

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2023**

**Hawaii**



**PART B DUE February 3, 2025**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

### Executive Summary

The Hawai'i State Department of Education (Department) is submitting its Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2023 to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This plan was developed with guidance from OSEP and OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and input from a broad range of educational and community partners.

Hawai'i's K-12 public education system, established in 1840 by King Kamehameha III, is the oldest in the United States west of the Mississippi and the only one created by a sovereign monarch. The Hawai'i State Board of Education (BOE), a nine-member policy-making body, oversees the state's public education system. The BOE is responsible for adopting educational standards, monitoring school success, and appointing the Superintendent of education, who leads the Department. For more information about the BOE, visit the official website at <https://boe.hawaii.gov/>.

The Department functions as both the state educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) within a tri-level system—state office, complex area (CA), and individual schools—working collaboratively to meet the needs of all students. The Superintendent serves as the chief executive officer of the public school system, which includes 296 schools, including 38 public charter schools and serves approximately 165,340 students. Of these students, 12% receive special education services, 10% are English learners, and 46% are economically disadvantaged. Additionally, 53% of students with disabilities spend 80% or more of their school day in the general education classroom. The most common languages spoken besides English are Ilocano, Chuukese, Marshallese, Tagalog, Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin, and Cantonese.

Grounded in the Na Hopena A'o (HA) framework, the Department embraces a collective responsibility—ne'epapa—to nurture students through Hawai'i's unique cultural values. By fostering Belonging, Responsibility, Excellence, Aloha, Total Well-being, and Hawai'i (BREATH), we strengthen the connections between students, families, educators, and communities. In doing so, we uphold the rights of all learners, ensuring students, especially those with disabilities, receive a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE). This shared commitment honors Hawai'i's heritage while preparing students to thrive both locally and globally. More information about Na Hopena A'o (HA) framework can be found at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/ohehub/n%C4%81-hopena-a%CA%BB0-h%C4%81>.

On February 2, 2023, the BOE approved its 2023-2029 Strategic Plan. The plan has twenty-seven (27) Desired Outcomes. On May 18, 2023, the BOE approved an Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan Phase II, including Action Items and Performance Measures for each Desired Outcome. The Department is committed to advancing key initiatives for all students, including students with disabilities, ensuring equitable access to education and success in alignment with the overarching goals and desired outcomes of the BOE's 2023-2029 Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan. These initiatives focused on:

- Student Mental Health – Expanding mental health resources to support student well-being.
- Early Literacy – Strengthening literacy instruction to build foundational reading skills.
- Mathematics Education – Enhancing instructional strategies to improve student proficiency.
- Workforce Development – Increasing access to career and technical education (CTE) and work-based learning opportunities.

Additionally, the Strategic Plan is aligned with the priorities of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services in their mission to improve early childhood, education, and employment outcomes as well as raise expectations for our students with disabilities, their families, and their communities.

Furthermore, to improve special education implementation and monitoring, the Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) and the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) focused on strengthening the Department's General Supervision System (GSS). These improvement activities align with the Office of Special Education's (OSEP) priorities to raise the bar for:

- Academic Excellence – Delivering a comprehensive education tailored to the needs of students with disabilities.
- Better Learning Conditions – Addressing the educator shortage through recruitment and retention efforts.
- Pathways to Global Engagement – Expanding work-based learning opportunities to prepare students for college and careers.

Progress on these initiatives can be tracked through the Department's new educational data portal, LEI Kukui, available <https://hidoedata.org/Dashboard/dashboard/92>. A copy of the 2023-2029 Strategic Plan can be accessed on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Advancing%20Education/2023-29-ImplementationPlan.pdf>.

### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

### General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute

**resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:**

**Describe the process the State uses to select LEAs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of LEAs monitored per year.**

The Department upholds rigorous outcome expectations for our students with disabilities and maintains high levels of regulatory compliance by sharing the responsibility for monitoring, support, and accountability across its tri-level system—State, Complex Area (CA), and School.

The Department is tasked with ensuring that all educational programs for children with disabilities within the state comply with the IDEA. This includes preschool programs, public charter schools, the Hawai'i Schools for the Deaf and Blind, facilities for children with disabilities in residential settings, and educational programs within juvenile and adult correctional facilities. The Department guarantees that IDEA requirements are upheld, even during disasters, whether human-made, health-related, or natural, consistent with the OSEP GSS Memo QA 23-01.

The Department's GSS, led by the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) and the Exceptional Support Branch (ESB), ensures support and accountability across all levels—State, CA, and School. ESB provides direction, professional development (PD), and technical assistance (TA) to support program implementation and improvement. MAC is responsible for the general supervision and monitoring of IDEA compliance, in alignment with 34 C.F.R. § 300.604 and Hawai'i Administrative Rules (HAR) § 8-60.

#### GSS Theory of Action

The Department's Theory of Action is grounded in a collaborative, data-driven and capacity-building approach:

IF MAC, ESB, CAs, and Schools work together to:

- Build capacity in compliance and performance,
- Use data-based decision-making, and
- Continuously improve a cohesive system focused on Results-Driven Accountability,

THEN the Department will improve outcomes for students with disabilities while ensuring compliance with both federal and state regulations.

#### Stakeholder Engagement

The Department values its partnerships with various community partners and agencies such as the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawai'i (LDAH), Department of Human Services (DHS)/Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawai'i State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), Department of Health (DOH), Early Intervention Section, Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD), the Executive Office on Early Learning (EOEL), the University of Hawai'i, and other education representatives to enhance engagement opportunities.

#### Monitoring Activities

The Department's GSS is informed by several key monitoring activities:

##### State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)

Each CA and school is evaluated annually on the performance of eighteen indicators outlined in the SPP/APR. Following the OSEP's annual determination in June, MAC issues a report detailing performance data for each CA. The development of the SPP/APR involves collaboration with the Special Education Advisory Council, educational partners, parents, and community members.

##### Beyond SPP/APR

Every six (6) years, each CA undergoes a comprehensive monitoring to assess compliance with IDEA's core requirements, including Child Find (Evaluation and Reevaluation), Service Delivery, Least Restrictive Environment, and Procedural Safeguards. These activities extend beyond the scope of the SPP/APR-required indicators. Approximately three CAs are monitored each year.

##### Credible Allegations

When credible allegations arise, MAC conducts monitoring of the affected CA/school(s) regardless of its place within the 6-year integrated monitoring cycle.

##### Data Collection and Analysis

The Department employs a data-driven approach to monitoring progress, identifying priorities, and determining support needs. Schools routinely update student information, which is verified by MAC. The data is then analyzed to track CAs' progress against the SPP/APR indicators. MAC and ESB facilitate Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to help CAs analyze their data and inform improvement efforts. Ongoing state activities and performance data are used to guide program improvements.

##### Policies and Procedures and Effective Implementation

The Department's policies and procedures for students with disabilities are established primarily through:

- The IDEA Part B - <https://www.ed.gov/laws-and-policy/individuals-disabilities/idea>
- Hawai'i Revised Statutes - <https://boe.hawaii.gov/statutes/>
- Hawai'i Administrative Rules - <https://boe.hawaii.gov/administrative-rules/>
- Hawai'i Administrative Rules (HAR) Title 8, Chapter 60 - <https://boe.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/60-Provision-of-a-Free-A-ppropriate-Public-Education-for-a-Student-with-a-Disability.pdf>
- Board of Education Policies - <https://boe.hawaii.gov/board-policies/>

##### Fiscal Management

Fiscal management of federal IDEA funds is monitored at the state, CA, and school levels. CA applications, financial reports, and supporting documents are reviewed to ensure proper use of funds. In addition to compliance with allowable costs, fixed assets, and payroll certifications, the Department ensures that qualified personnel actively advance IDEA priorities.

##### Dispute Resolution

MAC follows established procedures for mediation, state complaints, and due process. Trends identified through dispute resolution processes inform ongoing monitoring and action plans.

##### Identification, Correction, and Verification of Noncompliance

When noncompliance is identified, MAC issues a written finding to the school within 90 days, outlining the issue, relevant statutes or regulations, and required corrective actions. MAC ensures that noncompliance is corrected promptly, with a deadline of no later than one year from the written notification. If corrective actions are not completed within the specified timeline, MAC works with the school to develop an action plan and, if necessary, considers sanctions.

#### Verification of Required Resolution(s)

If the submitted documentation does not demonstrate the correction, MAC will follow the steps below and require the school to make further corrections until the correction is verified.

- An additional notification with a revised timeline will be sent to the Principal, the District Educational Specialist (DES), and the Complex Area Superintendent (CAS).
- If the correction is not completed after the notification, then MAC will set up a meeting with the CAS, DES, and Principal.
- If that plan of action is not completed within a year and the previous steps have occurred, then MAC will consider the direction of the use of funds in that particular Complex Area.

After MAC has verified that both individual and systemic noncompliance are corrected, MAC sends a close out letter to the Principal, cc'd: CAS, DES, and Special Education Director, notifying them that all identified noncompliance has been corrected, verified, and closed.

#### Tiers of Accountability and Support

The Department's accountability system is structured into three tiers of support: universal, targeted, and intensive. These tiers are designed to improve educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities, ensuring that every student has the opportunity to succeed.

**Describe how student files are chosen, including the number of student files that are selected, as part of the State's process for determining an LEA's compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the LEA's correction of any identified compliance.**

#### Beyond SPP/APR Cyclical Monitoring

The number of records selected for the sample is determined by the special education population in the CA.

- Small CAs (Special Education Population of 1 – 1,000) are required to assess a minimum of 20 records.
- Medium CAs (Special Education Population of 1,001 – 1,500) are required to assess a minimum of 35 records.
- Large CAs (Special Education Population 1,501+) are required to assess a minimum of 50 records.

If the total number of relevant student records available is less than the noted minimum records required to review, 100 percent of those records will be reviewed.

When selecting student records for review, MAC uses a random selection process that represents:

- Relevant documents from students' cumulative records dated within the last 12 months;
- All ages, 3 through 21, and all grade levels are proportionately represented (e.g., preschool, elementary, middle, and high school students, especially secondary transition-aged students);
- All schools within the CAs, including alternative schools;
- Placements in settings outside of the public schools, including private residential and day schools, nursing homes, homebound instruction, home-based instruction, and jails; and
- All disability categories are proportionately represented.

For cyclical monitoring, a similar process is followed for the verification of subsequent data.

#### Compliance Indicators: 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13

The Department monitors all the schools statewide annually on each of the compliance indicators. For all compliance indicators, the Department utilizes the data from both eCSSS and Infinite Campus collected during July 1 through June 30 of each year.

For indicator 4B, the Department utilizes the suspension/expulsion data from EdFacts Report 088 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days), Child Count data, enrollment data, and suspensions and expulsions of students without disabilities for comparison. The Department does not use sampling for indicator 4B. As mentioned above, the Department is a single District State; the SEA and LEA are the same, thus to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)), the Department uses the methodology of comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) by race and ethnicity compared to the rates of children without IEPs in the same LEA (in this case, the Department). If the Department is found to have a Significant Discrepancy, a finding is issued to the school based on the data. If the data, in a given year, indicates the Department has identified significant discrepancy, the MAC reviews and analyses the Department policies, procedures, or practices (e.g., reviews of school-level data, analysis of state policies, procedures, and practices, and verification of implementation of these practices in schools and complex areas) to verify whether they contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the Department, and verify whether they comply with requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

For indicators 9 & 10, at the end of each year, the IDEA Data Manager utilizes the Indicator 11 and all student enrollment data. The Department uses the Risk Ratio Methodology. The threshold for disproportionate representation is any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective group size. The Department uses a minimum cell size of 10. Any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective disability and group size signifies disproportionate representation. For disproportionate representation, 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. The Department applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to this 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, the Department issues notification of noncompliance to the schools that were found noncompliant. The Department tracks the completion of noncompliance within a year of initial notification, and reviews subsequent data of a random sample determined based on all of the initial evaluations conducted to ensure schools are correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% based on the review of updated data.

For indicators 11 and 12, at the end of each year, the IDEA Data Manager downloads the data for Child Find from eCSSS for all the schools statewide including charter schools. The student information data is directly entered at the school level. All initial evaluation and IEP timelines are reviewed, sorted by completion within and over the timeline. All over timeline files are reviewed for reasons for delay, and the data is aggregated by school and complex area to be issued as noncompliance to each individual school found noncompliant based on child-specific cases. The Department tracks the completion of noncompliance within a year of initial notification, and reviews two consecutive months of subsequent data for all initial evaluations and IEPs developed to ensure schools are correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% based on the review of updated data.

For indicator 13, a random selection of IEPs of students aged 16 and above for each CA is extracted from the 618 Child Count file for the current reporting year to conduct state monitoring using the NTACTION Checklist: Form B. All files are reviewed to determine if each IEP demonstrated compliance with the eight (8) specific transition requirements, and the data is aggregated by school and complex area to be issued as noncompliance to

each individual school found noncompliant based on child-specific cases. The Department tracks the completion of noncompliance within a year of initial notification, and reviews two consecutive months of subsequent data that are randomly selected based on the total transition IEPs developed to ensure schools are correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% based on the review of updated data.

**Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.**

The Department collects monitoring and SPP/APR data through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS), Infinite Campus, Parent Involvement Survey, Post-Outcomes Survey, mediation, state written complaints and due process complaints, and credible allegations. The Department collects, reviews and analyzes the data between July 1 through June 30 of each year.

**Describe how the State issues findings: by number of instances or by LEAs.**

The Department issues findings of noncompliance by school based on child specific cases of noncompliance. A written finding of noncompliance is issued to the school principal and cc-ed to the District Educational Specialist and the Complex Area Superintendent which includes individual cases of noncompliance that must be corrected, relevant statutes or regulations, required corrective actions and the timeline in which correction must be submitted to the Department.

**If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).**

The Department does not permit the school to correct noncompliance before the Department issues a finding.

**Describe the State's system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part B's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.**

The Department utilizes a tiered approach to correcting noncompliance notifications that allows the schools to complete the correction within a year of initial notification of noncompliance.

A progressive sanctions and enforcement provisions are utilized when a school does not correct within the timeline. Sanctions include the following:

- Individual student corrections shall be corrected as soon as possible but not later than 2 months of notification.
- Subsequent data demonstrating 100% compliance must be provided to MAC within 4 months of receipt of notification of noncompliance.
- When a CA does not meet the above timelines then an additional notification is sent to the principal and DES with a revised timeline.
- If the new timeline is not met, then MAC will set up a meeting with the CAS, DES, and Principal. In the meeting, a plan of action will be developed.
- If that plan of action is not completed within a year of initial notification, and the previous steps have occurred, then MAC will consider directing the use of funds in that particular school.

**Describe how the State makes annual determinations of LEA performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying LEAs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.**

The Department serves as a single SEA/LEA and does not issue LEA determinations.

**Provide the web link to information about the State's general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.**

Department's Website  
<https://hawaiiipublicschools.org/>

Hawai'i Administrative Rules Page  
<https://boe.hawaii.gov/administrative-rules/> and

Hawai'i Administrative Rules, Title 8, Chapter 60  
<https://boe.hawaii.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/60-Provision-of-a-Free-Appropriate-Public-Education-for-a-Student-with-a-Disability.pdf>

**Technical Assistance System:**

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

The Department has multiple mechanisms to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based TA and support to all CAs and schools. The ESB and the MAC manage all the TA activities related to the implementation of the IDEA and HAR Chapter 60. The ESB and the MAC have teams of subject matter experts in instruction, behavior, program planning, and federal and state statutory regulations. Data from various sources, such as SPP/APR, Section 618, dispute resolution, team meetings input/feedback, SPP/APR Principal/CAS meetings, and other data sources, are used to identify necessary TA and are provided to other Department offices, CAs, schools, and various organizations. TA is provided in the form of standing meetings, written guidance, consultation, infographics, PLCs, and collaboration with other state agencies, parent groups, and TA providers. During School Year 2023-2024, the Department provided schools and CAs with the following technical assistance opportunities:

**District Educational Specialist (DES) Meetings**

The monthly DES meetings are used as an avenue for the ESB, Student Services Branch (SSB), MAC, and other relevant offices and key partners to disseminate information, provide professional development and technical assistance, discuss special education issues, and collaborate on relevant and timely issues and resources critical to special education. Active participation is integral in achieving a strong professional network that informs the Department's special education programs. The design of the 2023-2024 meetings aligned with the 2023–2029 Strategic Phase II Implementation Plan and the GSS under Part B of the IDEA. The professional development activities intentionally target Priority II–High-Quality Educator Workforce in All Schools; Goal 2.4–CA and state offices comprise effective staff whose work is aligned to support student learning.

**Monthly Meetings with Community Partners**

The Department and the Special Educational Advisory Council (SEAC) continued to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage parents and educational and community partners in monthly meetings as a part of the TA system. These meetings provided opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community partners include the SEAC, SPIN, LDAH, DHS/DVR, CCCs, the DD Council, DOH, Early Learning Section, the University of Hawai'i, and other representatives of higher education. During 2023-2024, technical assistance was provided in the areas of secondary transition, preschool inclusion, dispute resolution, and bullying/safe schools. In addition, time and collaboration were dedicated to developing infographics to help families understand special education matters and how to navigate through them. For more information, please refer to SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

**Child Find and Transition for Preschool Age Children - DOH/Early Intervention Part C and Part B Collaboration**

The Department had monthly meetings with Part C staff (Early Intervention) and Home Visiting. These meetings were to develop a Memorandum of

Understanding (MOU) to identify mutual goals, policies, and procedures for each of the agencies as it pertains to Child Find, the transition from Part C to Part B, and data sharing. The MOU was developed and regular meetings continue to share information on implementation and any challenges that may arise.

#### Hawai'i State Preschool Interagency Meetings

The Department continues to engage with leaders from multiple agencies (Headstart, EOEL, DOH and DHS- licensing agency for private preschools and daycare programs), University of Hawai'i, Child Care Centers, and military liaison)) to learn about and explore settings that may offer opportunities for preschool-age children with disabilities to participate with same-age peers without disabilities.

#### Quarterly Multi-Agency Transition Meetings

The Department, in partnership with the following partners (DHS/DVR, Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD), DD Council, DOH, Center on Disability Studies (CDS), CCCs, and Self-Advocacy Advisory Council (SAAC)), continued to collaborate on monthly meetings designed to support and assist the development of postsecondary transition plans.

#### Post-Secondary Transition Meetings

To strengthen transition programs and services, the following learning opportunities were provided for district, complex and school level personnel - Quarterly transition coordinator meetings focused on post-school outcomes, self-determination, and transition resources (assessments, services, outside agencies/organizations/community resource partners).

#### Monthly Meetings with Speech-Language Pathologists and Resource Teachers

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

#### Monthly Literacy Coaches Meeting

Monthly meetings were held for Literacy Coaches (from 3 pilot complex areas) with a focus on coaching school level personnel on Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS).

#### Meetings with PLN on Inclusive Practices

Ongoing Professional Learning Network (PLN) meetings, both monthly and quarterly in-person, to foster collaboration and provide consistent guidance; tiered complex area support customized to meet the unique needs of complex areas; and complex area sustaining change meetings to promote lasting improvements.

#### Monthly SLP Coordinator Meetings

The goal of the SLP coordinators is to assist the DES in the role of the related service provider so that students can benefit from special education services. These meetings focused on building the capacity of occupational therapists, physical therapists, and speech-language pathologists. Some of the topic areas included workload analysis, addressing personnel shortages, and interdisciplinary interventions.

#### Quarterly Itinerant Teachers of Students with Visual Impairments (TVIs) and Teachers of the Deaf

The Itinerant TVIs and Teachers of the Deaf provide direct services to students who are deaf, hard of hearing, deafblind and/or visually impaired and guidance to Individualized Educational Program Teams. These meetings focused on sharing information and practices, providing professional development, and discussing special education issues.

#### Bi-Monthly TeachTown Professional Learning Community (PLC)

A PLC for all individuals using TeachTown statewide to collaborate on strategies regarding the implementation of the TeachTown online platform and curriculum.

#### TeachTown Classroom Coaching

Classroom teachers received in-class coaching using TeachTown. The focus was on answering any questions they had about the platform, observing and providing feedback on lesson implementation, and supporting instruction planning.

#### Dispute Resolution TA Sessions

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

### **Professional Development System:**

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

The Department is committed to aligning its professional learning with critical components of evidence-based professional learning and provides a variety of PD opportunities to ensure that teachers, paraprofessionals, and related service providers have the skills to improve results for children with disabilities. The following PD opportunities were provided during SY 2023-2024:

#### Early Childhood Conference

The ESB co-sponsored with the Executive Office of Early Learning (EOEL) a two-day Early Childhood Conference that had a variety of topic areas consisting of assessment practices, high quality instruction, targeted and focused interventions and decision making for preschool placements. This conference was free and open to all Department and DOH staff as well as parents and community partners.

#### Training on Assessments

To assist with the statewide effort to improve language and literacy skills SLPs were provided with a two (2) day training on administration of the Test of Language and Literacy Skills (TILLS). This is a tool that can be used to appropriately identify and target language and literacy deficits and assist with appropriate interventions.

#### Science of Reading

SLP Coordinators were provided with training on the Science of Reading to increase their knowledge about the science of reading, with the expectation that this knowledge would be shared with SLP practitioners to inform interventions and support student learning.

#### Assistive Technology

Best Practices in AAC Assessment: Selecting Appropriate Communication Systems. This learning opportunity focused on evidence-based Augmentative Alternative Communication assessment practices for students with complex communication needs.

SMoRRRES® AAC modeling: The purpose of this learning opportunity is to teach participants an evidence-based communication partner training program. The SMoRRRES® program will be used to teach participants to set goals for the training program, learn why modeling is important, verbally rehearse steps to successful modeling, and observe and practice modeling on communication books, apps, and devices.

#### Hearing Screening Training

The ESB provided training to SLPs on school-based hearing screenings utilizing Otoscopy and Distortion Product Otoacoustic Emissions (DPOAEs).

The ESB offered statewide training for Teachers of the Deaf, focusing on the Science of Reading and the Bilingual Grammar Curriculum, which was specifically developed for deaf learners. These training initiatives emphasized the application of high-leverage practices to support literacy development. The goal is to ensure that deaf students achieve literacy gains comparable to their hearing peers.

#### Classroom Listening Assessments

The ESB provided a specialized course for teachers of the deaf and speech-language pathologists, equipping them with the knowledge and tools to assess and support deaf and hard-of-hearing students. The training emphasized utilizing auditory channels for learning and enhancing team-based decision-making to improve educational access and outcomes.

#### Sensory Experience Workshop

The ESB offered this workshop to Maui principals, other school leaders, and DESs aiming to put leaders in the shoes of their students who are deaf, hard of hearing, deafblind, and visually impaired and tasked with navigating the learning experience in a typical classroom setting.

#### The Deaf/Hard of Hearing/Deafblind Communication Plan

The ESB continued to offer support and training on the Communication Plan for students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing.

#### Hawai'i State Summer Behavior Conference and Post-Conference Workshops - Ka Ulana 'Ana i ka Piko: In Weaving, You Begin at the Center

The Office of Student Support Services (OSSS) hosted a two-day conference where participants gained knowledge and resources related to positive student behavior and well-being and ready to use strategies to implement in the classroom.

#### Organizational Behavior Management and Deliberate Coaching Workshops

ESB partnered with Dr. Paulie Gavoni to provide workshops on Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) for organizational management and coaching. The training emphasized goal setting, feedback, and reinforcement to enhance teaching effectiveness and student success.

#### Virtual Training Series in Topics on Special Education and Applied Behavior Analysis

ESB offered a monthly virtual training series for special education teachers and related service providers on topics like addressing student non-compliance, classroom setup, creative data collection, self-monitoring, and ethics in supervision and restraint. Over 300 staff statewide participated, accessing recorded presentations and resources through a shared Google Classroom.

#### Practical Functional Assessment & Skill-Based Treatment (PFA-SBT) Training Cohorts

In preparation for the Summer Behavior Conference, the ESB facilitated PFA-SBT training cohorts across six school districts. These cohorts focused on supporting the faithful implementation of Practical Functional Assessment and Skill-Based Treatment. As a culminating activity, participants presented their case studies at the conference, highlighting their progress and successes in addressing challenging behaviors.

#### Training on Understanding and Supporting Neurodivergent Students

The ESB offered training for Educational Assistants to enhance their understanding of and support for neurodivergent students in classrooms. The training provided an overview of neurodiversity, with a particular focus on autism spectrum disorders (ASD). It also introduced effective strategies and interventions to support neurodivergent students, fostering an inclusive and supportive learning environment.

#### TeachTown Summit

The OSSS offered a four-day training series that started with foundational information on providing access to core content for students with intensive academic needs, using Teachtown as a facilitator, and how administrators can use Teachtown to inform their special education programming.

#### TeachTown Workshops

The OSSS facilitated both large and small group workshops across all Complex Areas to support special education staff in implementing the TeachTown curriculum for students with intensive academic needs. These workshops were delivered in three series, introducing participants to the platform, guiding them on curriculum utilization, and demonstrating how to use data effectively to inform instruction.

#### Training on Disciplinary Processes for Students with Disabilities

The ESB co-led training sessions for school administrators focused on disciplinary procedures and considerations for students with disabilities. The training covered key topics, including manifestation determination, interim alternative educational placements, positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS), and restorative approaches to discipline.

#### Training on the Hawai'i State Alternate Assessment (HSA-Alt)

The ESB and MAC, in collaboration with the Assessment and Accountability Branch, co-presented training sessions to schools. These sessions focused on appropriately identifying students eligible for the HSA-Alt, particularly in schools where more than 1% of students were identified. The training provided guidance on the criteria for determining when students should participate in the HSA-Alt.

#### Pro Se Training

Two days, April 8 and 9, were dedicated to DESs and their teams, and one day, April 10, was dedicated to parents and parent information, advocacy, and training centers. The training was facilitated by Special Education Solutions, LLC, the nation's leading expert in IDEA compliance, training, and dispute resolution. It provided an overview of special education law, the hearing process, and how to work with pro se parents.

## Stakeholder Engagement:

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

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

### CCCs

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

### LDAH

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

### The DD Council

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

### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the



learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

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

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

22

#### **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 continued its monthly collaboration with SEAC members throughout the year. At the start of each year, SEAC members and the Department identify key priorities. For the 2023-2024 school year, the Department's top priorities, which aligned with SEAC's priorities, were: preschool inclusion and outcomes, secondary transition, dispute resolution, and discipline. At the conclusion of each SEAC meeting, time was dedicated to planning for the next meeting, fostering continuous collaboration. Presentations and resources from each meeting were shared with participants and posted on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

In addition to the monthly meetings, SEAC and the Department organize an annual culminating engagement meeting, inviting a broad group of stakeholders to review indicators and inform the development of the SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting was held on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, and educational and community partners. The session provided an opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities related to the implementation of IDEA requirements. Of the 150 participants, 22 were parents of children with disabilities.

During this meeting, the Department used a standardized process to solicit stakeholder input on the final review of compliance and results indicators for the SPP/APR. The one-day engagement included both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach emphasized capacity-building, enabling participants to better understand each indicator, review relevant data, and provide meaningful input.

Participants were engaged in the following activities:

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

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). The participants were provided with the opportunity to access the materials in advance. After each meeting, they could continue to provide feedback on indicators via Feedback Forms. Materials utilized during the meeting were posted on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

The CCCs, in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific, provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills. During these training sessions, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch shared information about the Indicator 8-Parent Involvement Survey and received the participants' feedback on improvement strategies.

#### **Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

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

The Department's vision is that Hawai'i's students become educated, healthy, and joyful lifelong learners who make positive contributions to both our community and global society. Achieving this vision requires a kakou (collaborative) effort involving the Department, the Board of Education (BOE), state agencies, advocacy groups, families, community organizations, employers, higher education institutions, and other community partners. The Department places high value on family engagement as a key driver of student achievement, social development, and sustainable, long-term success.

Throughout the monthly SEAC meetings, information was shared with the primary goal of educating parents, community members, and state agency partners. These meetings were designed to build capacity on special education matters, address questions and concerns, and gather valuable feedback and input on strategies for improvement.

August 11, 2023: FFY 2022 OSEP Determination and Monitoring and Compliance (MAC) Branch Priorities for SY 23-24. The discussion focused on the accountability rating received from the Office of Special Education Programs for Hawai'i's Annual Performance.

September 8, 2023: Inclusive Practices and SEAC Priorities; Overview of Department's Inclusive Practices

October 20, 2023: Preschool Inclusion – Monitoring & Compliance Branch (MAC) and Exceptional Support Branch (ESB). The following were shared: a) Data from Indicator 6 – Preschool LRE; b) Definition of a Regular Early Childhood Program; c) Continuum of Placement Options. Recommendations of the Parent Survey (Indicator 8) Work Group.

November 17, 2023: Update on the Dispute Resolution Strategic Plan; Discussion regarding Planning for the December 8th State Performance

## Plan/Annual Performance Report Stakeholder Engagement Meeting

December 8, 2023: FFY 2022 Feedback Engagement Meeting

January 12, 2024: SPP/APR Discussion/Feedback Session - a) Overview of the December 8th SPP/APR Stakeholder Engagement Meeting; b) Member Feedback on the Meeting Experience; c) SPP/APR Planning for 2024; Presentation on Bullying Data for Students with IEPs

February 19, 2024: Discussion of Data Sources and Documentation Related to Bullying of Students with Disabilities

March 8, 2024: Discussion on Graduation and Dropout Rates (APR Indicators 1 & 2)

April 12, 2024: IDEA Training on Working with Unrepresented Parents; Suspension Data Overview for Students with IEPs

May 10, 2024: Suspension data session two; Due Process Report on Due Process Hearing Requests, Hearing Decisions, Written Complaints and Mediations from SY 2022-23; Annual SEAC Report Recommendations to the Department's Superintendent

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

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

The Department highly values parental involvement in IEP meetings and other school-related activities and events concerning their children's education. It encourages parents to actively participate in the Parent Involvement Survey, which is available in both paper and online formats at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/>. During the 2023-2024 school year, the Department established a workgroup composed of representatives from the state office, complex areas, schools, SEAC, LDAH, and parents. This workgroup collaborated to develop a new Parent Involvement Survey that aligns with Hawaii's cultural values. The new survey is being implemented during the 2024-2025 school year. To support parents in understanding the survey and its importance, the Department has created a handout with questions and answers, which can be accessed at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/handout.php>.

To further support tri-level leaders in developing conflict resolution skills, the Department partnered with the Mediation Center of the Pacific to provide professional development on Mediation Skills for School Leaders. This one-day interactive training offered practical strategies for resolving disputes through an informal, structured, and confidential negotiation process. School administrators gained valuable skills to address conflicts in ways that resolve the issue while maintaining dignity and preserving relationships. A total of 12 one-day interactive training sessions were held for school leaders statewide.

### **Soliciting Public Input:**

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

The primary mechanisms the Department uses to solicit public input are monthly SEAC meetings, sharing information with Complex Areas and schools to inform parents and community partners, and utilizing the Department's public SPP/APR page at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and SEAC's public website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

The Department's SPP/APR page was updated to reflect the new materials for FFY 2023. The feedback forms are available to the public year-round. As described in the "Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities" section, multiple meetings throughout the year were held to focus on input strategies, target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies to guide the implementation and future SPP/APR submission. The feedback materials for FFY 2023 can be accessed at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR culminating meeting was held on December 8, 2023. The Department and the SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate in discussing the FFY 2022 data, reviewing targets, and improving strategies for the FFY 2023 submission.

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

- Group 1 – Graduation (Indicator 1), Dropout (Indicator 2), and School-Age Environments (Indicator 5)
- Group 2 – Statewide Assessments (Indicator 3)
- Group 3 – Preschool Environments (Indicator 6) and Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7)
- Group 4 – Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)
- Group 5 – Secondary Transition (Indicator 13) and Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14)
- Group 6 – State Systemic Improvement Plan/SSIP (Indicator 17)

After the meeting, the participants and other stakeholders were allowed to continue providing feedback on all 17 indicators via Feedback Forms. For a copy of the materials that were used during this meeting, please visit the Department's SPP/APR page at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and SEAC's SPP/APR Resource page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Engagement Meeting was held on December 3, 2024. The Department and the SEAC invited a broader and diverse group of stakeholders to participate in discussing the FFY 2023 data, reviewing targets, and improving strategies for the FFY 2024 submission.

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

- Group 1 – Graduation (Indicator 1), Dropout (Indicator 2), and School-Age Environments (Indicator 5)
- Group 2 – Suspensions/Expulsions (Indicator 4)
- Group 3 – Preschool Environments (Indicator 6) and Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7)
- Group 4 – Parent Involvement (Indicator 8)
- Group 5 – Secondary Transition (Indicator 13) and Post-School Outcomes (Indicator 14)
- Group 6 – State Systemic Improvement Plan/SSIP (Indicator 17)

A large group presentation was also conducted that focused on the remaining indicators.

After the meeting, the participants and other stakeholders had the opportunity to continue providing feedback on all of the indicators via Feedback Forms. For a copy of the materials used during this meeting, please visit the Department's FFY 2023 SPP/APR Feedback page at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

The Department developed an SPP/APR page on the public website dedicated to sharing information related to SPP/APR indicators. The Department's SPP/APR page can be found at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

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

- Presentation Slides
- Factsheets
- Infographics
- Feedback Forms

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

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

These materials are available to the public throughout the year for their continuous feedback. Each of the materials developed was made available prior to each meeting through the Department's public website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and 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 2022 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 2022 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2022 APR in 2024, is available.**

The FFY 2022 SPP/APR was posted on the Department's website at [https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE\\_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf](https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf) within a week of submission to OSEP of its revised version submitted during the clarification process in April 2024, 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 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR**

National Center on Accessible Educational Materials (AEM), 2023-2024

Under the guidance of the AEM Center, the Department developed a process and guidelines for school teams to follow to ensure students with visual impairments receive accessible materials in a timely manner, which the state of Hawai'i defines as being at the same time as their sighted peers.

Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR), 2023-2024

The CIFR provided TA to the MAC and ESB to review the department's fiscal monitoring procedures and build capacity for MAC and ESB staff on fiscal monitoring. As a result, the Department collaborated with CIFR to review and revise the current fiscal monitoring procedures to make them more effective.

Data Center for Addressing Significant Disproportionality (DCASD Workshop), 2023-2024

The Department was invited to participate in a two-day in-person workshop to conduct a self-assessment to identify strengths and areas of improvement related to significant disproportionality. Participation in the Significant Disproportionality Process Workshop provided the opportunity for department staff to collaborate with technical assistance providers to examine current policies, procedures, and practices to strengthen current practices and improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), 2023-2024

With guidance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Department collaborated with multiple agencies to expand inclusive preschool opportunities. Partnering with organizations like Head Start, EOEL, Part C - Early Intervention, and the University of Hawai'i, a shared vision and mission statement was developed to reinforce this commitment. Leadership will continue refining policies and practices to ensure equitable access to quality, inclusive early education.

#### The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), 2023-2024

Part C and Part B completed their year of intensive technical assistance from the DaSy (The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems). Both agencies targeted strengthening Child Find procedures and processes towards increasing the percentage of children referred from Part C to B in having timely transitions and IEPs developed and implemented by a child's third birthday. Under the guidance of DaSy the agencies collaborated to pilot Child Find activities in a remote community on the Big Island of Hawai'i.

#### National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)'s RBAS Cross-State Learning Collaborative (CSLC), 2023-2024

Monthly virtual meetings were held and focused on general supervision activities, significant disproportionality, Indicator 18, DMS 2.0, and identifying and correcting noncompliance. The Department's IDEA Data Manager was able to engage with other states in discussing suggestions, recommendations or ideas to support the Department's general supervision, preparation for DMS 2.0, and identification and correction of noncompliance.

#### IDEA Data Center & WestEd, 2023-2024

MAC received TA on data processes and protocols. As a result, they developed protocols for the majority of the indicators. The MAC staff looks forward to completing all the data protocols during SY 24-25.

#### IDEA Data Center (IDC) Annual SPP/APR Summit, 2023 & 2024

The IDC Annual SPP/APR Summit promoted the continuing improvement process within the Department towards learning about the latest trends, practices, processes, and policies. This allowed the Department to better examine state data, policies, and programs, as well as recommend strategies and target efforts to continue building a culture and system that supports families and improves outcomes for students with disabilities.

#### IDC - Interactive Institute 2024

The goal of the Interactive Institute 2024 (ii24) is to enhance each state's capacity to embrace a culture that values, produces, and influences the use of high-quality data. This institute provided Department staff with professional development and support to continue improving processes and data collection not only to ensure data is consistent, accurate, and timely but, most importantly, to use data to improve outcomes for our students with disabilities.

#### IDC Data Manager Meetings - IDC Data Manager Data Quality Peer Group (DQPG) and New Data Managers Connection Call, 2023-2024

Monthly Data Manager Data Quality Peer Group (DQPG) topical meetings/discussions and New Data Managers Connection Call for drop in support and bi-monthly Part B Data Manager/EDFacts Coordinator Peer to Peer Exchange provided technical assistance that the Department utilized to improve the quality of IDEA data, prepare the SPP/APR collection and reporting, and implement DMS 2.0.

#### CADRE Dispute Resolution Learning Community, 2023-2024

The MAC dispute resolution staff participated in the Dispute Resolution Learning Community TA sessions and utilized the learning opportunities to continue improving the Department's resolution processes and procedures.

#### National Technical Assistance Center for Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C), 2023-2024

The Department received TA in the following areas: utilizing age-appropriate transition assessments in developing transition plans, providing appropriate transition services, collecting and analyzing post-school outcomes data (quarterly B14 Community of Practice), and transition policies related to school personnel. As a result, the Department developed an action plan to improve the knowledge and skills of school personnel and better address the response representativeness for underrepresented groups in Indicator 14 data collection.

#### OSEP Conference - 2023 & 2024

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

#### OSEP Monthly National TA Calls, 2023-2024

OSEP Monthly National TA Calls provided the Department staff with updated information and clarification on implementing the expectations of states regarding the DMS 2.0, SPP/APR, Personnel shortages and Vocational Rehabilitation. The Department collaborated with TA providers from IDC, WestEd, and NCSI to develop the data protocols for Indicator 18.

#### CASE Academy of Law and Leadership (CASE) Conference, 2024

The 2024 CASE Academy of Law and Leadership Conference is an application-driven conference that bridges legal know-how with enacting leadership in special education, two pillars of special education administration. The knowledge and expertise that was gained during the conference were utilized in the training with complex areas and schools.

#### NASDSE - Fostering Resilience, Enhancing Sustainable Results Conference, 2023

During this conference, Department staff obtained the latest practices in building the capacity of state special education leaders in leadership management and improving the implementation and monitoring system of students with disabilities. The Department utilized the information gained to improve the monitoring system of our students with disabilities.

#### NCSI DMS Prep: Monitoring Policy and Procedures Workshop, 2024

The purpose of the workshop was to support state teams through the process of developing and refining written state monitoring policies and procedures aligned with OSEP's expectations. Staff from ESB and MAC attended the workshop, and focused on revising the procedures for fiscal monitoring.

#### LRP Conference on Legal Issues of Educating Individuals with Disabilities, 2024

Legal experts reviewed key cases, highlighted common procedural missteps, and shared best practices. The knowledge gained, was utilized to support the Department's processes and procedures of investigating state complaints, support CA and school personnel, and enhance the Department's dispute resolution system.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2023 and 2024 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 21, 2024 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

## **Intro - Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2024 and 2025 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2025 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 2024 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2026, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

## Indicator 1: Graduation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 72.24%        |

| FFY       | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 90.00% | 83.00% | 72.24% | 73.00% | 74.00% |
| Data      | 64.01% | 63.41% | 72.24% | 69.72% | 70.22% |

### Targets

| FFY       | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 75.00% | 76.00% | 77.00% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department’s established advisory panel that advises the Department’s special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group’s special education priorities alongside the Department’s own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department’s SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawaii’s FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing

feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input specifically related to Indicator 1:

On March 8 and December 3, 2024, the Department brought educational partners together to discuss Indicator 1. They reviewed the longitudinal data, discussed whether the Department had made progress, and provided their input on the targets and improvement strategies. In reviewing the graduation rate data from FFY 2020, when the Department and stakeholders established a new baseline of 72.24%, the Department had a slight dip in FFY 2021 due mostly to the COVID-19 pandemic, and has been making steady progress with the FFY 2022 being at 70.51%. Although the Department did not meet the target of 75%, the stakeholders suggested not to adjust the targets, but rather focus on improvement strategies and raising the bar. Participants suggested adding an alternate diploma to the Department's exit option.

#### Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date       | Description  | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)     | 959  |
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |      |
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)                           | 181  |

| Source  | Date       | Description   | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 44   |
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)     | 176  |

#### FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 959  | 1,360   | 70.22%        | 75.00%          | 70.51%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

#### Graduation Conditions

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

In accordance with Board Policy 102-15 that can be accessed at <https://boe.hawaii.gov/policies/Board%20Policies/High%20School%20Graduation%20Requirements%20and%20Commencement.pdf>, High School Graduation Requirements and Commencement, Hawai'i has one set of standards for all youth with and without disabilities to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

High school graduation requirements in Hawai'i public schools set a rigorous standard of learning that enables all students to:

- 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 without the need for remediation.

A Hawai'i High School Diploma shall be issued to students who meet the following minimum course and credit requirements (Board of Education Policy 102-15), which total 24 credits.

- English = 4 credits;
- Social Studies = 4 credits;
- Mathematics = 3 credits;
- Science = 3 credits;
- World Language or Fine Arts or Career & Technical Education = 2 credits;
- Physical Education = 1 credit;
- Health = 0.5 credits;
- Personal Transition Plan = 0.5 credit;
- Electives = 6 credits

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

In addition, the Department has developed a dashboard called LEI Kukui that provides graduation data for all students. To access the LEI Kukui dashboard, please use the link: <https://hidoedata.org/Dashboard/dashboard/428>.

**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)**

While the Department did not meet its FFY 2023 target, graduate rates trended positively. The Department continued to prioritize the Hawai'i Multi-Tiered System (HMTSS), social-emotional learning (SEL), and trauma-informed practices to promote equitable access to mental health services and resources to address lingering challenges from COVID-19 and the catastrophic Maui wildfires. Strategies to support student well-being toward strengthening academic and functional performance included the following:

- Here To Help, a continuum of care that includes resources and school-based support to ensure students have what they need to thrive and reach their potential. Learn more about the Department's Here To Help at: <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/ssshome/hido-here-to-help?authuser=0>.
- Implementation of the Panorama Education Student Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Survey to identify and support student SEL needs. For more information, go to: <https://sites.google.com/panoramaed.com/hido/student-sel-survey-overview>.
- Access to Hazel Health, a comprehensive array of acute mental health support services, is aligned with HMTSS as an option for community-based mental health support for students.
- The Education of Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) program supports the identification and immediate enrollment of students in unstable housing. It includes full-time community liaisons in each complex and mobile outreach to students. Additional information can be found at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/ssshome/equity-and-access/education-for-homeless-children-youth>.
- Opportunities for middle and high schools to participate in Out-of-School Time Network (OST) programs to provide student academic enrichment and keep students on track to graduation. Programs included:
  - Resources for Enrichment, Academics/Athletics, Culture and Health (REACH) to support out-of-school time (before school, after school, weekends, summer, and intersessions) with enrichment activities toward keeping middle school students maintain



progress. Read more at: <https://hawaiicommunityengagement.com/reach/#about>

- United Peer Learning, Integrating New Knowledge (UPLINK), a middle school after-school program conducted in conjunction with Hawai'i Department of Human Services to prevent students from engaging in risky behaviors and promote positive activities, such as teen pregnancy prevention, remediation/tutoring, service-learning opportunities, etc.
- The Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers, a program to provide students with academic enrichment opportunities as well as offer families opportunities for literacy and related educational development. Read more at: <https://hawaiicommunityengagement.com/21cclc/>.
- Offered summer learning opportunities with prioritization for high school students who are not on track to graduate. Programs include but are not limited to: Summer School, Hawai'i Online Courses (HOC), Summer Learning Hubs, High School Athletic Camp, Alternative Learning Program, Services and Supports, Extended School Year, Early College and Student internships.
- Expansion of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) pathways to include Hospitality, Tourism and Recreation, Cultural Arts, Media, and Entertainment. Explore more at: <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/academics/secondary-middle-high-school/career-technical-education/>.

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 14.93%        |

| FFY       | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 11.00% | 11.00% | 14.93% | 14.00% | 13.00% |
| Data      | 16.82% | 12.38% | 14.93% | 12.55% | 15.84% |

### Targets

| FFY       | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 12.00% | 11.00% | 10.00% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

## Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

## Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

## IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

## Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

## CCCs

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

## LDAH

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

## The DD Council

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

## The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

## Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

## Additional input related to Indicator 2:

On March 8 and December 3, 2024, the Department brought educational partners together to discuss Indicator 2. They reviewed the longitudinal data, discussed whether the Department had made progress, and provided their input on the targets and improvement strategies. In reviewing the dropout rate data from FFY 2020, when the Department and stakeholders established a new baseline of 14.93%, the Department had an increase of dropouts in FFY 2022 at 15.84% being the first year that students fully returned to school in person after the pandemic. The Department made progress by decreasing dropout rates in FFY 2023 to 12.94%. The participants shared that students lacked the stamina and skills to transition back after virtual learning, and mental health needs had an impact on students being ready to learn. Although the Department did not meet the target of 12%, the stakeholders suggested not to adjust the targets, but rather focus on improvement strategies.

## Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date       | Description  | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)     | 959  |
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |      |
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)                           | 181  |

| Source  | Date       | Description   | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 44   |
| SY 2022-23 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 02/21/2024 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)     | 176  |

#### FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 176   | 1,360   | 15.84%        | 12.00%          | 12.94%        | Did not meet 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;
- Court-ordered to a youth correctional facility;
- Excluded from school due to zero-tolerance policies (for possession of guns, drugs);
- In-flight and the school had no information on whereabouts;
- Left the state to reside on the mainland (unable to verify);
- Married and not returning to school;
- Incarcerated in an adult correctional facility;
- 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)

While the Department did not meet its FFY 2023 target, the drop-out rate at 12.94% is less than the FFY 2022 data of 15.84% and less than the baseline target of 14.93%. The Department continued to focus on implementing the Department's Strategic Plan, aligning with supporting students to stay in school on track to graduation - Goal 1.2: All students learn in a safe, nurturing, and culturally responsive environment; and Goal 1.3: All students who graduate high school prepared for college and career success and community and civic engagement.

To promote students to target their college and career goals and support timely identification and response to student needs, the Department implemented the following strategies:

- Opportunities for middle and high schools to participate in Out-of-School Time Network (OST) programs to provide student academic enrichment and keep students on track to graduation. Programs included:
  - Resources for Enrichment, Academics/Athletics, Culture and Health (REACH) to support out-of-school time (before school, after school, weekends, summer, and intersessions) with enrichment activities toward keeping middle school students maintain progress. Read more at: <https://hawaiicommunityengagement.com/reach/#about>
  - United Peer Learning, Integrating New Knowledge (UPLINK), a middle school after-school program conducted in conjunction with Hawai'i Department of Human Services to prevent students from engaging in risky behaviors and promote positive activities, such as teen pregnancy prevention, remediation/tutoring, service-learning opportunities, etc.
  - The Nita M. Lowey 21st Century Community Learning Centers, a program to provide students with academic enrichment opportunities as well as offer families opportunities for literacy and related educational development. Read more at: <https://hawaiicommunityengagement.com/21cclc/>.
- Offered summer learning opportunities with prioritization for high school students who are not on track to graduate. Programs include but are not limited to: Summer School, Hawai'i Online Courses (HOC), Summer Learning Hubs, High School Athletic Camp, Alternative Learning Program, Services and Supports, Extended School Year, Early College and Student internships.
- Expansion of the Career and Technical Education (CTE) pathways to include Hospitality, Tourism and Recreation, Cultural Arts, Media, and Entertainment. Explore more at: <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/academics/secondary-middle-high-school/career-technical-education/>.

To foster student well-being and positive mental health, as students who feel mentally, emotionally, and physically supported are likely to stay academically engaged, the Hawai'i Multi-Tiered System (HMTSS), social-emotional learning (SEL) and use of trauma-informed practices to promote equitable access to mental health services continued to be a priority for the Department. The HMTSS is a student-centered, data-driven, team-based decision-making framework for achieving positive outcomes for every student through a layered continuum of evidence-based practices. In HMTSS, students are provided targeted support for well-being and mental health based on their needs. Such support addressed the lingering challenges from COVID-19 and the tragic Maui wildfires and encouraged students to continue their studies. Strategies to support student well-being toward strengthening academic and functional performance included the following:

- Here to Help is a multi-year plan to train and coach staff to support student well-being and to provide equitable access to mental and physical health for all students in schools statewide. Learn more at: <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/ssshome/hidoe-here-to-help?authuser=0>.
- Implementation of the Panorama Education Student Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) Survey to identify and support student SEL needs. For more information, go to: <https://sites.google.com/panoramaed.com/hidoe/surveys-overview/student-sel-survey-overview>.
- Access to Hazel Health, a comprehensive array of services for acute mental health support, is aligned with HMTSS as an option for community-based mental health support for students.
- The Education of Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) program supports the identification and immediate enrollment of students in unstable housing and includes full-time community liaisons in each complex and mobile outreach to students. Additional information can be found at: <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/ssshome/equity-and-access/education-for-homeless-children-youth>.
- The COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated concerns about students' social and emotional well-being. To monitor and evaluate perceptions, the Department administered the following surveys: 1) The annual School Quality Survey indicated the overall perception of students and parents regarding school safety. Perception data remains relatively the same with a slight increase in elementary students by approximately two (2) percent increase in the perception that schools are safe. 2) A social-emotional learning perception survey twice a year that is composed of four (4) strands: Sense of Belonging, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Emotion Regulation. Based on the results, the kindergarten through second grade showed progress in emotion regulation and social awareness; elementary students demonstrated favorability in the areas of sense of belonging, self-management, and social awareness; and grades six through 12 students demonstrated a need for improvement strands.

## **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 ED Facts 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 | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >=  | Grade 4    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | B >=  | Grade 8    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >=  | Grade HS   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math    | A >=  | Grade 4    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math    | B >=  | Grade 8    | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Math    | C >=  | Grade HS   | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

### CCCs

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

### LDAH

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

### The DD Council

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

### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

### Additional input related to Indicator 3A:

At the December 3 meeting and other activities, a discussion was held regarding the participation rate of students in Grade 11, as data indicates that it is lower than other grades for both students with and without disabilities. Their insight was: a) As students mature, they may choose to decline participation in statewide assessments; b) Some students may feel that statewide assessments are less relevant to their postsecondary plans; and c) By Grade 11, students have participated in multiple years of standardized testing, which can lead to assessment fatigue.

## FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

01/08/2025

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)**

| Group   | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs (2)   | 1,525   | 1,492   | 1,198    |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)    | 337     | 711     | 805      |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)       | 1,020   | 566     | 104      |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 125     | 101     | 121      |

**Data Source:**

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

01/08/2025

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

| Group   | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs (2)   | 1,527   | 1,492   | 1,198    |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3)    | 323     | 741     | 811      |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3)       | 1,041   | 551     | 95       |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 123     | 101     | 121      |

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

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

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

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 1,482                                      | 1,525                        | 97.20%        | 95.00%          | 97.18%        | Met target          | No Slippage |
| B     | Grade 8    | 1,378                                      | 1,492                        | 92.23%        | 95.00%          | 92.36%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C     | Grade HS   | 1,030                                      | 1,198                        | 83.85%        | 95.00%          | 85.98%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 1,487                                      | 1,527                        | 97.27%        | 95.00%          | 97.38%        | Met target          | No Slippage |
| B     | Grade 8    | 1,393                                      | 1,492                        | 93.08%        | 95.00%          | 93.36%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |



| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| C     | Grade HS   | 1,027                                      | 1,198                        | 84.59%        | 95.00%          | 85.73%        | 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 2022 SPP/APR data at the following link.  
[https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE\\_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf](https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf)

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

Participation

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

Accountability Resource Center Hawaii (ARCH)

<http://arch.k12.hi.us/>

Every Student Succeeds Act Report Card

<http://arch.k12.hi.us/reports/essa>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting

<https://hawaiipublicschools.org/school-services/special-education-data-and-reports/>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 3A - OSEP Response

### 3A - Required Actions

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

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

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

### CCCs

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

### LDAH

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

### The DD Council

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

### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

Additional input related to Indicator 3B:

During the discussions with the various stakeholders, the recommendation was to keep with the same targets as they are appropriate and reasonable.

## FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

01/08/2025

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment     | 1,357   | 1,277   | 909      |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 65      | 64      | 107      |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level    | 54      | 33      | 4        |

**Data Source:**

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/08/2025

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment     | 1,364   | 1,292   | 906      |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 69      | 28      | 12       |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level    | 82      | 17      | 3        |

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

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| Gr<br>ou<br>p | Group<br>Name | Number of Children<br>with IEPs Scoring At or<br>Above Proficient<br>Against Grade Level<br>Academic Achievement<br>Standards | Number of Children<br>with IEPs who<br>Received a Valid Score<br>and for whom a<br>Proficiency Level was<br>Assigned for the<br>Regular Assessment | FFY 2022<br>Data | FFY 2023<br>Target | FFY 2023<br>Data | Status                 | Slippage       |
|---------------|---------------|---|--|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| A             | Grade 4       | 119   | 1,357  | 9.40%            | 16.00%             | 8.77%            | Did not<br>meet target | Slippage       |
| B             | Grade 8       | 97  | 1,277  | 8.32%            | 14.00%             | 7.60%            | Did not<br>meet target | Slippage       |
| C             | Grade<br>HS   | 111   | 909  | 12.86%           | 21.00%             | 12.21%           | Did not<br>meet target | No<br>Slippage |

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

The Department did not meet its grade 4 reading assessment target and had a slippage of 0.63 percentage points compared to FFY 2022. After a review of and analysis of workforce data, teacher shortage and inexperienced workforce likely impacted instructional quality and designing and delivering specialized instruction aligning to the grade level expectations.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The Department did not meet its grade 8 reading assessment target and had a slippage of 0.72 percentage points compared to FFY 2022. The same reasons described for group A apply to group B.

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 151  | 1,364  | 11.48%        | 18.00%          | 11.07%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B     | Grade 8    | 45   | 1,292  | 4.60%         | 12.00%          | 3.48%         | Did not meet target | Slippage    |
| C     | Grade HS   | 15   | 906  | 1.92%         | 9.00%           | 1.66%         | Did not meet target | Slippage    |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The Department did not meet its grade 8 math assessment target and had a slippage of 1.12 percentage points compared to FFY 2022. The same reasons described for group A & B in Reading Assessment. After a review of and analysis of workforce data, teacher shortage and inexperienced workforce likely impacted instructional quality and designing and delivering specialized instruction aligning to the grade level expectations.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The Department did not meet its grade 11 math assessment target and had a slippage of 0.41 percentage points compared to FFY 2022. The same reasons described for group A & B in Reading & Math Assessment.

**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 2022 SPP/APR data at the following link.  
[https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE\\_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf](https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf)

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

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

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

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

618 Data Tables Public Reporting  
<https://hawaiipublicschools.org/school-services/special-education-data-and-reports/>

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

None

**3B - OSEP Response**
**3B - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using ED*Facts* 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 | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|---------|-------|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Reading | A >=  | Grade 4    | 58.00% | 60.00% | 62.00% |
| Reading | B >=  | Grade 8    | 50.00% | 52.00% | 54.00% |
| Reading | C >=  | Grade HS   | 43.00% | 45.00% | 47.00% |
| Math    | A >=  | Grade 4    | 57.00% | 59.00% | 61.00% |
| Math    | B >=  | Grade 8    | 48.00% | 50.00% | 52.00% |
| Math    | C >=  | Grade HS   | 45.00% | 47.00% | 49.00% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of

information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input related to Indicator 3C:

During the December 3 meeting and other activities, the participants recommended not to adjust the targets as they are reasonable and achievable. Furthermore, the Department received additional feedback on the development of the HSA-Alt program. The Assessment Section, in the Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance convened a Stakeholder Committee composed of various role groups from the Department, special education advocates, parents of children with significant cognitive disabilities and community members to review and provide feedback on the development of the HSA-Alt program. This included: a) New HSA-Alt Decision Making Tool, b) HSA-Alt Participation Plan; c) HSA-Alt Shortened Test Protocol, and c) Pilot the HSA-Alt Classroom Embedded Assessment.

## FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

01/08/2025

### 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 | 125     | 101     | 121      |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient            | 59      | 24      | 34       |

### Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

### Date:

01/08/2025

### 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 | 123     | 101     | 121      |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient            | 46      | 21      | 42       |

### FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 59   | 125  | 41.09%        | 58.00%          | 47.20%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B     | Grade 8    | 24   | 101  | 31.18%        | 50.00%          | 23.76%        | Did not meet target | Slippage    |
| C     | Grade HS   | 34   | 121  | 36.84%        | 43.00%          | 28.10%        | Did not meet target | Slippage    |

### Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The Department did not meet its Grade 8 HSA-Alt reading assessment target, experiencing a 7.42 percentage point slippage compared to FFY 2022. Several key factors contributed to this decline:

#### - Impact of COVID-19 on Students with Significant Cognitive Impairments

- Many students in this cohort, who were enrolled in school during the early COVID-19 pandemic, faced substantial disruptions in literacy skill development.
- School closures and shifts to remote learning disproportionately affected students with significant cognitive impairments, who often require structured, in-person instruction and support.

#### - Increased Participation in Alternate Assessments

- The Department observed a gradual increase in student participation in alternate assessments.
- While this reflects efforts to ensure more students are assessed, it may have negatively impacted overall performance on Indicator 3C.

#### - Chronic Absenteeism Among Students Taking the HSA-Alt



- a) Chronic absenteeism among students participating in alternate assessments was notably higher than the overall student population.
- b) Missed instructional time contributed to gaps in literacy development and lower assessment performance.

- To address these challenges, the Department is committed to:

- a) Enhancing targeted interventions for students with significant cognitive impairments to close literacy gaps.
- b) Increasing student engagement and participation in alternate assessments through individualized learning supports.

Addressing chronic absenteeism by implementing attendance monitoring systems and providing additional family engagement resources.

#### **Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The Department did not meet its grade HS HSA-Alt reading assessment target and had a slippage of 8.74 percentage points compared to FFY 2022. The same reasons discussed under Group B also apply to group C.

#### **FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 46   | 123  | 37.01%        | 57.00%          | 37.40%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B     | Grade 8    | 21   | 101  | 31.18%        | 48.00%          | 20.79%        | Did not meet target | Slippage    |
| C     | Grade HS   | 42   | 121  | 36.56%        | 45.00%          | 34.71%        | Did not meet target | Slippage    |

#### **Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The Department did not meet its grade 8 HSA-Alt math assessment target and had a slippage of 10.39 percentage points compared to FFY 2022. Similar to the explanation under Groups B and C for reading, this cohort, who were enrolled in school during COVID-19 pandemic, most students with significant cognitive impairments, were the groups that were more heavily impacted by early pandemic closures, leading to significant disruptions in literacy skill development. These students are gradually increasing their participation on alternate assessments, probably impairing the Department's performance on 3C. Another contributing factor is chronic absenteeism among students taking the alternate assessment, which was notably higher than the overall population, further hindering their ability to achieve proficiency.

#### **Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

The Department did not meet its grade HS HSA-Alt reading assessment target and had a slippage of 1.85 percentage points compared to FFY 2022. The same reasons discussed under Group B also apply to group C.

#### **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 2022 SPP/APR data at the following link.  
[https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE\\_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf](https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/HIDOE_SPP-APRFFY2022.pdf)

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

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

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

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

618 Data Tables Public Reporting  
<https://hawaiipublicschools.org/school-services/special-education-data-and-reports/>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

**3C - Required Actions**

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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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 2023-2024 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2023-2024 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 | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|---------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Reading | A <=  | Grade 4    | 35.00 | 33.00 | 31.00 |
| Reading | B <=  | Grade 8    | 37.00 | 35.00 | 33.00 |
| Reading | C <=  | Grade HS   | 38.00 | 36.00 | 34.00 |
| Math    | A <=  | Grade 4    | 30.00 | 28.00 | 26.00 |
| Math    | B <=  | Grade 8    | 26.00 | 24.00 | 22.00 |
| Math    | C <=  | Grade HS   | 21.00 | 19.00 | 17.00 |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of

information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input related to Indicator 3D:

During the discussions with the various stakeholders, the recommendation was to keep with the same targets as they are appropriate and reasonable.

### FFY 2023 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

#### Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

01/08/2025

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment                 | 12,967  | 12,252  | 10,831   |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment           | 1,357   | 1,277   | 909      |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level       | 6,318   | 5,995   | 6,324    |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level          | 54      | 33      | 4        |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 65      | 64      | 107      |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level    | 54      | 33      | 4        |

**Data Source:**

SY 2023-24 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

01/08/2025

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)**

| Group  | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment                 | 13,054  | 12,372  | 10,879   |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment           | 1,364   | 1,292   | 906      |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level       | 6,119   | 3,930   | 2,681    |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level          | 82      | 17      | 3        |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 69      | 28      | 12       |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level    | 82      | 17      | 3        |

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

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 8.77%   | 49.14%  | 41.60         | 35.00           | 40.37         | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B     | Grade 8    | 7.60%   | 49.20%  | 41.36         | 37.00           | 41.60         | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C     | Grade HS   | 12.21%  | 58.42%  | 45.64         | 38.00           | 46.21         | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A     | Grade 4    | 11.07%  | 47.50%  | 37.75         | 30.00           | 36.43         | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B     | Grade 8    | 3.48%   | 31.90%  | 26.10         | 26.00           | 28.42         | Did not meet target | Slippage    |
| C     | Grade HS   | 1.66%   | 24.67%  | 23.04         | 21.00           | 23.02         | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

The Department has faced ongoing challenges in student performance on the SBA math assessments contributing to the observed achievement gap in FFY 2023, particularly in Grade 8 Math. An October 2023 memo to the Board of Education highlighted that in FFY 2021, fewer than one-third of Hawaii's eighth-grade students demonstrated grade-level math proficiency. Additionally, the national and local shortage of math teachers remains a persistent issue. In response, the Department has intensified mathematics education efforts through a tri-level system—state, complex area, and school—to build proficiency from elementary to middle school. Despite a slight overall increase in Grade 8 math proficiency from 30.70% in FFY 2022 to 31.90% in FFY 2023, the achievement gap for students with disabilities widened, with their proficiency rate declining from 4.60% to 3.48%. Other contributing factors outlined in indicator 3B further explain this slippage.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Department recognizes the critical importance of mathematics and its impact on students and their success in school and preparing them for post-secondary career, college and community plans. More specifically, based on a review of Smarter Balanced data from SY 2018-2019 to 2021 to 2022, the Department determined 8th grade mathematics to be a critical area of need. Thus, the Department made mathematics education a priority. To address the critical need for 8th grade proficiency and beyond, the Department focused on three areas: 1) Viable Quality Mathematics Curriculum; 2) Evidence-based High-Impact Math Instructional strategies and 3) Student for Monitoring Progress. For students who do not meet math proficiency, the Department is utilizing the HMTSS - response to intervention, school instructional decision making teams, tutoring, training to general education teachers, special education teachers and educational assistants of students with disabilities on multisensory learning kits (math manipulatives) to implement Evidence-Based Practice of Concrete-Recreational Abstract instructional approach, Listening to Learn Digital Online Assessment and Instructional Strategies for Mathematics (K-5) to Increase Access and Engagement of students with disabilities.

**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 must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs.

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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 23-01, dated July.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 1.00%         |

| FFY       | 2018  | 2019  | 2020  | 2021  | 2022  |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data      | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

### Targets

| FFY       | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawaii's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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



#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input related to Indicator 4A:

During the 2023-2024 school year, the Department reviewed suspension and expulsion data with stakeholders and determined its definition of significant discrepancy appropriate. Stakeholders requested more detailed, disaggregated data on disability categories, race/ethnicity, grade levels, and historical trends as well as alternative to suspension strategies the Department is utilizing to decrease the use of exclusionary discipline practices.

At the December 3 meeting, participants discussed strategies to reduce suspensions. The Department is strengthening student behavior support by focusing on adult behavior through Organizational Behavior Management (OBM) and trauma-informed practices; reinforcing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) through the OASIS framework, emphasizing Tier 1 strategies and integrating Social-Emotional Learning (SEL), Restorative Practices, Trauma-Informed Care, and Mental Health with academics. Further to promote a supportive learning environment, the Department is utilizing the Inclusive Skill-Building Learning Approach (ISLA), an instructional and restorative alternative to exclusionary discipline practices, on discipline disproportionality. Future initiatives include updating Manifestation Determination Guidance, strengthening Tier 1 and Tier 2 behavioral supports, launching an attendance campaign, collaborating with the Hawai'i State Teachers Association (HSTA) through a Behavior Workgroup and revising its discipline administrative rules, Chapter 19.

Participants emphasized the importance of collaboration, training, and proactive behavior strategies to reduce suspensions. Key recommendations included setting clear timelines for system changes, improving school-family communication, fostering respectful relationships, and creating meaningful student programs. Schools should also explore creative staffing solutions, equip stakeholders with effective tools, and ensure consistent follow-up on behavior concerns to build a more supportive and inclusive school environment.

#### FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

**If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).**

The Department, with stakeholder input, determined a minimum n and cell size of five (5) children for the data analysis. The state selected a minimum n and cell size to maintain data integrity. When n and cell sizes are too small, in the case of Hawai'i, smaller than five (5) children, it may lead to unreliable calculations, which may mislead the interpretation of the results.

**If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.**

In collaboration with educational partners, the Department determined that the n-cell size of five (5) children for the data analysis is reasonable. Longitudinal data was utilized to determine whether the n-cell size of five (5) was determined to be reasonable to ensure smaller complex areas are included in the analysis in order to identify significant discrepancy.

**If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.**

No change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. Minimum N size of five (5) remains unchanged.

**If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.**

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n/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.

0

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 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**

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

In analyzing the FFY 2023 data, the Department used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted in October 2023 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the SY 2022-2023. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

**FFY 2023**

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

State's Rate for Children with Disabilities:

145 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 19,611 (Total number of special education children) = 0.74%

State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:

509 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 150,598 (Total number of children without disabilities) = 0.34%

Rate Difference = (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children without disabilities) 0.74% - 0.34% = 0.40 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 0.40 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 that both the number of children with and without disabilities suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in SY 2022-2023 was higher when compared to SY 2021-2022.

To better support student behavior and development, the Department continued with the Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Supports, however, with a shift in its lens toward understanding how factors are interconnected with student behavior. This included examining classroom environments, class rules and expectations, behavior management practices, building student-teacher relationships, strengthening curriculum/instructional interventions, and how adult behavior impacts student behavior.

In SY 2023-2024, the Department held the Ka Ulana "Ana i ka Piko: In Weaving You Begin at the Center, Hawai'i State Summer Behavior Conference and Post-Conference Workshops, with the initial conference held from July 24, 2023 through July 27, 2023. As many roles support positive student behavior, various positions, such as Educational Assistants, related service personnel, teachers, principals, and complex area staff, were invited to attend.

As part of the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) multi-tiered framework adopted by the Department to cultivate and sustain a positive school culture and climate, a variety of strategies were implemented statewide. Some strategies to improve behavior included The Panorama Social and Emotional Learning Survey and Student Success Dashboard, Trauma-informed practices, Organizational Behavior Management with a focus on adult behavior to improve student behavior, and the Inclusive Skill-building Learning Approach (ISLA). To learn more about ISLA, go to: <https://www.neselab.org/isla/>.

Lastly, in SY 2023-2024, the Department recognized the importance of having a high-quality educator workforce in schools to support students with diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds access and meet achievement standards, offered teachers the opportunity to participate, and added a Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) certification to their current teaching license. Additionally, TESOL Sheltered Instruction Qualification coursework was made available throughout the school year to support multilingual students, including bilingual learners identified with learning disabilities.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 data)**

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

If the Department is identified as having significant discrepancy, the Department conducts a review of procedures, policies, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards (e.g., reviews of school-

level data, analysis of state policies, procedures, and practices, and verification of implementation of these practices in schools and complex areas, etc.).

Due to the fact that the Department did not have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2023, no review of procedures, policies, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards were warranted.

The Department 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 2022**

| 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 2022**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, by race and ethnicity, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA, by race and ethnicity).

The State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity. The State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. If so, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

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 2023 SPP/APR, use data from 2022-2023), 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:

- Option 1: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- Option 2: The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEAs

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

If, under Option 1, the State uses a State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate for children with disabilities to compare to LEA-level long-term suspension and expulsion rates for the purpose of determining whether an LEA has a significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, the State must provide the State-level long-term suspension and expulsion rate used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose long-term suspension/expulsion rate exceeds 2 percentage points above the State-level rate of 0.7%, the State must provide OSEP with the State-level rate of 0.7%).

If, under Option 2, the State uses a rate difference to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate difference used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, is 4 percentage points above the long-term suspension/expulsion rate for nondisabled children, the State must provide OSEP with the rate difference of 4 percentage points). Similarly, if, under Option 2, the State uses a rate ratio to compare the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions for nondisabled children within the LEA, the State must provide the State-selected rate ratio used in its methodology (e.g., if a State has defined significant discrepancy to exist for an LEA whose ratio of its long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for children with IEPs, by race and ethnicity, to long-term suspensions and expulsions rate for nondisabled children is greater than 3.0, the State must provide OSEP with the rate ratio of 3.0).

Because the Measurement Table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2022-2023 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2022-2023 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2023-2024, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2022-2023 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2022-2023 (which can be found in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of 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 23-01, dated July.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

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    | 2018  | 2019  | 2020  | 2021 | 2022  |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| Target | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%   | 0%    |
| Data   | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |      | 0.00% |

### Targets

| FFY    | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

### FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

If yes, the State must provide a definition of its minimum n and/or cell size itself and a description thereof (e.g., a State's n size of 15 represents the number of children with disabilities enrolled in an LEA, and a State's cell size of 5 represents the number of children with disabilities, by race and ethnicity, who have received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days within the LEA).

The Department, with stakeholder input, determined a minimum n and cell size of five (5) children for the data analysis. The Department selected a minimum n (number of children with disabilities enrolled in the Department) and cell size (number of children with disabilities who received out-of-school suspensions and expulsions within the Department) to maintain data integrity. When n and cell sizes are too small, in the case of Hawai'i, smaller than five (5) children, it may lead to unreliable calculations, which may mislead the interpretation of the results.

If yes, the State must also provide rationales for its minimum n and/or cell size, including why the definitions chosen are reasonable and based on stakeholder input, and how the definitions ensure that the State is appropriately analyzing and identifying LEAs with significant discrepancy.

In collaboration with educational partners, the Department determined that the n and cell size of five (5) children for the data analysis is reasonable. Longitudinal data was utilized to determine whether the n and cell size of five (5) was determined to be reasonable to ensure smaller complex areas are included in the analysis in order to identify significant discrepancy.

If yes, the State must also indicate whether the minimum n and/or cell size represents a change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period.

No change from the prior SPP/APR reporting period. Minimum n and cell size of five (5) remains unchanged.

If yes, the State must provide an explanation why the minimum n and/or cell size was changed.

NA

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/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.

0

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity | Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 1  | 0  | 1   | 0.00%         | 0%              | 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

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Methodology

Hawai'i is a single District State; as such, the SEA and LEA are the same; therefore, Hawai'i determines significant discrepancy by comparing the rates of suspension/expulsion for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to the rates of suspension/expulsion for children without disabilities within the Local Education Agency (LEA)/State Education Agency (SEA). This is consistent with IDEA Data Center (IDC) Measuring Significant Discrepancy "An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide," page 70, which can be found at: [https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring\\_significant\\_discrepancy-an\\_ind.pdf](https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring_significant_discrepancy-an_ind.pdf).

To compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children without IEPs within the Department, the rate difference methodology is used. Rate difference compares the suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs to the suspension/expulsion rate for children without IEPs by race and ethnicity. Rate difference equation = state suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs minus (-) the state rate for children without IEPs.

Definition of Significant Discrepancy

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

FFY 2023 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:

145 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 19,611 (Total number of special education children) = 0.74%

State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:

509 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 150,598 (Total number of children without disabilities) = 0.34%

Rate Difference= (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students without disabilities) 0.74% - 0.34%= 0.40 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  $(509/150,598) \times 100 = 0.34\%$

The 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  $(15/3175) \times 100 = 0.47\%$

The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(509/150,598) \times 100 = 0.34\%$

The rate difference is  $0.47\% - 0.34\% = 0.13$  percentage points

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  $(509/150,598) \times 100 = 0.34\%$

The 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  $(52/4426) \times 100 = 1.17\%$

The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(509/150,598) \times 100 = 0.34\%$

The rate difference is  $1.17\% - 0.33\% = 0.83$  percentage points

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  $(509/150,598) \times 100 = 0.34\%$   
The 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  $54/6169 = 0.88\%$   
The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(509/150,598) \times 100 = 0.34\%$   
The rate difference is  $0.88\% - 0.34\% = 0.54$  percentage points

#### White

Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is  $21/2295 = 0.92\%$   
The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(509/150,598) \times 100 = 0.34\%$   
The rate difference is  $0.92\% - 0.34\% = 0.58$  percentage points

#### Summary

The Department did identify a significant discrepancy for FFY 2023 by race/ethnicity in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days for the Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity with a rate difference of 0.83 percentage points, which met the significant discrepancy definition of the rate difference of 0.75 percentage points or greater.

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Department, in keeping with the 2023-2029 Implementation Plan, Priority II, high-quality educator workforce in all schools, recognized the need to have effective staff committed to providing quality services to support students. The Department provided professional development opportunities to promote adherence to IDEA requirements, behavioral supports, and procedural safeguards and included the following:

- Substantively Measurable IEPs and Learning Excellence (SMILE), focused on the development and implementation of IEPs
- Ka Ulaana 'Ana i ka Pilo: In Weaving, You Begin at the Center - Hawai'i State Summer Behavior Conference and Post-Conference Workshops, promoting positive student behavior, student well-being, and supports
- I KE ALU LIKE - We Are All In This Together Conference, targeting IEP development, procedural requirements related to discipline, etc.,
- Executive Function Professional Learning Network, examining executive functioning skills (e.g., Organization, Attention, Problem-solving, Self-control, and Emotional regulation, etc.) to increase academic and behavioral outcomes for students

To learn more about the 2023-2029 Strategic Plan Phase II, Implementation Plan, visit:

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Advancing%20Education/2023-29-ImplementationPlan.pdf>

#### Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2023 using 2022-2023 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.

As mentioned above, the Department is a single District State; the SEA and LEA are the same. If the data, in a given year, indicates the Department has identified significant discrepancy, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC), designated as the monitoring entity within the Department, reviews and analyses the Department policies, procedures, or practices to verify whether they contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the Department, and verify whether they comply with requirements related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

The Department identified significant discrepancy for FFY 2023 by race/ethnicity in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days for the Hispanic/Latino race/ethnicity with a rate difference of 0.83 percentage points, which met the significant discrepancy definition of the rate difference of 0.75 percentage points or greater. As a result, MAC reviewed the Department policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards and determined these policies, procedures, and practices are consistently implemented statewide regardless of race/ethnicity. Noncompliance was not identified as a result of the review.

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 2022

| 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 2022

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**



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

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Part | Baseline | FFY       | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A    | 2020     | Target >= | 57.00% | 57.00% | 50.71% | 53.00% | 55.00% |
| A    | 50.71%   | Data      | 43.86% | 47.95% | 50.71% | 52.54% | 52.77% |
| B    | 2020     | Target <= | 14.00% | 14.00% | 16.30% | 15.80% | 15.30% |
| B    | 16.30%   | Data      | 17.15% | 16.41% | 16.30% | 16.22% | 16.37% |
| C    | 2020     | Target <= | 1.50%  | 1.50%  | 0.96%  | 0.96%  | 0.95%  |
| C    | 0.96%    | Data      | 1.21%  | 1.07%  | 0.96%  | 1.21%  | 1.34%  |

### Targets

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took

place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input related to Indicator 5:

During the discussions with the various stakeholders, the recommendation was to keep with the same targets as they are appropriate and reasonable.

#### Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date       | Description   | Data   |
|---|------------|---|--------|
| SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/31/2024 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 18,241 |

| Source  | Date       | Description  | Data  |
|---|------------|--|-------|
| SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/31/2024 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day   | 9,711 |
| SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/31/2024 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 2,903 |
| SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/31/2024 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools                              | 164   |
| SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/31/2024 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities                        | 18    |
| SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/31/2024 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements                 | 52    |

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 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day  | 9,711  | 18,241  | 52.77%        | 57.00%          | 53.24%        | 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  | 2,903  | 18,241  | 16.37%        | 14.80%          | 15.91%        | 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] | 234  | 18,241  | 1.34%         | 0.95%           | 1.28%         | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Department continued its efforts to expand inclusive practices across the state through a range of strategies and professional development opportunities, as seen by the gradual increase in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) percentage for students served inside the regular class for more than 80% of the day.

These efforts included:

- Ongoing Professional Learning Network (PLN) meetings, both monthly and quarterly in-person, to foster collaboration and provide consistent guidance. The PLN is composed of various schools, complex areas, and state representatives across the state to discuss, have learning opportunities, and build capacity for implementing inclusive practices, with its membership continuing to expand.
- Tiered Complex Area Support customized to meet the unique needs of complex areas.
- Complex Area Sustaining Change Meetings to promote lasting improvements.
- Demonstration Site Expansion offering targeted professional development and modeling effective inclusive practices.
- Delivered statewide Step-by-Step training to five schools across three complex areas.
- Leadership Training for school leaders on revitalizing inclusive practices on their campuses and a three-day statewide training focusing on co-teaching strategies and supporting collaborative teaching partnerships.
- Mini Professional Development covering essential topics such as Educational Assistant roles, student-centered decision-making, and staffing/scheduling.
- Inclusive Practices Learning Network book club focusing on Specially Designed Instruction and best practices for inclusion.
- Credited Inclusive Practices Course designed to support teachers in implementing accommodations effectively in inclusive classrooms. Personalized

assistance was also provided to schools as needed.

- Standards of Practice website was developed with tools and resources for administrators, teachers, and school staff toward supporting implementation and inclusive practices. More information can be accessed at: <https://inclusion.hawaiipublicschools.org/standards-of-practice>
- Professional Development opportunities were provided to school staff toward creating more inclusive and effective learning environments such as:
  - Substantively Measurable Individual Education Programs and Learning Excellence (SMILE), August 21-24, 2023
  - Enhancing Reading Instruction for Students who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing, October 9-12, 2023
  - Classroom Listening Assessments for Students who are Deaf/Hard of Hearing, various dates from January 2024 - March 2024
  - Executive Function Professional Learning Network, April 26, 2024, May 31, 2024, June 28, 2024
  - I KE ALU LIKE - We Are All In This Together, March 19-20, 2024

## **5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **5 - OSEP Response**

## **5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# 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) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 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 preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

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

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

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

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

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

| Part | FFY       | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A    | Target >= | 35.50% | 35.50% | 21.33% | 22.00% | 22.75% |
| A    | Data      | 26.93% | 28.44% | 21.33% | 20.45% | 16.97% |
| B    | Target <= | 23.20% | 23.20% | 32.29% | 31.00% | 30.00% |
| B    | Data      | 21.76% | 23.82% | 32.29% | 38.34% | 41.44% |
| C    | Target <= |        |        | 1.26%  | 1.23%  | 1.20%  |
| C    | Data      |        |        | 1.26%  | 0.60%  | 0.90%  |

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

##### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

### CCCs

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

### LDAH

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

### The DD Council

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

### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

### Additional input related to Indicator 6:

During the December 3 meeting and other engagement activities, the participants expressed maintaining the established Indicator 6 targets for the state to be high achieving. Participants provided feedback for the Department to increase collaboration with the Executive Office of Early Learning, school and parents. Further the Department shared about the Interagency Collaboration Team consisting of Complex Area and State staff, Part C—Early Intervention staff, and early childhood community partners to strengthen preschool inclusion opportunities.

### Targets

**Please select if the State wants to set baselines 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         | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A >= | 23.50% | 24.25% | 25.00% |
| Target B <= | 29.00% | 28.00% | 27.00% |

#### Inclusive Targets – 6C

| FFY         | 2023  | 2024  | 2025  |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target C <= | 1.17% | 1.14% | 1.11% |

#### Prepopulated Data

##### Data Source:

SY 2023-24 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

##### Date:

07/31/2024

| Description  | 3   | 4   | 5   | 3 through 5 - Total |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|
| Total number of children with IEPs   | 656 | 969 | 356 | 1,981               |
| 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 | 77  | 185 | 75  | 337                 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class  | 318 | 402 | 138 | 858                 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school   | 7   | 5   | 1   | 13                  |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility  | 2   | 0   | 2   | 4                   |
| c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home  | 3   | 5   | 3   | 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 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 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 | 337  | 1,981   | 16.97%        | 23.50%          | 17.01%        | 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility | 875  | 1,981   | 41.44%        | 29.00%          | 44.17%        | Did not meet target | Slippage    |
| C. Home   | 11   | 1,981   | 0.90%         | 1.17%           | 0.56%         | Met target          | No Slippage |

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

The closure of four (4) general and six (6) special education preschool classrooms due to significant events such as the Maui wildfires, general education PreK classrooms ending, and staffing challenges necessitated the relocation of preschool students. The disruption in routine and surroundings added challenges that may have impacted student academic, social, and behavioral performance, requiring a closer examination of the needs and support of students in the least restrictive environment.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

With support from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), the Department established an Interagency Collaboration Leadership Team in 2023 consisting of Complex Area and State staff, Part C—Early Intervention staff, and early childhood community partners to strengthen preschool inclusion opportunities. In 2023-2024, the team developed the Hawai'i Early Childhood Inclusion Statement, which can be found at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SKJJQGdEbQsryTCw\\_N-ODXXn0sFMC1yW/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SKJJQGdEbQsryTCw_N-ODXXn0sFMC1yW/view).

On October 12 and 13, 2023, the Department held the 2023 Early Childhood Conference. Topics included how to support preschool special education instructional practices, learn new skills, and access resources, including the IDEA Data Center's Preschool Environments Toolkit, found at <https://ideadata.org/resources/resource/2524/preschool-environments-toolkit/>.

In the school year 2023-2024, the Executive Office of Early Learning (EOEL) expanded its program by adding 12 preschool classrooms for 3 and 4 year old children. This growth of the public preschool program will increase inclusive 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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

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

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

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

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

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

| Part | Baseline | FFY       | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1   | 2018     | Target >= | 74.00% | 74.00% | 66.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% |
| A1   | 62.01%   | Data      | 62.01% | 69.66% | 65.68% | 54.74% | 57.53% |

|    |        |           |        |        |        |        |        |
|----|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A2 | 2018   | Target >= | 52.00% | 52.00% | 45.00% | 46.00% | 47.00% |
| A2 | 44.28% | Data      | 44.28% | 43.13% | 41.20% | 45.62% | 50.67% |
| B1 | 2018   | Target >= | 76.00% | 76.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% | 72.00% |
| B1 | 65.56% | Data      | 65.56% | 69.79% | 68.07% | 55.54% | 58.52% |
| B2 | 2018   | Target >= | 56.00% | 56.00% | 51.00% | 52.00% | 53.00% |
| B2 | 49.53% | Data      | 49.53% | 45.02% | 42.65% | 40.46% | 45.59% |
| C1 | 2018   | Target >= | 76.00% | 76.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% | 72.00% |
| C1 | 63.90% | Data      | 63.90% | 71.56% | 68.21% | 56.37% | 56.12% |
| C2 | 2018   | Target >= | 59.00% | 59.00% | 41.00% | 42.00% | 43.00% |
| C2 | 40.11% | Data      | 40.11% | 39.00% | 37.32% | 46.20% | 52.67% |

## Targets

| FFY          | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 >= | 72.00% | 74.00% | 76.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 48.00% | 49.00% | 50.00% |
| Target B1 >= | 74.00% | 76.00% | 78.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 54.00% | 55.00% | 56.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 74.00% | 76.00% | 78.00% |
| Target C2 >= | 44.00% | 45.00% | 46.00% |

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input related to Indicator 7:

During the December 3 meeting and other engagement activities, the participants expressed maintaining the established Indicator 7 targets for the state to be high achieving. Educational partners provided a variety of feedback, such as suggesting the Department conduct training for parents to learn effective student strategies so parents can implement them in the home. This additional reinforcement would likely increase positive student outcomes. Another recommendation was to have targeted early childhood professional development for special education teachers and related service providers to empower staff to meet the varied needs of the preschool students.

#### FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

835

##### 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   | 9                  | 1.08%                  |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 307                | 36.77%                 |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 161                | 19.28%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 203                | 24.31%                 |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 155                | 18.56%                 |

| Outcome A  | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, | 364       | 680         | 57.53%        | 72.00%          | 53.53%        | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| Outcome A   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.<br><i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>                                   |           |             |               |                 |               |                     |          |
| 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> | 358       | 835         | 50.67%        | 48.00%          | 42.87%        | Did not meet target | 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   | 5                  | 0.60%                  |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 302                | 36.17%                 |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 215                | 25.75%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 187                | 22.40%                 |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 126                | 15.09%                 |

| Outcome B   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 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> | 402       | 709         | 58.52%        | 74.00%          | 56.70%        | 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>   | 313       | 835         | 45.59%        | 54.00%          | 37.49%        | 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   | 16                 | 1.92%                  |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 294                | 35.21%                 |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it                      | 146                | 17.49%                 |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers                                 | 210                | 25.15%                 |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers                                     | 169                | 20.24%                 |

| Outcome C   | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 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.<br><i>Calculation:</i><br>$(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$ | 356       | 666         | 56.12%        | 74.00%          | 53.45%        | 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.<br><i>Calculation:</i><br>$(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$   | 379       | 835         | 52.67%        | 44.00%          | 45.39%        | Met target          | No Slippage |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable   |
|------|---|
| A1   | The closure of four (4) general and six (6) special education preschool classrooms due to significant events such as the Maui wildfires, general education PreK classrooms ending and staffing challenges necessitated the relocation of preschool students. These unexpected disruptions in daily routines and surroundings such as new personnel and peers etc., may have impacted growth and the need to have a consistent structure and routine for learning.               |
| A2   | Many teachers reported an increase in behavioral and social emotional challenges in comparison to previous years. Children were entering programs with more significant social emotional issues and although the data demonstrates that children exhibited growth, it was not substantial enough to catch up with same-age peers.   |
| B1   | The majority of children entering the program have speech, language, and communication delays and/or disabilities. In addition, their foundational skills to learn and focus were also weak. The minimal amount of growth could be due to lacking these skills. Environmental and personnel factors, along with the lack of models from same-age peers without disabilities, possibly all contributed to the minimal growth in the language and learning of the young children. |
| B2   | The data suggested that children made gains; however, they were not substantial. The growth rate in language and learning is heavily influenced by having well-trained, consistent staff who facilitate language and learning growth. Again, changes in personnel and environments will impact outcomes in language and learning. Targeted and focused language interventions were not consistently embedded into naturally occurring daily routines.                           |
| C1   | Language and learning growth play a role along with exposure to same-age typically-developing peers. Although the children have exhibited growth in this outcome area, behaviors could have been reinforced with more exposure to same-age typically-developing peers.  |

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

YES

| Sampling Question  | Yes / No |
|--------------------|----------|
| Was sampling used? | NO       |

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

YES

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

The Department adopted Teaching Strategies GOLD (TS GOLD) in FFY 2017 and continues to use TS GOLD as the instrument to gather preschool outcome data for Indicator 7. TS GOLD is aligned with the Hawai'i Early Learning and Development Standards (HELDS). TS GOLD converts assessment item-level data to a 7-point scale used for OSEP reporting. Preschool students with disabilities with a rating of six (6) or seven (7) are considered to be functioning at a level that is "comparable to same-aged peers."

Annually, 619 Preschool Resource Teachers provide special education technical support to all Early Childhood Special Education Teachers (ECSE) to understand how to collect, record, input, and improve student outcomes. Data from various sources is collected by the ECSE within two (2) months of entry and exit into the program to measure students' progress in the ECSE program for six (6) months or more. Student performance data from various sources are collected by the teachers with the scores used by TS GOLD to calculate the outcome data for the identified school year, with the Department analyzing the outcome data to improve programming and report progress to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Preschool outcomes are one of the Department's priorities. To continue its efforts of increasing preschool student performance in FFY 2023 (SY 2023-2024), the Department implemented activities with an emphasis on the following areas:

Maintaining commitment to inclusive practices: Continued collaboration with various stakeholders through the Hawai'i Preschool Interagency Group. This year, an emphasis was placed on developing a vision and mission statement that documented the commitment of all partners to the inclusion of all

children with disabilities in all early childhood environments. The guiding principles included embracing a unified purpose of inclusion. The group recognized that it needed to share this commitment publicly in writing. The vision statement was shared at the 2023 Early Childhood Conference and 2024 Special Parent Information Network conference.

Building knowledge and skills: Language and learning

- Building foundation knowledge: Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling for Early Childhood Educators (LETRS) program for participating ECSE teachers.
- 2023 Early Childhood Conference - Topics - building language and communication skills through books(emphasis on shared reading interventions); laying the foundation for literacy (emphasizing phonological awareness) developing communication through personally generated stories, vocabulary building; and attaching words to feelings (SEL)
- Quarterly state-led PLC with Speech-Language Pathologists and District/Complex area Early Childhood Leads

Building knowledge and skills: Preschool Transition and Preschool Environments

- 2023 Early Childhood Conference, October 12-13, 2024, in partnership with the Executive Office of Early Learning, topic sessions on exploring natural environments and transition from EI to DOE services
- Meetings with principals and school teams on preschool transition and preschool environments
- Quarterly state-led PLC with Speech-Language Pathologists and Complex Area Early Childhood Leads

Improving assessment practices: Trained two pilot teams (Maui and Kauai) on the Transdisciplinary Play-Based Assessments (TPBA) as a way to authentically assess preschool-age children to identify their strengths and needs through play. The focus of training: parent involvement, play as an authentic assessment procedure, and development of high-quality IEPs and appropriate programming.

- Offered augmentative and alternative communication professional development for personnel who work with students with complex communication needs on August 9, 2023 and September 13, 2023.

The Department is exploring the need for a more precise assessment tool to track children's growth at a granular level. A potential option, the Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System (AEPS-3), could help identify specific areas of need and provide targeted intervention strategies.

## **7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **7 - OSEP Response**

## **7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

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

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

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

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

## 8 - Indicator Data

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

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input related to Indicator 8:

During the School Year (SY) 2023-2024, the Department created a Parent Involvement Engagement Team to develop a new survey for Hawai'i that meets needs and aligns with Hawai'i's cultural and traditional values of Na Hopena A'o (HA). Na Hopena A'o or HA are six outcomes to be strengthened in every student over the course of their K-12 learning journey. Hawai'i is the foundation of our learning. The outcomes include a sense of Belonging, Responsibility, Excellence, Aloha, Total Wellbeing and Hawai'i.

#### The goals of the team were to:

- review the parent survey utilized by Hawai'i and its process design strategies to increase the response rate,
- improve the representativeness of respondents,
- improve the use of data collected through the parent survey, and
- transform the survey from involvement to engagement,

so that the Hawai'i schools can improve parent engagement as measured by the SPP/APR Indicator 8 (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.)

The Parent Involvement Engagement Team, consisting of members from state offices, complex areas, schools, the Special Education Advisory Council, parents, and community stakeholders, undertook a comprehensive review to improve parent engagement. The team examined parent involvement surveys from across the nation, analyzed Hawai'i's existing survey questions and data trends, and drafted a revised survey. Feedback was then gathered from a broad range of educational partners, and the survey was finalized based on this input. A copy of the survey can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF\\_JrvcPXKyKeDa/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF_JrvcPXKyKeDa/view).

The Department, in collaboration with the Community Children's Councils, had the opportunity to present at the 2024 OSEP Conference on the process



used to engage educational partners in reviewing the current survey, longitudinal data trends, conducted analysis, reviewed surveys nationwide and developed a new survey to meet Hawaii's needs.

During the School Year 2023-2024, the Department partnered with the Community Children's Councils to share the parent involvement survey data and receive feedback and input from parents, complex area superintendents, and community members statewide.

- October 20, 2023, Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) Meeting — Parent Survey Engagement Team — During this presentation, the facilitator, Cesar D'Agord, shared the team's recommendations and received feedback and input from SEAC members.
- January 30, 2024, District Educational Specialist (DES) Meeting — Parent Survey Engagement Team — During this presentation, the facilitator, Cesar D'Agord, shared the team's recommendations and received feedback and input from the DESs and state office staff.
- August 7, 2024 — OSEP Presentation - Indicator 8 - Transforming from Involvement to Engagement — Hawai'i
- December 3, 2024 — SPP/APR Engagement Meeting, where the Department brought educational partners together to review the current performance of Hawaii's SPP/APR indicators and engage in providing their feedback on improvement strategies.

The goal of the Indicator 8 presentation was to:

- Understand the purpose, goal, and measurement of Indicator 8
- Review the Department's revised survey
- Review current performance and targets since FFY 2020, the new SPP/APR cycle
- Review current strategies for improvement and implementation activities
- Gather input on additional strategies for improvement and implementation

For more information on the presentation, please refer to the link below:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing)

Continued collaboration with the Special Parent Information Network (SPIN) and the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) in developing a resource for parents to understand the survey and how to access it. To see the 2023-2024 infographic, visit SEAC's page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Indicator-8-SY23-24-Infographics.pdf> or the Department's site at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jiGgdWsLK2xWxwecx7mqqlCbYdDVXDbO/view>.

Promotional activities were shared with Department staff, parents, and community members to promote parental and school/complex area staff awareness at community/professional events, such as the SPIN Conference on Footsteps to Transition Fair, Early Childhood Conference, and the I KE ALU LIKE - We Are All In This Together Conference.

The Department continued to improve its Indicator 8 response rate and satisfaction through engagement with educational partners. The Department's response rate improved from 3.30% in FFY 2020 to 8.99% in FFY 2023, and the percentage of parents who indicated that the schools helped facilitate their engagement in the education of their children increased from 51.78% in FFY 2020 to 59.11% in FFY 2023. The development of the online survey and parent/staff handout was translated into the 16 most common languages and shared with all staff and parents statewide.

Parents may take the survey online at

<https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/altlogin.php> or utilize the QR code in the Parent Involvement Survey Handout accessible at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/handout.php>.

#### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 51.78%        |

| FFY       | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 54.00% | 60.00% | 51.78% | 54.00% | 56.00% |
| Data      | 57.42% | 58.20% | 51.78% | 54.48% | 60.88% |

#### Targets

| FFY       | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 58.00% | 60.00% | 62.00% |

#### FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status     | Slippage    |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 1,074  | 1,817  | 60.88%        | 58.00%          | 59.11%        | 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.

Surveys are collected in a valid and reliable manner. The Department uses one survey for parents of all grade levels, including parents of preschool children. 1,817 surveys were returned, yielding an overall response rate of 8.99%. Of the 1,817 returned surveys across all age groups, 275 (15%) 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 analyzed using the same procedures.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

20,222

**Percentage of respondent parents**

8.99%

**Response Rate**

| FFY           | 2022  | 2023  |
|---------------|-------|-------|
| Response Rate | 7.26% | 8.99% |

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

Representativeness of the responders was assessed by applying a +/- 3% threshold for percentage discrepancy between the responder's demographic proportions and those of the target population. This threshold ensures that the responders accurately reflect the diversity and characteristics of children ages 3 through 21 receiving special education services in Hawai'i, reducing the likelihood of bias in the survey results. Specifically, an over-representation was based on a discrepancy of at least three (3) percentage points greater than the Department's percentage in any given race/ethnicity or disability group. Conversely, underrepresentation was established as a difference of three (3) percentage points or less than the Department's percentage in any race/ethnicity or disability group. Differences of less than three (3) percentage points between respondents' and the Department's percentages are not considered significant.

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

The Department applied the metrics for representativeness, the +/- 3% discrepancy between the responder's demographic proportions and those of the target population, to two demographic categories: race/ethnicity and disability categories. The analysis indicated that, in terms of race/ethnicity, families of students identified as Hispanic/Latino were underrepresented in the group of respondents. In terms of disability categories, families of students classified as Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability were underrepresented in the group of respondents. The Hispanic or Latino group was found to be underrepresented in the respondent group by 20.06 percentage points. In terms of disability types, two groups were underrepresented: Specific Learning Disability by 16.64 percentage points and Other Health Impairment by 9.62 percentage points.

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

NO

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

Based on the educational partners, parents, internal staff, and community members input/feedback and the analysis of data trends, multiple strategies/activities have been taken to increase survey response representation of the identified demographics:

- The Department developed a new survey that began implementing in School Year 2024-2025. The new survey was developed to increase the response rate, addressing the cultural responsiveness of Hawai'i's culture and traditions and representativeness. A Parent Involvement Engagement Team was created with members from State offices, Complex Areas, Schools, the Special Education Advisory Council, parents, and community members. The Engagement Team reviewed parent involvement surveys nationwide, analyzed Hawai'i's current survey questions and data trends, drafted a survey, solicited feedback and input from various educational partners, and finalized the new survey based on the feedback. A copy of the survey can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF\\_JrvCPXKyKeDa/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF_JrvCPXKyKeDa/view).

The Department will utilize the following strategies to ensure the response data are representative of those demographics:

- Expand its outreach by collaborating with the Community Children's Councils to attend their meetings and activities and attending community and parent events to share the why and importance of the survey.
- Issue guidance and provide schools with recommendations for providing parents with the opportunity to complete the survey after a parent-teacher conference and after an IEP meeting at the school site in a separate environment to maintain impartiality and privacy. The guidance will be tailored to all schools based on their response rate and the representativeness of the surveys coming from their schools.
- Provide schools with a more detailed analysis of the survey responses so they can track their school's responses and develop improvement strategies to collect surveys and improve parent engagement. The schools will be able to track responses by race and disability, which will help them increase support and reach out to families who are underrepresented.
- Continue to collaborate with the Special Parent Information Network (SPIN) and the Community Children's Councils to hold informational meetings with various Complex Areas to increase understanding of the importance of engaging and promoting parental participation in the survey and its impact on programming and support for students with disabilities.

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

Some of the strategies described above, targeting the improvement of the representativeness of the data, are also anticipated to improve the response rate. In addition, the Department will utilize the following strategies that are designed more specifically to improve the response rate.

- Continue to provide the District Educational Specialists, their teams, and school principals with the response rate data so they can self-monitor the return rates of schools and complex areas. The schools will be able to track responses by race and disability, which will help them increase support and reach out to underrepresented families.
- Issue guidance and support to schools to encourage them to utilize various strategies to allow more parents to take the survey, such as providing an electronic device for parents to take the survey after school meetings and following up with an email.

- Continue to improve its outreach to parents by utilizing the Parent Involvement Handout and infographics developed with educational partners and sharing them statewide through parent conferences, parent events, etc. A link to the Parent Involvement Handout in various languages can be found at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/hawaii/handout.php>. A link to the infographics can be found at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jiGgdWsLK2xWxwecx7mqqlCbYdDVXDbO/view>.

**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.**

All public schools, including charter schools, must provide parents with the opportunity to take the Parent Involvement Survey after an initial or annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting. Parents may take the survey online at <http://www.hiparentsurvey.com> or via a paper copy with a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. All returned surveys for students ages 3-21 between July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024, are combined, processed, aggregated, and analyzed.

As mentioned above, the Department uses one survey for parents of all grade levels, including parents of preschool children. 1,817 surveys were returned, yielding an overall response rate of 8.99%.

The Department analyzed the distribution of race/ethnicity and type of disability to measure if the surveys are representative of the student population. The Department applied weights to the survey responses of the two demographic groups according to the weight attributed to that group in the population. The result is a weighted mean. To obtain a mean value of Indicator 8 that is weighted with respect to the race/ethnicity and type of disability of the population, the following procedures were followed. First, the mean result for each variable within a category (such as for the race/ethnicity category, White, Black/African American, etc.) is obtained for the respondents. Then, the sample mean for each category is multiplied by the proportion of the population classified as the particular category. Finally, the category-level products (sample mean for the category multiplied by population proportion for the category) are summed to yield the final weighted mean.

The percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement, calculated as the percentage of the summary analysis of all survey questions, is 59.11% (unweighted). The standard error of the survey respondents percentage is 1.2%. The 95% confidence interval for the survey respondents percentage is 56.8%–61.3%. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state percentage lies within this range. When weighted by race/ethnicity (to compensate for the underrepresentation of the Hispanic/Latino population), the result is 60% with 95% confidence intervals of 57.2%–61.7%. With regard to the type of disability (to compensate for the underrepresentation of Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability), the result is 58%, with 95% confidence intervals of 56.2%–60.7%, respectively.

Based on the analysis above, nonresponse bias was identified in the response data with respect to race/ethnicity and disability category, as Hispanic/Latino students, as well as students with Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability, were both underrepresented and varied from other subgroups in their overall survey responses. On a practical level, however, the impact of the nonresponse on the overall survey estimate was not significant, as the non-weighted and weighted results were close and did not impact meeting the state target.

Therefore, in the three scenarios described above (the non-weighted and the corrected or weighted for race/ethnicity and type of disability), the responses meet or exceed the state target of 58.00% for FFY 2023. All three are slightly lower than the performance in the previous year, FFY 2022 of 60.88%.

Below are some activities and strategies that the Department utilized to increase survey response representation:

- The Parent Involvement Survey was made available in 16 languages in a paper and electronic format.
- A new survey was developed and implemented in School Year 2024-2025. The new survey was developed to increase the response rate, addressing the cultural responsiveness of Hawaii's culture and traditions and representativeness. A Parent Involvement Engagement Team was created with members from State offices, Complex Areas, Schools, the Special Education Advisory Council, parents, and community members. The Engagement Team reviewed parent involvement surveys nationwide, analyzed Hawaii's current survey questions and data trends, drafted a survey, solicited feedback and input from various educational partners, and finalized the new survey based on the feedback. A copy of the survey can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF\\_JrvcPXKyKeDa/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF_JrvcPXKyKeDa/view).
- Informational meetings were held with various Complex Areas to increase understanding of the importance of engaging and promoting parental participation in the survey and its impact on programming and support for students with disabilities.
- Parental and school/complex area staff awareness was promoted at various community and professional development events.

| 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 Department contracts with Piedra LLC to collect and analyze parent survey data. This includes the analysis of the representatives and nonresponse bias of the group of respondents.

As mentioned above, this is the final year that the Department used the 25-item rating scale Parent Survey from 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.

During SY 2023-2024, the Department developed a new survey for Hawai'i that meets Hawai'i's needs and aligns with Hawai'i's cultural and traditional values of Na Hopena A'o (HA). The Department began to implement the new survey On July 1, 2024. A copy of the survey can be accessed at

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF\\_JrvPXXKyKeDa/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WM8Om6noVmcZ4iG2AF_JrvPXXKyKeDa/view). Since the new survey results will be analyzed and reported in the FFY 2024 submission, a copy of the survey will also be provided along with the submission.

## **8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

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

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR**

The Department addressed the representativeness in the FFY 2023 and included its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Please refer to the sections above.

## **8 - OSEP Response**

### **8 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 0.00%         |

| FFY    | 2018  | 2019  | 2020  | 2021  | 2022  |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    | 0%    |
| Data   | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY    | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

#### FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 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:

The Department is a single District state, which means the SEA and LEA are the same entity and are reported as one district: (0 districts/1) x 100% = 0%

The Department uses the Risk Ratio Methodology. The threshold for disproportionate representation is any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective group size. The Department uses a minimum cell size of 10.

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.

Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

For disproportionate representation, the state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over-identified by conducting a file review for each student. The Department applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to this 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. The AIPP is composed of the following key indicators that align with IDEA and HAR, Chapter 60:

- Child assessed in all areas of suspected disability;
- Review of existing evaluation data;
- Variety of measures and sources;
- Selection and administration of assessments; and
- Eligibility determination.

Methodology:

The first tier is a statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial and ethnic groups. In the statistical analysis of disproportionate representation, risk ratios are calculated based on the racial/ethnic group category concerning all racial and ethnic groups in Hawai'i for children aged five (5) enrolled in Kindergarten through 21 served under IDEA. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, the Department applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to the 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 GSS process consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the IDEA.

Cell Size: A group of students, based on the expected state average rate of a disability for that group, needs to be 10 or more. When expected numbers based on the state average for a group are less than 10, the analysis of risk ratios is inappropriate, as variations of one (1) or two (2) cases would cause the risk ratios to fluctuate excessively.

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.

Tier I uses statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial/ethnic groups. Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education concerning the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawai'i. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on group size.

Tier II consists of a two-part analysis and 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 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 GSS 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 Department analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately overidentified by conducting a file review for each student in the sample.

For FFY 2023, the Department used a sample size determined by a 95% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation in the Tier II analysis. In the case of indicator 9, there were two (2) groups that were disproportionately represented (Hispanic or Latino (HI) and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders (PI)), with 876 students in the HI group and 862 students in the PI group (students identified in SY 2023-2024). To ensure appropriate policies and procedures in the identification of students with disabilities are conducted appropriately, the Department reviewed a random sample of files from these two groups of students, exceeding the 95% confidence level and 10% margin of error. The Department conducted a review of 152 (HI) and 159 (PI) student files.

All student files included in the sample for indicator 9 were identified randomly and reviewed by the team. Each student was reviewed using the 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, a written finding of noncompliance is issued to the school. The Department reviews and verifies the correction of noncompliance consistent with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01. Each individual case of noncompliance is required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. The Department conducts a subsequent review of individual cases of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction and verifies each of the individual cases is in compliance in order to ensure that schools are correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance.

In addition, the Department reviews policies, practices, and procedures related to inappropriate practices per the Department's GSS process consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| 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 2022**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.  
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Data Source

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2023 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2024).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020          | 0.00%         |

| FFY    | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |



|      |       |       |       |       |       |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|

#### Targets

| FFY    | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |

#### FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 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:

The Department is a single District state, which means the SEA and LEA are the same entity and are reported as one district:  $(0 \text{ districts}/1) \times 100\% = 0\%$

The Department uses the Risk Ratio Methodology. The threshold for disproportionate representation is any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective group size. The Department uses a minimum cell size of 10.

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.

Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

For disproportionate representation, 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. The Department applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to this 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. The AIPP is composed of the following key indicators that align with IDEA and HAR, Chapter 60:

- Child assessed in all areas of suspected disability;
- Review of existing evaluation data;
- Variety of measures and sources;
- Selection and administration of assessments; and
- Eligibility determination.

When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under the Department's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's QA 23-01, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the IDEA.

Methodology:

The first tier is a statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial and ethnic groups. In the statistical analysis of disproportionate representation, risk ratios are calculated based on the racial/ethnic group category concerning all racial and ethnic groups in Hawai'i for children aged five (5) enrolled in Kindergarten through 21 served under IDEA. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, the Department applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to the 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 GSS process consistent with OSEP's QA 23-01, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the IDEA.

Cell Size: A group of students, based on the expected state average rate of a disability for that group, needs to be 10 or more. When expected numbers

based on the state average for a group are less than 10, the analysis of risk ratios is inappropriate, as variations of one (1) or two (2) cases would cause the risk ratios to fluctuate excessively.

#### 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.

Tier I uses statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial/ethnic groups by disability category. Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education concerning the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawai'i. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on group size.

Tier II consists of a two-part analysis and 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 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 GSS 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.**

##### Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

The Department analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over-identified by conducting a file review for each student in the sample.

For FFY 2023, the Department used a sample size determined by a 95% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation in the Tier I analysis. In the case of Indicator 10, the disproportionately represented ethnic groups by ethnicity in SY 2023-2024 were Specific Learning Disability (SLD), Other Health Impairment (OHI), and Emotional Disability (ED) for Hispanic/Latino students; OHI and Speech or Language Disability (SLI) for White, and SLD, OHI, and Intellectual Disability (ID) for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander students. The sample sizes were the following: Hispanic/Latino students had 71 (SLD), 58 (OHI), and 23 (ED) students found eligible; White students had 53 (OHI) and 54 (SLI) eligible students, and for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander there were 71 (SLD), 55 (OHI), and 33 (ID) students.

All students in the analysis samples for Indicator 10 were identified randomly and made available for the review team. Each file for these students in the analysis sample was reviewed utilizing the 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, a written finding of noncompliance is issued to the school. The Department reviews and verifies the correction of noncompliance consistent with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01. Each individual case of noncompliance is required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. The Department conducts a subsequent review of individual cases of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction and verifies each of the individual cases is in compliance in order to ensure that schools are correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance.

In addition, the Department reviews policies, practices, and procedures related to inappropriate practices per the Department's GSS process consistent with OSEP's QA 23-01.

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

#### **Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| 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 2022**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

#### **10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **10 - OSEP Response**

#### **10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
  - b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
- Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 93.77%        |

| FFY    | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   | 95.39% | 92.52% | 96.56% | 98.52% | 95.56% |

### Targets

| FFY    | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 4,871   | 4,632  | 95.56%        | 100%            | 95.09%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

239

**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 2023-2024:

- A total of 4871 initial evaluations were received.
- A total of 4632 initial evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline.
- 239 initial evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 95.09% of initial evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

**Number of Days Beyond the 60-Day Timeline:**

A total of 239 initial evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.

- 120 within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 84 within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 20 within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 15 beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

**Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:**

A total of 239 initial evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.

- 106 Parent not available.
- 36 Provider's report not available.
- 22 Provider not available.
- 63 Parental request.
- 12 Other.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The Department has a comprehensive statewide system that monitors individual schools and individual complex areas. The data for Indicator 11, Child Find, was retrieved through the Department's statewide electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSH) for all students receiving initial evaluations in SY 2023-2024. The eCSSH database is used by the Department to track students who receive support and services, with the report generated, reviewed and analyzed by the Monitoring and Compliance Branch to ensure the accuracy of the information. 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)**

To support parents, community members, and school staff statewide, the Department provides information on the Child Find process on the Department's public website. The Department has developed a Child Find brochure to be shared statewide. Information and a copy of the brochure can be found at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/school-services/does-my-child-have-a-disability-child-find/>.

Throughout SY 2023-2024, technical assistance was provided to the Complex Area Superintendents, staff, and Principals in examining SPP/APR data, including Indicator 11, for trends, patterns, and insight to support decision-making about improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

The Department engaged educational partners through SEAC meetings in a review of Indicator 11 longitudinal data and solicited feedback on improvement strategies to ensure 100% of the initial evaluations are conducted within the 60-day timeline. As a result, the Department will provide training with an emphasis in parent participation in the initial evaluation process to Department staff, parents, and community members beginning in February 2025.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 97                                   | 97  | 0  | 0                                      |

**FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Beginning with FFY 2022, the Department issued notification of noncompliance at the school level instead of the complex level. This notification method was changed based on educational partner feedback.

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 97 schools in 37 complexes based on a total of 195 child-specific cases of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

In keeping with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01, in order to ensure that these schools were correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance, the Department reviewed updated data on each of the 97 schools and verified that each school was at 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements within one year of notification.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 97 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

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

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 97 schools in 37 complexes, based on a total of 195 child-specific instances of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

The Department reviewed each of the files of these 195 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. The written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists, and the Principals of the 97 schools in 37 complexes of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01.

Each individual case of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. The Department conducted a subsequent review of each individual case of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction and verified each of the individual cases was in compliance with OSEP QA 23-01.

The Department reviewed each individual case of previously noncompliant files to verify that the correction was completed.

- Each individual case of noncompliance (195) is corrected, and
- Each school (97) that did not meet the 100% compliance standard demonstrated evidence of correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 97 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

#### **Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022**

| <b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b> | <b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR</b> | <b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b> | <b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b> |
|---|---|--|---|
|   |   |  |   |
|   |   |  |   |
|   |   |  |   |
|   |   |  |   |
|   |   |  |   |

### **11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR**

The Department reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022. Please refer to the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in the FFY 2022 section above.

### **11 - OSEP Response**

## 11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005          | 90.90%        |

| FFY    | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   | 93.27% | 85.86% | 79.07% | 90.57% | 89.93% |

#### Targets

| FFY    | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.   | 472 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.   | 47  |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.   | 344 |
| 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.                                 | 35  |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.   | 4   |
| 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 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. | 344           | 386                     | 89.93%        | 100%            | 89.12%        | 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**

42

**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.**

A total of 344 children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, who had an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday.

There were 42 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.

Range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed:

The range of days beyond the third birthday ranged from 4 to 132 days.

- 11 within 1-10 days beyond the 3rd birthday.
- 14 within 11-30 days beyond the 3rd birthday.
- 10 within 31-60 days beyond the 3rd birthday.
- 7 within 60+ days beyond the 3rd birthday.

Reasons for the delays beyond the third birthday:

- 12 referred from Part C with less than the required 90 days. There was no noncompliance on the part of the schools; however, the schools were unable to complete the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP process by the child's third birthday.
- 30 delays in the referral, evaluation, eligibility, or IEP development process.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The data for Indicator 12 is generated from the data in the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database, "Preschool Services by Age 3." This report pulls data from individual student files of all children aged three (3) who were referred for an initial evaluation from Part C during the school year (SY) 2023-2024. The report data generated was reviewed and analyzed by the Monitoring and Compliance Branch to ensure the accuracy of the information. The report includes the following information for each child:

- Birthdate
- Date the school received the referral
- Number of days the referral was received prior to the child's 3rd birthday
- Date the parent signed consent for the initial evaluation
- Date the evaluation is projected to be completed (In Hawai'i, evaluations are considered complete when services are available; 60 days from the consent.)
- Referral source (Part C) - Transition Notice date
- Date the initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) was held
- Date services were made available

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To support parents, community members, and school staff statewide, the Department provides information on the Child Find process on the Department's public website. The Department has developed a Child Find brochure to be shared statewide. Information and a copy of the brochure can be found at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/school-services/does-my-child-have-a-disability-child-find/>.

In FFY 2023, in efforts to improve the Child Find processes to ensure children are located, identified, and evaluated, children and youth who are suspected of having or have been identified as having a disability and may need special education and related services, the Department, in collaboration



with the Department of Health, Early Intervention, and Home Visiting Services, was awarded the opportunity to be a state cohort and received technical assistance by DaSy, the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Systems, the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, and Waters Center For Systems Thinking. As part of this cohort, the Hawai'i team collaborated to examine and improve Child Find processes and procedures toward strengthening the finding of children and the referral for Part C or Part B services.

Further, the Department continued its ongoing collaboration efforts with community partners through the Hawai'i Preschool Interagency Leadership Team to strengthen preschool programming. Guidance was provided to ensure Part B participation in the Part C transition. In addition, the Department conducted Sequenced Transition to Education in Public Schools (STEPS) meetings with schools and the community to promote positive and timely transitions.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 24                                   | 24  | 0  | 0                                      |

#### FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Beginning with FFY 2022, the Department issued notification of noncompliance at the school level instead of the complex level. This notification method was changed based on educational partner feedback.

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 24 schools in 16 complexes based on a total of 29 child-specific cases of noncompliance for the children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3 and were found eligible for Part B but did not have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday.

In keeping with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01, in order to ensure that these schools were correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance, the Department reviewed updated data on each of the 24 schools and verified that each school was at 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements within one year of notification.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 24 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

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

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 24 schools in 16 complexes based on 29 child-specific cases of noncompliance for children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3 and found eligible for Part B but did not have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday.

The Department reviewed each of these 29 child-specific cases through the eCSSS database and verified that all of those children who were still enrolled at the time of the correction had an IEP developed, although late (after their third birthday). The written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists, and the School Principals of the 24 schools in 16 complexes of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01.

Each individual case of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. A subsequent review of each individual case of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction was conducted, and the individual cases were verified to be in compliance with OSEP QA 23-01.

The Department reviewed each individual case of previously noncompliant files to verify that the correction was completed.

- Each individual case of noncompliance (29) is corrected, and
- Each school (24) that did not meet the 100% compliance standard demonstrated evidence of correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 24 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 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 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR**

The Department reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022. Please refer to the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in the FFY 2022 section above.

## **12 - OSEP Response**

### **12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 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 the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2009          | 76.00%        |

| FFY    | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   | 100%   |
| Data   | 69.21% | 13.57% | 14.12% | 18.52% | 22.82% |

### Targets

| FFY    | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 140   | 575   | 22.82%        | 100%            | 24.35%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) online database is used across the Department to document and track supports and services provided to students eligible for special education and related services. For all IEPs with a transition plan developed from July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024, the Department used a 99% confidence level and a confidence interval of 5 to determine a random selection of IEPs of students ages 16 and above in all of Hawai'i's public schools.

For Indicator 13 monitoring, the Department reviewed the random selection of IEPs to examine the data using the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B and made compliance decisions.

In order to be considered in compliance with Indicator 13, an IEP must have demonstrated compliance with the eight (8) specific requirements:

1. The IEP must include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that address education, training, employment, and independent living (as appropriate);
2. The postsecondary goals are updated annually;
3. The postsecondary goals are based on age-appropriate transition assessment;
4. The transition services in the IEP will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals;
5. The transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals;
6. There is/are annual IEP goal(s) related to the student's transition services needs;
7. There is evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed; and
8. There is evidence that a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services was invited to the IEP Team meeting (if appropriate) with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

| Question  | Yes / No |
|---|----------|
| Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | NO       |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

While the Department did not meet the 100% compliance, it continued to show growth in meeting all eight (8) compliance requirements for Indicator 13, up to 24.35% from 22.82% in FFY 2022. An IEP is determined noncompliant if it does not meet one (1) or more of the eight (8) requirements. Upon further review of the Department's data, each requirement shows an upward trend from FFY 2023. This increase is attributed to extensive individualized training and technical assistance to school staff in developing effective and compliant transition plans.

Secondary transition continues to be a priority area for the Department and SEAC. The Department is committed to improving transition service planning for our students with disabilities and continues to partner with our community agencies, including the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), as well as receive Technical Assistance (TA) from OSEP-approved TA centers such as NTACT:C.

The Department continued to prioritize and promote the Transition Assessment website. For more information, please refer to the site at <https://sites.google.com/k12.hi.us/transitionassessments-hawaii-doe/home>. Transition assessment kits were disseminated to schools statewide.

The Department is committed to expanding opportunities for students to engage in structured work-based learning experiences, including internships for high school students, through partnerships with employers, community partners, and military and higher education institutions. To facilitate this effort, the Department established the Workforce Development Branch in November 2022 with the support of the Hawai'i State Legislature.

These efforts align with the 2023-2029 Department's Strategic Plan, Desired Outcome 1.3.1, Action Item 3: Expand Students' Opportunities for Structured Work-Based Learning Experiences, including Internships for High School Students, Through partnerships with Employers, Community Partners, Military, and Higher Education Institutions. The Workforce Development Branch advances the Department's Career and Technical Education program. In 2023, the Legislature appropriated funds to expand work-based learning opportunities specifically for students with disabilities. The Department has now expanded its School-Based Enterprise to Work-Based Learning Project to 19 schools to support students in developing necessary job skills for employment opportunities.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 62                                   | 62  | 0  | 0                                      |

**FFY 2022 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Beginning with FFY 2022, the Department issued notification of noncompliance at the school level instead of the complex level. This notification method was changed based on educational partner feedback.

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 62 schools in 42 complexes based on a total of 443 child-specific cases aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the Indicator 13 requirements. In keeping with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01, in order to ensure that these schools were correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance, the Department has reviewed updated data on each of the 62 schools and verified that each school was at 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements within one year of notification.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 62 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

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

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 62 schools in 42 complexes based on a total of 443 child-specific cases of noncompliance that did not meet the Indicator 13 requirements.

Each individual case of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. The Department conducted a subsequent review of each individual case of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction and verified each of the individual cases was in compliance with OSEP QA 23-01.

The Department reviewed each individual case of previously noncompliant files to verify that the correction was completed.

- Each individual case of noncompliance (443) is corrected, and
- Each school (62) that did not meet the 100% compliance standard demonstrated evidence of correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 62 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022**

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |
|  |  |   |  |

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR**

The Department reported on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022. Please refer to the Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in the FFY 2022 section above.

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2023, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2023 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 and no outstanding corrective action exists under a State complaint or due process hearing decision for the child, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2024 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 2023, although its FFY 2023 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings. If the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its LEAs to correct noncompliance prior to the State's issuance of a finding, the explanation must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the LEA has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment =  $\left[ \frac{\text{(\# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment)}}{\text{(\# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)}} \right] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2024 on students who left school during 2022-2023, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2022-2023 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services).

#### II. Data Reporting

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

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2023 response rate to the FFY 2022 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school *must* be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Measure | Baseline | FFY         | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|---------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A       | 2020     | Target<br>≥ | 40.00% | 40.00% | 19.78% | 23.10% | 26.40% |
| A       | 19.78%   | Data        | 34.15% | 31.05% | 19.78% | 21.69% | 26.36% |
| B       | 2020     | Target<br>≥ | 78.00% | 80.00% | 70.69% | 73.70% | 76.70% |
| B       | 70.69%   | Data        | 79.95% | 72.73% | 70.69% | 69.19% | 64.85% |
| C       | 2020     | Target<br>≥ | 88.00% | 90.00% | 75.32% | 78.90% | 82.40% |
| C       | 75.32%   | Data        | 88.35% | 80.45% | 75.32% | 78.82% | 80.96% |

### FFY 2021 Targets

| FFY        | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A ≥ | 29.70% | 33.00% | 36.30% |
| Target B ≥ | 79.70% | 82.70% | 85.70% |
| Target C ≥ | 86.00% | 89.50% | 93.10% |

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department’s established advisory panel that advises the Department’s special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group’s special education priorities alongside the Department’s own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional

resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

#### Additional input related to Indicator 14:

At the December 3 meeting and through other engagement activities, the Department in collaboration with the stakeholders determined that the targets are reasonable and achievable and decided not to adjust them, but rather focus on improvement strategies.



**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census   | 1,337  |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school   | 764    |
| Response Rate  | 57.14% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school  | 171    |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school  | 262    |
| 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)                         | 61     |
| 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). | 102    |

| 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1)  | 171                        | 764  | 26.36%        | 29.70%          | 22.38%        | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)  | 433                        | 764  | 64.85%        | 79.70%          | 56.68%        | 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) | 596                        | 764  | 80.96%        | 86.00%          | 78.01%        | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| Part     | Reasons for slippage, if applicable   |
|----------|---|
| <b>A</b> | <p>In FFY 2023, the Department did not meet its target and saw slippage for measurement A: enrolled in higher education. Based on survey results data, 31 additional responses indicating enrollment in higher education would have resulted in non-slippage for measurement A. Respondents were given the opportunity to provide reasons for not enrolling in school or training. The most common responses were: "I do not want further training or education" (36.5%) and "I cannot afford further training or education" (2.3%).</p> <p>The Department has continuously improved secondary transition plans in recent years. However, external factors, including Hawaii's employment landscape, may influence postsecondary enrollment trends. In 2024, the Retail Trade, Accommodation and Food Services, Administration, Business Support, and Waste Management Services sectors accounted for 36.4% of statewide employment. Many entry-level positions in these industries do not require higher education, which may contribute to fewer students pursuing post-secondary education. Understanding these employment trends provides valuable insight into students' post-school decisions and will help inform future support strategies for career and educational pathways.</p> |
| <b>B</b> | <p>In FFY 2023, the Department did not meet its target and saw slippage for measurement B: enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. Based on response rates, 63 additional responses indicating competitive employment would have resulted in non-slippage for measurement B. The Department attributes this slippage in part as compounded from measurement A. Upon a deeper analysis of the data, 53 respondents met all requirements for measurement B, except they were employed for fewer than 3 months (about 90 days). The primary mode for conducting the Post-School Outcomes survey is via phone and the Department speculates there may be confusion by some respondents if the question is in reference to their most current employment, rather than any employment within the last year. This would have in part improved the slippage rate (increasing outcomes data to 63.61%).</p>   |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable  |
|------|--|
|      | <p>Additional areas that negatively impacted results data for measurement B included students who did not work 20 hours or more (37 respondents) and type of employment (29 respondents).</p> <p>Additionally, the Department offers the opportunity for students to provide additional information for the reason not competitively employed since leaving high school, the top responses were "I am in school/ job training/ other education program" (41.62%) and "Unable to work due to my disability" (20.61%). Respondents that selected "Other" were provided the opportunity to include additional comments, top responses included unable to find employment, taking a break, and serving a caregiver.</p>  |
| C    | <p>In FFY 2023, the Department did not meet its target and saw slippage for measurement C: enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed or in some other employment. Based on response rates, 22 additional responses would have resulted in non-slippage for measurement C. The Department attributes slippage for measurement C due greatly in part to decreases in measurements A and B. In FFY 2022, the 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) was 54, which increased to 61 in FFY 2023. Similarly, the 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) in FFY 2022 was 67, which increased to 102 in FFY 2023.</p> |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

**Response Rate**

| FFY           | 2022   | 2023   |
|---------------|--------|--------|
| Response Rate | 61.31% | 57.14% |

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

The metric used to conduct the analysis of survey data was based on the -3/+3% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group, based on three demographics: race/ethnicity (the seven federal categories), type of exit (graduation with a regular diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, and dropout), and disability categories.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

The Department analyzed data of survey respondents using the -3/+3% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group based on three demographics (disability categories, race/ethnicity, and exit reason). Using the -3/+3% methodology to compare the composition of the target and respondent groups using these categories, one specific group was overrepresented in one category, and one specific group was underrepresented in one category.

The respondent demographic for disability categories was within the -3/+3% margin, indicating respondents from all disability categories are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. The demographic representativeness regarding race/ethnicity, showed Asian respondents were slightly above the +3% upper boundary, at +3.48%. For the type of exit, students who met the criteria as a dropout were slightly below the lower boundary at -3.93%. All other student groups were representative based on the methodology used.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

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

To ensure all student groups are adequately represented in post-school outcomes data collection, the Department will continue utilizing four key strategies from previous years, along with an additional targeted outreach strategy:

1. Multiple Survey Formats for Accessibility – Students can complete the survey via paper copy, electronic submission, or phone interview to accommodate diverse needs.
2. Live Data Dashboard Tracking – The Department maintains a real-time dashboard at the State, Complex Area (CA), and School levels, enabling staff to monitor completion rates by state, school, CA, disability category, race/ethnicity, and type of exit throughout the data collection window.
3. Benchmark Reports for Targeted Outreach – Two benchmark reports are distributed during the data collection period, providing CA and school staff with representativeness data to guide targeted outreach efforts.
4. Pre-Survey Engagement with Students & Families – Schools and CAs proactively engage students and families during their final year of high school by:
  - Collecting contact information to support future outreach.
  - Educating students and families on the survey's purpose and process to improve response rates.
5. Direct Outreach to Student Alumni – At the end of the survey window, Department staff personally contact student alumni via phone to ensure a more representative sample.

These strategies will help maximize participation and ensure post-school outcomes data accurately reflect the diverse experiences of all students.

**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 five strategies outlined above are expected to improve the overall response rate year over year. Additionally, to enhance the representativeness of underrepresented groups, the Department will implement a targeted emphasis on specific strategies:

- Prioritizing the Data Dashboard for Underrepresented Groups – The Department will continue operating a live data dashboard at the State, CAs, and School levels to monitor response rates. Staff will specifically focus on students who were underrepresented in previous years, such as those who dropped out, ensuring more balanced representation.
- Targeted Individual Outreach – During direct outreach efforts (such as phone calls to student alumni), staff will prioritize students from underrepresented groups to ensure their experiences and outcomes are accurately reflected.
- Providing Stipends for Staff Participation – The Department will offer financial incentives to CAs to support staff involvement in survey implementation. The goal of this stipend is to increase staff buy-in by recognizing their time and effort; free up school resources to focus on outreach and data collection; and improve response rates, ensuring a more comprehensive and representative dataset.

By leveraging data-driven strategies, prioritizing outreach to underrepresented groups, and providing financial incentive with the existing strategies, the Department aims to enhance engagement and achieve a higher and more equitable participation rate in the post-school outcomes survey.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The Department used the Nonresponse Bias Analysis Application (NRBA App) to assess for potential nonresponse bias with respect to exit reason. The Department identified nonresponse bias due to the underrepresentation of students identified as dropouts in the type of exit demographic category. Based on the calculated mean/percent after adjustment, the Department saw a slight decrease in the performance of the three (3) measurements of indicator 14 (approximately one percentage point for each of the three measures). The adjusted data does not impact the status or slippage of the three measurements, as the state did not meet any targets and saw slippage in each category.

The Department will continue to focus on increasing responses for leavers identified as dropouts using strategies identified above to improve the representativeness of all demographic groups, with emphasis on increasing the representation of dropout students in the respondent group.

| 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)**

To prepare Hawai'i's students for both global competitiveness and local commitment, the Department is enhancing workforce readiness strategies from classroom learning to real-world job experiences. Through partnerships with employers, community organizations, the military, and higher education institutions, the Department is expanding structured work-based learning, including high school internships. Established in November 2022 with legislative support, the Workforce Development Branch strengthens Career and Technical Education by collaborating with industries to create hands-on learning opportunities. Additionally, work-based experiences for teachers help align instruction with industry standards. In 2023, the Legislature allocated funds to expand these opportunities for students with disabilities.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2022 SPP/APR**

The Department has addressed the FFY 2023 representativeness in the sections above.

## 14 - OSEP Response

### 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2024 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2024 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.  
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baselines 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 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/13/2024 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions  | 30   |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/13/2024 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 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 Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

##### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

##### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

### CCCs

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

### LDAH

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

### The DD Council

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

### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

Additional input related to Indicator 15:

During the December 3 meeting, the Department explained various target-setting strategies and presented multiple options for stakeholders to consider. After discussion and input, the Department collectively decided to maintain the existing targets, reaffirming a shared commitment to high expectations for resolving hearing requests through settlement agreements.

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2019          | 64.00%        |

| FFY       | 2018   | 2019   | 2020   | 2021   | 2022   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 45.00% | 60.00% | 66.00% | 68.00% | 70.00% |
| Data      | 59.57% | 64.00% | 29.73% | 47.37% | 15.79% |

### Targets

| FFY       | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 72.00% | 74.00% | 76.00% |

FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status              | Slippage    |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 5   | 30                                 | 15.79%        | 72.00%          | 16.67%        | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent =  $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$  divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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

States are not required to establish baselines or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

| Source  | Date       | Description   | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/13/2024 | 2.1 Mediations held   | 14   |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/13/2024 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints     | 2    |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/13/2024 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 4    |

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

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

#### Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawaii's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

**Infographics**  
To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

**Parent Training**  
The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

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

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

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

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

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

**The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)**  
The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

**The University of Hawai'i and Other Representatives of Higher Education**  
These representatives support the Department and SEAC in preparing highly qualified special education and related service personnel to improve the learning opportunities and experiences for children with disabilities and their families. The faculty attending these meetings contribute their knowledge and expertise in special education.

**Department of Health (DOH)**  
The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

Additional input related to Indicator 16:

The educational partners provided input and feedback on Indicator 16, including setting the baseline, targets, and improvement strategies.

At the December 3, 2024 meeting, the Department provided participants with information to enhance their understanding of the requirements for establishing baselines and targets. Since FFY 2023 was the first year the Department held 10 or more mediations (14 total), it was necessary to set a baseline and targets. The Department followed guidance from the "Setting Baselines and Targets in a World of Questionable Data Quality presentation" by the IDEA Data Center, available at [https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2021-06/baselines%20and%20targets\\_0.pdf](https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2021-06/baselines%20and%20targets_0.pdf).

Longitudinal data was reviewed and analyzed, leading the educational partners and the Department to adjust the baseline to 42.86% for FFY 2023 to ensure data comparability. The group agreed that this new baseline accurately represented the data. Additionally, participants received information on target-setting requirements, emphasizing that targets must be rigorous yet achievable, demonstrate improvement over the baseline, and be set with stakeholder input. To establish targets for FFY 2023, 2024, and 2025, the Department used the "Eyeball Method," which was deemed appropriate given the limited number of mediations in previous years. With the baseline updated for FFY 2023, it will also serve as the target for that year.

**Historical Data**

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2023          | 42.86%        |  |  |  |  |

| FFY       | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target >= |      |      |      |      |      |



|      |        |        |        |        |        |
|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Data | 80.00% | 42.86% | 50.00% | 66.67% | 83.33% |
|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

#### Targets

| FFY          | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target<br>>= | 42.86% | 47.00% | 51.00% |

#### FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data

| 2.1.a.i<br>Mediation<br>agreements<br>related to due<br>process<br>complaints | 2.1.b.i<br>Mediation<br>agreements not<br>related to due<br>process<br>complaints | 2.1 Number of<br>mediations<br>held | FFY 2022<br>Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023<br>Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------|----------|
| 2   | 4   | 14                                  | 83.33%           | 42.86%          | 42.86%           | N/A    | N/A      |

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The Department recognizes the importance of early dispute resolution and has prioritized training and support for schools, parents, and community partners. To build capacity among school leaders and parents, mediation training incorporates the seven M.E.D.I.A.T.E. principles, equipping participants with skills to resolve conflicts effectively while maintaining dignity and preserving relationships.

Since the 2021-2022 school year, the Department has collaborated with WestEd, the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), and other educational partners to improve its Dispute Resolution System. As part of these improvement efforts, the Department has:

- Analyzed Mediation Data: Reviewed mediation trends, conducted a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis, and developed a strategic improvement plan.
- Updated Mediation Resources: Revised the mediation model form and designed an informational brochure for staff, parents, community members, and advocacy groups. The brochure is available at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/Mediation.pdf>.
- Expanded Mediation Training: Partnered with the Mediation Center of the Pacific to provide mediation skills training for parents, community members, and school leaders. From July 13, 2023, to December 8, 2023, 12 hands-on training sessions were conducted to enhance dispute resolution skills.
- Improved Accessibility of Dispute Resolution Information: In collaboration with SEAC, the Department revised the Dispute Resolution public website to enhance accessibility for parents and community members. The updated website can be accessed at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/school-services/parent-rights/dispute-resolutions-and-mediations/>.
- Strengthened Training on IDEA Compliance and Dispute Resolution: Partnered with Special Education Solutions to provide training to parents and educational partners on IDEA compliance, Pro Se representation, and dispute resolution strategies.

The Department remains committed to offering learning opportunities for school leaders, parents, and community partners in effective strategies for early and informal conflict resolution. By fostering mediation skills, stakeholders can collaboratively identify solutions, leading to more positive outcomes for all involved.

#### 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

#### 16 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2023, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFY 2024 and FFY 2025 this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

#### 16 - Required Actions

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage, and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SiMR) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates)) outlined above):

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

##### **A. Data Analysis**

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

##### **B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2024). 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 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025) 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 Department's 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 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.

The Department is using a subset of students and includes those identified as OHD, SLD, and SoL in grades 3 and 4 attending Hawai'i public schools, including those in public charter schools.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qveCop7bT8nGj-YQKdaOSQKKpihIB0ie9Gb4f-f1QYA/edit?usp=sharing>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2014          | 8.33%         |

Targets

| FFY    | Current Relationship                             | 2023   | 2024   | 2025   |
|--------|--|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | Data must be greater than or equal to the target | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% |

FFY 2023 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 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|

|     |       |        |        |        |                     |             |
|-----|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|-------------|
| 216 | 1,828 | 11.09% | 50.00% | 11.82% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
|-----|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|-------------|

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 data.**

Department School Year 2022-2023 Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) in English Language Arts/Literacy.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

The SBA data is collected through the Department's Longitudinal Data System (LDS). The LDS provides reports and dashboards where teachers and administrators can access student academic progress and performance data.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

The additional data collected to assess progress toward the SiMR is the Median Growth Percentile (MGP) of 4th-grade students with OHD, SLD, and SoL eligibility categories on the SBA for ELA/Literacy. The MGP is calculated by taking each student's individual Student Growth Percentile (SGP), ordering them from lowest to highest, and identifying the middle score. The MGP provides a more sensitive analysis of student progress, and the state target is sixty (60). The Department's statewide MGP of 4th-grade students with OHD, SLD, and SoL eligibility categories on the SBA for ELA/Literacy for FFY 2023 is 41. Although the Department did not meet the MGP target set at 60, the Department made progress from FFY 2022 of 37 MGP.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, which 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/file/d/1FDIKj5hUfpyE0c85yQMKNtKq2d3hKoQm/view?usp=sharing>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

The reporting period for the SSIP occurs between July 1 and June 30 of each year. All SSIP infrastructure improvement strategies are designed to support the Department's tri-level system. The Department's State Office - Exceptional Support Branch (ESB), composed of special education experts, builds the capacity and knowledge of CA leaders, who, in turn, strive to build the capacity of educators and administrators within their CAs. The Department also works collaboratively and simultaneously with the CA and school-level leaders. This approach has been elevated to engage all tri-level stakeholders intentionally in collaborative engagement and participation. The Department strives to systematically provide infrastructure improvement strategies in targeted areas for all CAs. In addition, the Department's State Offices provide tailored technical assistance for CAs based on specific requests for support.

The ESB provided ongoing Technical Assistance and Professional Development to the CA District Educational Specialists and their teams who support their respective schools.

**District Educational Specialist (DES) Meetings**

During the 2023-2024 school year, monthly DES meetings were conducted with a focus on issues pertinent to the SiMR population. Key topics included state priorities, the development of high-quality programs (encompassing specially designed instruction, early childhood literacy, interventions, goal writing, and progress monitoring), student performance, and executive functioning. These meetings also served as one of several platforms for the ESB to support the DESs in reviewing the implementation of their Project Plans, covering areas such as budgeting, staffing, and activities aimed at improving literacy outcomes for the SiMR population.

**Ongoing Technical Support: CA Project Plans**

The ESB required all CAs to submit project plans outlining their strategies to enhance language and literacy outcomes for the SiMR population. These plans were also required to detail the allocation of funds, accountability measures, and staff utilization. Monitoring the implementation of the project plans was conducted, and technical assistance was provided.

**Language and Literacy Initiative**

Adhering to the Department's tri-level system, the ESB supported CAs in the development of the Language and Literacy Coaching Initiative. This initiative focused on offering teachers targeted professional development and coaching to enhance effective reading instruction, ultimately aiming to improve outcomes for the SiMR population. To support this effort, the ESB continued to fund the three CA literacy coaches who spearhead this initiative within their respective CAs. The literacy coaches recruited teachers to participate in the LETRS (Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling) professional development course. The LETRS program provided early childhood and elementary educators with deep knowledge to be literacy and language experts in the science of reading. Thirty (30) teachers enrolled and completed the LETRS courses, which consisted of online learning modules, job-embedded coaching, and family engagement activities. Support was provided in one-on-one settings to model strategies, conduct observations, and provide feedback, as well as virtual PLCs to engage in discussions around literacy strategies, implementation, and data collection. The CA literacy coaches created resources such as at-a-glance informational documents, data sheets, lesson plans, instructional materials, token boards, etc., for the teachers they were supporting. They also informed teachers of additional professional development opportunities that were available

in the area of literacy. Any materials or purchases needed for implementation were also provided to both CA literacy coaches and teachers participating in the course. The literacy coaches met bi-weekly to plan for the launch of the language and literacy initiative to be implemented at the school level during School Year 2024-2025.

#### Early Childhood Language and Literacy Initiative

In alignment with the goals of the Language and Literacy Initiative, the Early Childhood Language and Literacy Initiative was dedicated to delivering targeted professional development and coaching. This effort focused on equipping teachers and related service providers with effective language and literacy instruction strategies to enhance outcomes for preschool-aged children with language disorders. The initiative aimed to narrow the achievement through oral language development for all young children.

#### University of Hawai'i-Manoa (UHM) - Reading Intervention Program

In collaboration with the University of Hawai'i-Manoa (UHM) Special Education program, the ESB continued the Memorandum of Agreement to support the Reading Interventionist Program, which trains State-licensed special education teachers or dual-certified teachers to become eligible for certification as Reading Interventionists. ESB paid for the tuition and costs associated with the program. For additional information, please visit <https://coe.hawaii.edu/sped/programs/reading-interventionist/>.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SIMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

#### Ongoing Technical Support

Through DES meetings and other collaborative sessions, each CA developed Project Plans that emphasized fiscal management, accountability, staff utilization, monitoring, and service redesign to directly enhance literacy outcomes for the SIMR population. ESB staff worked closely with CAs to review these plans, ensuring that the goals were well-defined, focused on strategies aligned with improving reading proficiency, and both realistic and achievable.

#### CA Project Plans

CA staff engaged in the following activities to support their respective schools:

- Provided teachers with professional development in foundational reading instruction;
- Used ongoing assessments, such as iReady, Imagine Learning, Lexia Core 5, STAR, etc., to identify students who may need interventions and provide the interventions based on the identified area(s) of need;
- Ensured the fidelity of implementation of foundational reading instruction and evidence-based interventions; and
- Provided ongoing coaching to support school-wide efforts to support all teachers needing additional guidance.

Each activity included a measurement instrument, identified lead personnel, a projected timeline, and ongoing status updates. The Project Plans were reviewed to ensure that data and relevant information were collected and used to identify appropriate activities to address the needs of the schools.

#### Language and Literacy Initiative

The short-term and intermediate outcomes focused on professional development, with achievement assessed through various measures. Teachers' knowledge was evaluated using pre- and post-assessments of content mastery throughout the LETRS program. When analyzing the assessment data, the teachers participating in the LETRS program grew an average of 33 percentage points from pre- to post-assessment. In addition, all teachers passed their post-assessment with a minimum score of 80% accuracy. Additionally, literacy coaches assessed teachers' fidelity to the implementation of structured literacy instruction and interventions for struggling readers using a coaching rubric aligned with LETRS course material and critical components of data-based decision-making and the provision of appropriate interventions. Observational data from literacy coaches indicated that teachers enrolled in LETRS Volume 1 consistently utilized the LETRS phonics lesson plan template in their instruction. Furthermore, teachers progressed from not using assessments to actively collecting baseline data with diagnostic tools and regularly gathering progress monitoring data. When analyzing Universal Screener data for the SIMR population in classrooms with teachers who participated in the LETRS program, student scores demonstrated an average increase of thirty-six (36) points. Observational data also indicated those enrolled in LETRS Early Childhood consistently incorporated oral language lessons and activities into their teaching. Collaborative conversations between teachers and speech pathologists also increased, driven by the new learning opportunities. Lastly, teacher recruitment efforts continued through FFY 2023. Teachers in the existing cohort committed to continuing with LETRS Volume 2, while a new cohort was recruited to begin LETRS Volume 1 in FFY 2024.

#### Early Childhood: Improving Language and Literacy Skills - Early Childhood Language and Literacy Initiative

An Early Childhood Language and Literacy Initiative was implemented to improve outcomes for preschool-age children through professional development and coaching for teachers. The initiative for the 2023-2024 school year included:

- An inaugural Early Childhood Conference was held in October 2023 with sessions focused on language and literacy interventions, inclusion of preschool aged students with IEPs, and foundational oral language skills.
- Targeted professional learning for teachers and speech-language pathologists on the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling for Early Childhood (LETRS -EC) curriculum. This training was designed to provide a shared understanding of foundational knowledge for language and its connection to literacy development for young children.
- Training on Kimochis, a social-emotional language-based curriculum.

These strategies support system change by building capacity among educators, providing them with the knowledge and skills they need to effectively teach language and literacy. The strategies foster collaboration among professionals through team-based approaches and shared professional development experiences. Finally, they promote the use of evidence-based practices to ensure that instruction is aligned with the latest research. By investing in these infrastructure improvements, the initiative aims to create a more coordinated and effective system for supporting the language and literacy development of all preschool-age children.

#### UH-Manoa Reading Interventionist Program

This program is related to professional development for teachers and sustainability to specifically address reading proficiency. Participants of this program are taught structured literacy, data-based decision-making, and literacy interventions. The first cohort of eighteen participants completed the program during 2022-2023. During this reporting period, 12 participants completed the program, and an additional 16 participants were admitted for the 2024-2025 reporting period. Participants provide reading and writing interventions to SWD at their respective schools and train teachers in their complex areas. At the school level, ESB anticipates that trained teachers will provide SWD with the appropriate targeted and focused interventions for students to improve reading proficiency. For those teachers at the complex level, it is anticipated that ongoing professional development will be provided to

classroom teachers along with follow-up and technical assistance as needed, resulting in improved reading proficiency. The ESB acknowledges that it is too early to determine if this strategy will work; however, it is anticipated that it will result in sustainability at the CA and School.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.**

**Substantively Measurable IEPs and Learning Excellence (SMILE) Initiative**

The Substantively Measurable IEPs and Learning Excellence (SMILE) Initiative is a 4-day training series offered to DESs, CA Resource Teachers, Behavior Analysts, Itinerant teachers, Psychologists, and Teacher Mentors. This 4-day training series aimed to build the capacity of district and CA personnel to develop and implement Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and progress reporting. In addition, it is intended to support school teams in operationalizing the Endrew v. Douglas County School District Supreme Court ruling requiring that the Department provides students an education that is "reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances. This initiative hopes to increase the quality of programming and instruction for the SIMR population.

**State and CA Literacy PLC - SMILE Spin-off**

To support continued learning for State and CA personnel who attended the summer SMILE training in literacy, the ESB hosted quarterly PLCs to provide additional learning and answer questions regarding literacy to increase outcomes for the SIMR population. PLC topics included assessment and need Identification, strategies to support phonics, phonological awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, and guidance around progress monitoring and data analysis.

**Equipped for Reading Success (ERS) Foundational Literacy Intervention Learning Opportunity**

Equipped for Reading Success is in full alignment with the science of reading and is a "comprehensive, step-by-step program for developing phonemic awareness and fluent word recognition." This learning opportunity was available to complex area and school-level teachers. The topics of training include research on phonemic awareness and orthographic mapping and how these skills build word recognition skills, using assessment to determine areas of concern and tease out which students need support in word recognition, intervention design, fidelity of implementation, progress monitoring, and data analysis. This learning opportunity enhances the quality of instruction and programming for the SIMR population.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

**Monthly DES Meetings**

Monthly DES meetings will continue to provide professional learning on topics identified as areas of needed support in the field. The following topics will be included during SY 2024-2025:

- CA Team organization and Literacy Leads to Support Schools;
- Organizational Behavior Management and Creating Systems to Support Schools;
- Progress Monitoring and Data Collection;
- Expanding Stakeholder Engagement;
- Delivering High-Quality Preschool Instruction and Appropriate Preschool Placement; and
- SSC Training to Increase the Quality of Tiered Intervention, Evaluation and Eligibility

The anticipated outcome will be that DESs will have the knowledge and expertise to support their CAs in providing evidence-based instruction for the SIMR population to meet the goals of the SSIP.

**CA Project Plans**

The success of each CA Project Plan will be evaluated based on the implementation of activities and their impact on student outcomes, identifying areas that require improvement. The goal of this assessment is to refine and adjust future planning as needed. As a result, CAs will deliver more targeted support and coaching to teachers, focusing on effective language and literacy instruction to directly benefit the SIMR population.

**Language and Literacy Initiative**

In FFY 2024, the literacy coaches will support an additional cohort of special education teachers who serve the SIMR population in participating in the LETRS professional learning program. They will also provide ongoing job-embedded coaching to support the teachers in the application of their newly acquired skills and to ensure implementation fidelity. While teachers have the foundational knowledge, it is important that they have the knowledge and skills to intervene appropriately. Therefore, the ESB will start to shift its focus to providing training on evidence-based interventions using the science of reading framework.

**Early Childhood: Improving Language and Literacy Skills**

To continue the Early Childhood Language and Literacy Initiative, professional learning opportunities focusing on coaching practices will continue into the 2024-2025 school year. As participants gain proficiency in implementing language and literacy interventions, coaching will play a crucial role in supporting their continued growth and ensuring fidelity of implementation in the classroom setting.

The ESB remains committed to improving language and literacy outcomes for all preschool-age children by providing ongoing support to the SLP/RT teams. This support will focus on several key areas:

- Reinforcing the use of appropriate evidence-based practices to ensure that instruction is aligned with the latest research and proven effective.
- Supporting the use of appropriate assessment tools and data analysis to identify student needs, set individualized goals, and monitor progress toward improved language and literacy outcomes. Teams will be equipped to use data to make informed decisions about instruction and intervention.
- Emphasizing the importance of obtaining baseline and progress monitoring data to track student growth and demonstrate the effectiveness of interventions. This data-driven approach will help to ensure accountability and identify areas for improvement.
- Facilitating the connection between language and literacy interventions and the provision of services in the least restrictive environment. This means ensuring that students receive the support they need to access the general education curriculum and participate fully in their learning environment.

By continuing to invest in these areas, the ESB aims to create a sustainable system of support for early childhood language and literacy development. This system will be characterized by high-quality instruction, ongoing professional learning, and a commitment to data-driven decision-making.

**UH-Manoa Reading Interventionist Program**

The ESB anticipates that a second cohort of reading interventionists will complete the program and provide services to students during the next reporting period. With additional staff knowledgeable about the evidence-based interventions that specifically target reading, overall reading proficiency will improve at both the CA and school levels.

#### Substantively Measurable IEPs and Learning Excellence (SMILE) Initiative

In FFY 2024, the ESB will collaborate with at least three (3) CAs to co-present the Substantively Measurable IEPs and Learning Excellence (SMILE) 4-day training to selected target schools. Following the training, they will offer ongoing, job-embedded support to teachers as they implement the newly acquired skills. The initial focus will be on using diagnostic assessments to identify areas of concern and setting measurable goals based on national norms for rates of improvement and the intra-individual framework. Progress monitoring support will be provided shortly thereafter. Each year, additional complex areas will receive this training and support for their target schools.

#### Statewide Complex Area Literacy PLC - SMILE Spin-off

In FFY 2024, the ESB will help to support CAs who facilitated SMILE to create their own Literacy PLCs for their schools.

#### Equipped for Reading Success (ERS) Foundational Literacy Intervention Learning Opportunity

To provide ongoing support for teachers who attended the Equipped for Reading Success (ERS) Foundational Literacy Intervention Learning Opportunity, the ESB will facilitate an ERS PLC to help with implementation and data collection. The topics of the PLC include a collection of baseline data, creating intervention groupings, providing instruction, progress monitoring, IEP development (present levels of academic achievement and functional performance and goals/objectives), and Hawai'i Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (HMTSS). This PLC hopes to ensure fidelity of implementation and support with data analysis.

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

- Coaching
- Guided Play
- Multi-modal Language Instruction
- Narrative Intervention
- Shared Reading Approaches
- Speech to Print Approach
- Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction

#### Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

**Coaching:** A collaborative relationship where the coach and coachee (teacher, parent, para-professional, etc) engage in a systematic process of setting goals and developing solutions. It is an EBP that creates sustained educator practice change and improves student outcomes.

**Guided Play:** An adult playing with children while scaffolding and modeling specific literacy and language skills.

**Multi-Sensory Language Instruction:** The use of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic-tactile pathways simultaneously to enhance memory and learning of language.

**Narrative Interventions:** A language intervention that involves the use of telling or retelling stories. Narrative intervention can be an efficient and versatile means of promoting a large array of academically and socially important language targets that improve children's access to the general education curriculum and enhance their peer relations.

**Shared Storybook Reading:** This Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) is used to help children access text. It provides repeated exposures to new words, allows one to provide explicit definitions of new words, presents new words in a meaningful text or theme rather than in isolation, and has adults encourage children to use words in conversation in whole groups, small groups, or one-on-one. Shared reading encompasses a variety of interactive experiences in which an adult reads a book to children, models proficient skills, and guides the children in discussing aspects of the book.

**Speech to Print:** This EBP emphasizes the role of sound-letter associations in a child's ability to decode and comprehend written text effectively. It emphasizes phonemic awareness, the perception of the speech sounds that form words, and its relevance to the mastery of letters (i.e., phoneme-to-grapheme relationship).

**Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction:** Classroom instruction that is grounded in research and provides systematic, explicit, and cumulative instruction in whole-class and targeted small groups for reading. Evidence-based literacy instruction integrates the science of reading into classroom instruction and incorporates a structured literacy approach to target individual student needs to close the reading achievement gap.

#### Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

**Coaching:** By building relationships with the classroom teachers, it is anticipated that the coach will be able to support the teacher and provide feedback, model, and demonstrate instructional practices that will target the student's specific needs. By targeting the specific student needs, there should be improved reading proficiency. For the early language and literacy group, coaching parents is expected to provide the parents/caregivers with the tools and strategies to embed language into daily routines, resulting in improved language skills. It is intended that embedding coaching into all professional development will provide teachers/providers with additional support in the delivery of evidence-based reading and writing instruction. It is anticipated that this additional support will result in improved proficiency for the SiMR.

All of the EBPs listed below are based on building a strong language foundation, which is required in order for students to be successful readers and writers. Since language is the foundation of reading and writing, these EBPs were selected based on strong research that emphasizes the connection between language and literacy. It is intended that policies and programs, along with the instructional personnel, will change instructional practices (i.e. building the language foundation to improve reading and writing proficiency).

**Multi-modal Language Instruction:** Recognizing that students have different ways of learning and require language input in many different ways will improve teacher instructional practices by providing them with the strategies to address the diverse needs of students.

**Narrative Interventions:** This is a practice that can impact learning at many different levels. It is clear that students with disabilities do not have enough opportunities to practice expressing what they know and have learned. Using narrative interventions provides them with a structured means of "telling their story," which can positively impact them both academically and socially. This is a language-based strategy that supports students in the development of both oral and written language. It is an effective strategy that can be used across all age and grade levels and is an efficient means of

addressing academics, behavior, and social skills.

**Shared Storybook Reading:** This is a means to help children gain knowledge about reading and writing, not through reading and writing, but rather through observing and participating in informal literacy events using conversations. This EBP helps children gain important literacy prerequisite skills (i.e., print awareness, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, and the vocabulary used to describe literacy constructs - read, spell, read, etc.). By using shared reading with young children with disabilities, it is anticipated that the foundational language skills will be addressed at a young age, and students will not encounter reading difficulties when they begin to learn to read.

**Speech to Print:** This is an EBP that will change instructional practices. Many teachers are teaching reading in a traditional manner (teaching from letter to sound rather than sound to the letter). The traditional manner of teaching phonics is flawed and is an inefficient way to teach students. By changing teacher practices and using speech to print, students will have a better chance at learning to read and spell, advancing them to a higher level of literacy proficiency.

**Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction:** Providing teachers with professional learning on evidence-based literacy instruction that incorporates structured literacy, data-based decision making, and the provision of targeted interventions will strengthen the effectiveness of instruction and lead to improved reading outcomes for the SiMR population.

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

Reading Interventionist Program:

- number of individuals who completed the program and the schools or complex areas they are supporting

Substantively Measurable IEPs and Learning Excellence (SMILE) Initiative

- number of complex area staff who completed the SMILE training
- number of attendees to SMILE (SMILE PLC) spin-off - and areas of additional support needed
- number and names of school teams complex area staff are coaching

Equipped for Reading Success (ERS) Foundational Literacy Intervention Learning Opportunity

- number of complex area staff who completed the ERS training
- number and names of school teams complex area staff are coaching
- number and type of additional support requested of the ESB staff

Oral Language Development (Embedding Multi-sensory language interventions, Narrative Interventions, Shared Storybook Readings, Speech to print)

- number of complex area staff who are coaching school staff on oral language interventions
- identification of schools that are being coached
- type of support required for implementation

**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 practice and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

- Coaching: The ESB will continue to support coaching at the district and complex level, who will, in turn, develop a plan for school-level coaches. ESB will continue to focus on supporting development in the areas that have the research to support language and literacy development
- Prioritize areas needed to build skills and knowledge in the complex area teams
- Play-based assessment
- Multi-modal Language Instruction
- Narrative Intervention
- Shared Reading Approaches
- Speech to Print Approach
- Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction

If the areas of need are prioritized and the appropriate support is given to the complex area it is anticipated that school teams will understand how to provide the appropriately target and provide interventions that will lead to improved student outcomes.

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

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

ESB will use the data to determine if the support to CAs is sufficient and the topic areas where additional support is needed.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

**Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Department has effectively utilized the Leading by Convening framework as a central approach to engage parents in enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities. Through this framework, the Department has shared critical information on various special education matters, sought input on target setting, data analysis, and improvement strategies, and worked to build the capacity of a diverse group of parents. These efforts were carried out through the following mechanisms:

Monthly Meetings with the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) is the Department's established advisory panel that advises the Department's special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. In its monthly meetings, family members, community representatives, and Department partners come together to discuss the group's special education priorities alongside the Department's own goals. These meetings facilitate the exchange of information, allow for the voicing of community concerns, and foster collaborative efforts for improvement. Meeting agendas, minutes, and additional



resources for families can be accessed on the SEAC website at <https://seachawaii.org/>.

#### SPP/APR Engagement Meeting

In addition to the monthly meetings, the Department, with support from SEAC, hosts an annual engagement meeting to discuss the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators prior to the submission of the Department's SPP/APR. The 2024 engagement meeting took place on December 3, with 150 participants, including parents, families, educational partners, and community stakeholders. The meeting provided the participants with the opportunity to review Hawai'i's FFY 2023 data, discuss performance targets, and evaluate improvement activities aimed at meeting the requirements and goals of the IDEA.

The Department employed a standardized process for gathering broad stakeholder input on the SPP/APR indicators, covering both compliance and results-focused measures. The one-day engagement session was structured with both large-group discussions and smaller, focused group sessions, each facilitated by Department and SEAC members. This approach not only encouraged active participation but also served as a capacity-building exercise, allowing participants to gain a deeper understanding of each indicator and review relevant data before providing feedback.

A copy of the invitation can be accessed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o\\_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XJNfi1RJs0o_m4OpawfNOaeDR-laYJbE/view?usp=sharing). Participants were given the opportunity to review the materials in advance of the meeting. Following each session, they were encouraged to continue providing feedback on the indicators through Feedback Forms. All materials presented during the meeting were made available on the Department's SPP/APR website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/>.

#### Infographics

To support parents and families with understanding special education complex matters, the Department in collaboration with SEAC members developed Infographics. These infographics are available on the Department's website at <https://hawaiipublicschools.org/data-reports/state-reports/state-performance-plan-annual-performance-report/> and on the SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

#### Parent Training

The Community Children's Councils (CCCs) in collaboration with the Monitoring and Compliance Branch and the Mediation Center of the Pacific provided training to parents in Parent Involvement Survey and conflict resolution skills.

#### IDEA State Advisory Panel: SEAC

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

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

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

#### CCCs

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

#### LDAH

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

#### The DD Council

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

#### The Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)

The DDD serves people with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) who qualify for services.

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

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

#### Department of Health (DOH)

The mission of the DOH is to protect and improve the health and environment for all people in Hawai'i.

The Department recognizes that broad input from a diverse group of stakeholders is essential for ensuring accountability and informed decision-making. Genuine and relevant stakeholder engagement remains a priority, and the Department continues to collaborate with educational partners, parents, and community members to expand outreach and engagement opportunities across the state.

The Department gathered input from both internal and external stakeholders. On December 3, 2024, a meeting was held with parents, educational partners, and community members to review performance since the establishment of the baseline, assess targets, determine if revisions were needed, and discuss improvement strategies.

During the discussion, participants expressed concerns that the focus of the SIMR was too narrow. They recommended expanding SIMR to include additional eligibility categories while maintaining an emphasis on early literacy. Stakeholders also requested more detailed data, including disaggregated information by disability category, historical performance trends, student numbers with their SBA percentages by school and complex, and comparisons of proficiency rates between students with disabilities and all students in SIMR categories. Additional concerns included barriers such as funding constraints, staffing shortages, and the types of screeners utilized.

As a follow-up, another meeting was held to further address the concerns and questions raised on December 3. Participants suggested adjusting targets to be both achievable and reasonable by comparing them to the performance of general education students. In response, the Department decided to maintain the existing targets for FFY 2023 while conducting a deeper analysis and gap comparison to students without disabilities before making adjustments for the FFY 2024 submission. Additionally, the Department will explore the recommendation to expand the SIMR population to other eligibility categories and incorporate additional measurement tools beyond the SBA.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

In addition to the engagement activities that the Department utilized to receive input and feedback on the SPP/APR development, the ESB implemented the following additional strategies:

- Solicited feedback and recommendations from the DESs in developing professional learning materials.
- To better communicate with classroom teachers, weblinks were created for several programs containing resources and materials to support teachers.
- The ESB actively participated in Special Parent Information Network (SPIN) activities, including participating in their conference planning and facilitating several conference sessions.
- Members of the ESB also presented at the Pac Rim International Conference on Disability and Diversity engaging with the larger disability community.
- Presentations to the Board of Education meetings were held throughout the school year to share data, performance and receive feedback from the public on early literacy initiatives.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

The stakeholders expressed the following concerns:

- The focus of the SIMR is not broad; it is limited to eligibility categories of SLD, SoL, and OHD for 3rd and 4th-grade students.
- The measurement of SIMR is focused solely on SBA.

The recommendation was to continue with the focus on literacy, expand the eligibility categories, and utilize other measurement tools, including growth and more frequent measurements such as curriculum-based measures.

The ESB brought together parents, educational partners, community agencies, and Department staff to gather more information on their input on expanding the SIMR population and the measurement tools.

Further, the ESB collaborated with TA providers to discuss strategies for expanding the SIMR population and utilizing other measurement tools in addition to SBA.

**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 Department recognizes kindergarten as the foundation for students' development into lifelong learners. Factors including home-school relationships, kindergarten classroom quality, and instructional quality are influential for fostering students' early learning success. The Department adopted the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) Ready for Kindergarten assessment system in October of 2022. Through collaboration with the Office of Hawaiian Education (OHE) and the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Design (OCID), in partnership with the University of Hawai'i (UH) Manoa, the Department convened a working group of Kumu Papa Malaa'o (kindergarten teachers) in July 2023, as well as other stakeholders, to begin development of Na Ana KEA Kaiapuni (Kaiapuni KEA standards). Na Ana KEA Kaiapuni will be used to develop the initial assessment items for field testing in SY 2024-25.

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

During the School Year 2024-2025, ESB plans to:

- Continue collaborating with stakeholders on expanding the SIMR population,
- Finalize the research on identifying appropriate measurement tools,
- Continue to receive assistance from the TA providers on the expansion of the SIMR population

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

Expanding the measurement tools for the SIMR would require statewide training on using measurement tools, selecting appropriate tools, and using assessment tools with fidelity. The Department operates on a tri-level system: State Office—Complex Areas—Schools. Within this structure, schools have autonomy in selecting the types of formative assessments and other frequent measurement tools.

In addition, the Office of Curriculum Instruction and Design is working on redesigning the English Language Arts standards. Given the amount of training that will be happening, the adjustments to the SIMR population and the impact on the field may influence data reporting.

The Department continued to face staffing shortages for special education teachers and related service providers. In response, the ESB collaborated with the Office of Talent Management to address recruitment challenges. One strategy implemented to meet the needs of students and schools in Early Intervention was the use of itinerant teachers.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

**17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**17 - OSEP Response**

**17 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 18: General Supervision

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

**Compliance indicator:** This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State's exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its local educational agencies (LEAs) for requirements under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) through the State's reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(11) and 1416(a); and 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.149, 300.600). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

#### Data Source

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State's general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

#### Measurement

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)
- # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State's written notification of findings of noncompliance.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100

*States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.*

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State's FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State's baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State's written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States will be required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 18, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators listed below (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, and 17), fiscal and other areas.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

## 18 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2023          | 100.00%       |

### Targets

| FFY    | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**Indicator 4B. 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))

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable | Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 0  | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0  |

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 4B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There were no specific indicator findings for Indicator 4B.

The GSS monitoring findings account for the difference between the findings reported in Indicator 4B and the table above.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:**

The Department identified noncompliance related to 4B through the GSS monitoring and issued a written notification of noncompliance to the school impacted. The written notification of noncompliance included outlining the issue(s), relevant statutes or regulations, and required action(s) composed of correcting the individual case and evidence that the school was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The Department tracked required actions and verified through subsequent data that the school was implementing the regulatory requirements at 100% compliance.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:**

The school was required to correct the individual case as soon as possible (by the prescribed date) and no later than one year after the initial notification. The Department reviewed and verified that the individual case of noncompliance was corrected within the prescribed timeline.

**Indicator 9. 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))**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable | Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  |

Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 9 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).

There were no specific indicator findings or related requirement findings for Indicator 9.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:**

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:**

**Indicator 10. 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))**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable | Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 10 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

There were no specific indicator findings or related requirement findings for Indicator 10.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:**

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

**Indicator 11. 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))**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable | Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 97   | 4   | 97  | 4   | 0  |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 11 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

GSS monitoring and Dispute Resolution findings account for the difference between the findings reported in Indicator 11 and the table above.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:**

The Department identified three (3) findings of noncompliance related to Indicator 11 through the GSS monitoring. The written notification of noncompliance included outlining the issue(s), relevant statutes or regulations, and required action(s) composed of correcting the individual case and evidence that the school was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. The Department tracked required actions and verified through subsequent data that the school was implementing the regulatory requirements at 100% compliance.

The Department identified one (1) finding of noncompliance related to Indicator 11 through a Written State Complaint decision. The Department issued a decision that contained a written notification of noncompliance related to Indicator 11 to the School. The decision contained finding of noncompliance, required correction of the individual case and evidence that the school was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, including training to address the noncompliance. The Department tracked required actions and verified through subsequent data that the School was implementing the regulatory requirements at 100% compliance.

For the Indicator 11 specific findings, beginning with FFY 2022, the Department issued notification of noncompliance at the school level instead of the complex level. This notification method was changed based on educational partner feedback.

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 97 schools in 37 complexes based on a total of 195 child-specific cases of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation. In keeping with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01, in order to ensure that these schools were correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance, the Department reviewed updated data on each of the 97 schools and verified that each school was at 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements within one year of notification.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 97 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

For both GSS and Dispute Resolution findings, the Department tracks the correction of individual noncompliance in the same manner. The school was required to correct each individual case as soon as possible (by the prescribed date) and no later than one year of the initial notification. The Department reviewed and verified that the individual case of noncompliance was corrected within the timeline prescribed.

For Indicator 11 specific findings, the Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 97 schools in 37 complexes, based on a total of 195 child-specific instances of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation.

The Department reviewed each of the files of these 195 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. The written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists, and the Principals of the 97 schools in 37 complexes of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01.

Each individual case of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the

Department. The Department conducted a subsequent review of each individual case of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction and verified each of the individual cases was in compliance with OSEP QA 23-01.

The Department reviewed each individual case of previously noncompliant files to verify that the correction was completed.

- Each individual case of noncompliance (195) is corrected, and
- Each school (97) that did not meet the 100% compliance standard demonstrated evidence of correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 97 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

**Indicator 12. 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))**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable | Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 24   | 1   | 24  | 1   | 0  |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 12 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

Dispute Resolution findings account for the difference between the findings reported in Indicator 12 and the table above.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:**

The Department identified one (1) finding of noncompliance related to Indicator 12 through a Written State Complaint decision. The Department issued a decision that contained a written notification of noncompliance related to Indicator 12 to the school. The decision contained finding of noncompliance, required correction of the individual case and evidence that the school was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, including training to address the noncompliance. The Department tracked required actions and verified through subsequent data that the School was implementing the regulatory requirements at 100% compliance.

For the Indicator 12 specific findings, beginning with FFY 2022, the Department issued notification of noncompliance at the school level instead of the complex level. This notification method was changed based on educational partner feedback.

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 24 schools in 16 complexes based on a total of 29 child-specific cases of noncompliance for the children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3 and were found eligible for Part B but did not have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday. In keeping with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01, in order to ensure that these schools were correctly implementing the regulatory requirement related to 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 has verified for Indicator 12 that each school that was notified of noncompliance has demonstrated they have met the obligation of correction of noncompliance within one year of the finding. In keeping with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01, in order to ensure that these schools were correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance, the Department reviewed updated data on each of the 24 schools and verified that each school was at 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements within one year of notification.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 24 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:**

The school was required to correct the individual case as soon as possible (by the prescribed date) and no later than one year of the notification. The Department reviewed and verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected within the timeline prescribed.

For the Indicator 12 specific findings, the Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 24 schools in 16 complexes based on 29 child-specific cases of noncompliance for children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3 and found eligible for Part B but did not have an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday.

The Department reviewed each of these 29 child-specific cases through the eCSSS database and verified that all of those children who were still enrolled at the time of the correction had an IEP developed, although late (after their third birthday). The written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists, and the School Principals of the 24 schools in 16 complexes of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01.

Each individual case of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. A subsequent review of each individual case of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction was conducted, and the individual cases were verified to be in compliance with OSEP QA 23-01.

The Department reviewed each individual case of previously noncompliant files to verify that the correction was completed.

- Each individual case of noncompliance (29) is corrected, and
- Each school (24) that did not meet the 100% compliance standard demonstrated evidence of correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 24 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

**Indicator 13. 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 and 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 a representative of any participating agency 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))**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable | Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected) |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 62   | 0   | 62  | 0   | 0   |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 13 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

There were no related findings for Indicator 13.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on updated data:**

For the Indicator 13 specific findings, beginning with FFY 2022, the Department issued notification of noncompliance at the school level instead of the complex level. This notification method was changed based on educational partner feedback.

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 62 schools in 42 complexes based on a total of 443 child-specific cases aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the Indicator 13 requirements. In keeping with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01, in order to ensure that these schools were correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance, the Department has reviewed updated data on each of the 62 schools and verified that each school was at 100% compliance with the regulatory requirements within one year of notification.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 62 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected:**

The Department identified findings and issued noncompliance notifications to 62 schools in 42 complexes based on a total of 443 child-specific cases of noncompliance that did not meet the Indicator 13 requirements.

The Department reviewed each of these 443 child-specific cases through the eCSSS database and verified all of those students who were still enrolled at the time of the correction. The written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents, District Educational Specialists, and School Principals of the 62 schools in 42 complexes of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the IDEA requirements and the OSEP QA 23-01.

Each individual case of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Department. The Department conducted a subsequent review of each individual case of those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction and verified each of the individual cases was in compliance with OSEP QA 23-01.

The Department reviewed each individual case of previously noncompliant files to verify that the correction was completed.

- Each individual case of noncompliance (443) is corrected, and
- Each school (62) that did not meet the 100% compliance standard demonstrated evidence of correctly implementing regulatory requirements with 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.

After the Department verified each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected within one year, as well as ensured the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements through a review of updated data within one year, the Department notified in writing the 62 schools that each finding of noncompliance was closed.

**Optional for FFY 2023, 2024, and 2025:**

**Other Areas - All other findings:** States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).

| Column B: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected |
|--|---|---|
|  |   |   |

Explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on *updated data*:

Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:

**Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and Optional Areas):**

| Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23) | Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable | Column C1: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column C2: # of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification) | Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 183  | 6   | 183   | 6   | 0  |

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

| Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected | Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified FFY 2022 | FFY 2022 Data | FFY 2023 Target | FFY 2023 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 189  | 189   |               | 100%            | 100.00%       | N/A    | N/A      |

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification | 0.00% |
|---|-------|

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Department remains dedicated to strengthening the GSS to ensure compliance, accountability, and improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Through collaboration with technical assistance providers, community partners, and dedicated staff, the Department continues to refine processes, implement best practices, and enhance support systems. These collective efforts contribute to a more effective and responsive educational environment that upholds the rights of students with disabilities while fostering their academic and personal growth.

**Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023)                         | 189 |
| 2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the LEA of the finding) | 189 |
| 3. Number of findings <u>not</u> verified as corrected within one year   | 0   |



**Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected   | 0 |
| 5. Number of findings in Col. A the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline for Indicator 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 ("subsequent correction")                      | 0 |
| 6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 4B       | 0 |
| 6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 9        | 0 |
| 6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 10       | 0 |
| 6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 11       | 0 |
| 6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 12       | 0 |
| 6f. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - Indicator 13       | 0 |
| 6g. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - All other findings |   |
| 7. Number of findings <u>not</u> yet verified as corrected  | 0 |

**Subsequent correction:** If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA's enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

## 18 - OSEP Response

State has established the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2023, and OSEP accepts that baseline.

## 18 - Required Actions

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

#### **Name:**

Brikena White, D.Ed.

#### **Title:**

Administrator, IDEA Team - Monitoring and Compliance Branch

#### **Email:**

brikena.white@k12.hi.us

#### **Phone:**

(808) 307-3600

#### **Submitted on:**

04/16/25 5:56:35 PM