy strategies into naturally occurring daily activities.
- Training on Lively Letters supplemental program to address individual students' needs.

- The ESB will review applications for the LLI submitted by CAs. A total of four additional CAs will be selected to participate in the LLI Cohort 2. The four Literacy Coaches, one per CA will be hired at the end of the end of FFY 2023.

FFY 2024

Cohort 1: Training and observations will be provided to all CA elementary schools. The Literacy Coaches will continue to provide the following:

- LETRS curriculum training to their complex area elementary school teachers (teachers).

- Coaching to the teachers which includes data analysis, selection of appropriate interventions, provision of specially designed instructions, modeling, and feedback.
- Conduct classroom observations to ensure teachers are implementing EBPs to fidelity.
- Parent training regarding how to use literacy resources and/or embed language and literacy strategies into naturally occurring daily activities.
- Training on Lively Letters supplemental program to address individual students' needs.

Cohort 2: The Department will provide the same PD to the Literacy Coaches as indicated in FFY 2022.

Note: For system change, the ESB will review implementation data, conduct on-going analysis, and make adjustments as needed. It is anticipated that this cycle will repeat until all 15 CA participate in the LLI. It is anticipated that there will be four Cohorts to achieve this.

Data Sources:

- Effective teacher implementation of evidence-based language and literacy instruction and assessment.
 - Data Source: Formal Observations, LETRS application activities
- Teacher alignment of instructional strategy with discrete student needs.
 - Data Source: Formal Observations
- Effective implementation of coaching strategies to improve teacher practice.
 - Data Source: NCSI Coaching Fidelity Assessment
- Improved teacher efficacy and beliefs as evidenced by Improved reading proficiency rates
 - Data Source: Teacher efficacy survey, Third and Fourth grade Universal Screener data (Fall, Winter, Spring) of students in Language and Literacy Initiative CAs

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The primary mechanism the Department uses to solicit broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR targets is through monthly meetings with SEAC and District Educational Specialists using the Leading by Convening framework. The Department participates in quarterly transition meetings with outside agencies where data on Indicators 13 and 14 are shared and feedback on improvement activities is collected. In addition, the Department participates in the Community Children's Councils meetings to engage its members statewide. Annually, in addition to the monthly meetings, the Department and SEAC co-host a culminating meeting on SPP/APR indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. At the culminating meeting, the Department, in partnership with SEAC, invites a broader group of stakeholders to participate. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and solicit improvement activities to increase outcomes for our students with disabilities.

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 stakeholders to learn about each indicator and review the data prior to providing input. Stakeholders 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.
- Discuss current strategies of improvement.
- Solicit additional ideas for improvement strategies and the development of implementation activities.
- Share out with all stakeholders and receive additional feedback.

In FFY 2021, the Department met with SEAC leadership, and through continuous discussions along the year, it was determined to prioritize stakeholder input on Indicator 13 due to Hawaii's low performance data on this indicator. On November 18, 2022, SEAC and the Department decided to allocate one third of the meeting time to Indicator 13. The Department presented Indicator 13 data since the establishment of the new baseline, including the breakdown of the data across the 8 components of Indicator 13 requirements utilizing the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B). After the review of the data, the Department engaged stakeholders in soliciting input on improvement strategies, and a few positive outcomes were shared. In addition, during the November 18, 2022 meeting, SEAC and the Department determined that the December 9, 2022 SEAC meeting would be dedicated to a culminating SPP/APR meeting where a broad group of stakeholders would be invited to participate. SEAC and the Department prioritized which indicators they would engage in utilizing the standard capacity-building process (described above) to provide input. Please see this link for the November 18, 2022 agenda: <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/11.18.22-SEAC-Agenda-Page-1-2.pdf>

On December 9, 2022, the Department and SEAC met for the culminating SPP/APR meeting. The Department and SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate. For a copy of the invitation, please see this link:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DEOmioMcTPv7v6PTDVTzeYkbQL0rhaXr/view?usp=sharing>. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's website at:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx> and SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

In summary, 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 to partner with stakeholders to expand both community outreach and engagement opportunities.

Below is a description of key stakeholder groups engaged in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR feedback process and also on other special education related matters.

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. Membership for our SEAC is an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

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 Hawaii State Department of Health to fund SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, the SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer questions from parents via a telephone hotline. The SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. 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 parent and professional co-chairs, provide assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCCs are composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

LDAH

The LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. Additional information can be found on the LDAH website at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

DD Council

The DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. 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/>.

December 9, 2022, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members held a stakeholder engagement meeting where the members reviewed the SSIP improvement strategies, discussed the Language and Literacy Initiative and the UH-Manoa Reading Intervention program. Professional development on language and literacy efforts were also discussed. Current SiMR data was reviewed and input was given on adjusting the SiMR assessment tool from the Smarter Balanced Assessment to universal screeners and expanding the target population to include all eligibility categories.

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 2021. 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 of its programs containing resources and materials to support teachers. The ESB has actively participated in activities of SPIN (parent organization) including participating in their conference planning and facilitating several conference sessions. Members of the ESB also presented at the Pac RIm 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.

Some concerns were raised by our stakeholders during our engagement activities. Stakeholders expressed concern about the assessment tool (Smarter Balanced Assessment) we are currently using to measure the SiMR. Many stakeholders feel that a summative, high-stakes, standardized assessment is not able to capture granular growth of students over time. Other stakeholders shared concerns that not all students are being provided with the explicit phonics instruction needed to improve outcomes in foundation literacy skill. Another concern that was raised by our stakeholders was the need to increase family engagement in school and complex area literacy events.

To address the concerns raised about the lack of explicit phonics instruction for all students, the ESB is providing targeted support and training in explicit language and literacy instruction through our Language and Literacy Initiative. To address the concerns raised about insufficient family engagement in school and complex area literacy activities, the ESB is exploring the provision of virtual events that may be more accessible for families.

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.

The ESB will continue to collaborate with the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Design (OCID) on their initiatives to provide professional learning on effective language and literacy instruction for all elementary students, including students that comprise the SiMR population. The Department will continue to fund IDEA ARP grants for specific CAs. These grants were developed to support CAs in providing professional learning on effective language and literacy instruction, or to purchase evidence-based supplemental literacy intervention programs.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

The Department's OCID LETRS initiative is ongoing. Expected outcomes of this initiative include improved teacher knowledge and application of effective reading instruction and improved student ELA proficiency. The IDEA ARP funds were released to CAs in Spring 2022. These grants will be funded for three years. Outcomes and activities are dependent upon CA proposals but are expected to support improved ELA proficiency of SWDs in alignment with funding proposal criteria.

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 collaborated with the Induction and Mentoring Department to support special education teachers and prevent high attrition rates of special education teachers. The ESB recognized that many special education teachers needed more training on providing intensive reading interventions for struggling readers. To address this issue, the ESB collaborated with the University of Hawaii-Manoa to create a Reading Interventionist Certification program.

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

Title:

Administrator, IDEA Team-Monitoring and Compliance Branch

Email:

brikena.white@k12.hi.us

Phone:

(808) 307-3600

Submitted on:

04/25/23 10:42:18 PM