

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 79.6%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 79.3%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 2.95%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 3.2%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 3.1%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>The reporting requirements for Indicator 3A are not applicable to Hawaii since Hawaii is a unitary system and cannot report on the percentage of school districts meeting AYP for the disability subgroup.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 95.2% for reading and 95% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets of 96.5% for reading and 95.5% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 13.51% for reading and 6.61% for math.</p> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 9% for reading and 5% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 9% for reading and 5% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are .07%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 1%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 4%.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, its review, and if appropriate revision of, 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 compliance with the IDEA, for discrepancies in rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities identified in the FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 APRs. Because Hawaii is a unitary system, the State's data on significant discrepancies are based on long-term suspension and expulsion rates in schools, including public charter schools, and these schools are subject to the State's policies and procedures in this regard. The State reported on its review of discipline policies and procedures statewide as well as its review of practices of schools identified as having significant discrepancies in rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions in the FFY 2005 APR. OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
		<p>APR, due February 1, 2009, the State must describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008). In addition, the State must describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of 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 compliance with the IDEA, for the schools, including public charter schools, identified with significant discrepancies in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>												
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>													
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21: A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day; B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 1287 1419 1523"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">23%</td> <td align="center">21%</td> <td align="center">25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater</td> <td align="center">34%</td> <td align="center">35%</td> <td align="center">29%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	23%	21%	25%	B. Removed from regular class greater	34%	35%	29%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance for 5C and looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance for 5A and 5B in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target											
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	23%	21%	25%											
B. Removed from regular class greater	34%	35%	29%											

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>than 60% of the day.</p>				
	<p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p>	<p>3%</p>	<p>2%</p>	<p>3%</p>	
	<p>These data represent slippage for 5A and 5B and progress for 5C from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target for 5C and did not meet its targets for 5A and 5B.</p>				
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p>				<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities.</p> <p>The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009; and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	<p>06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p>Social Emotional</p>	<p>Knowledge & Skills</p>	<p>Appropriate Behavior</p>	
	<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>	<p>1%</p>	<p>1%</p>	<p>1%</p>	
	<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p>21%</p>	<p>21%</p>	<p>22%</p>	
	<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>	<p>48%</p>	<p>42%</p>	<p>33%</p>	
	<p>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable</p>	<p>23%</p>	<p>29%</p>	<p>34%</p>	

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	to same-aged peers.				
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	7%	7%	10%	
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. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p> <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 33%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 34%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 34.4%.</p>				OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.
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. [Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0% for the State. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0% for the State.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 0% for the State.</p> <p>The State reported no disproportionate representation in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. [Compliance Indicator]	<p>The State revised the baseline and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100% for the State. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100% for the State.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0% for the State. The State reported disproportionate representation that was the result of inappropriate identification on a statewide basis.</p> <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified for FFY 2005 related to this indicator with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111 and</p>				OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent identified in the State with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination; (2) FFY 2006 data on the percent identified in the State with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>300.301 through 300.311 was not corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that it focused its training efforts with the District Educational Specialists on the fidelity of implementation of the policies, practices, and procedures relating to child find, evaluation, and eligibility. The State also reported that it was conducting an ongoing review of policies, practices and procedures to determine if the disproportionality could be the result of inappropriate identification practices.</p>	<p>categories that is the result of inappropriate identification, and a description of how the State made that determination; and (3) use of language referring to disproportionate representation instead of significant disproportionality in reporting on this indicator. The State provided the required data and information for both FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified for FFY 2005 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311 was not corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance identified for FFY 2006 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the State has in effect policies and procedures that are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. Because the State determined that there was disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories based on FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 data, and is conducting an ongoing review of its policies, practices, and procedures for compliance with 34 CFR §§300.111 and 300.301 through 300.311, the subsequent review, at a minimum, must include whether there have been changes to the policies, practices, and procedures since the last review; and if so, whether those changes comply with the requirements of 34</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		CFR §§300.111 and 300.301 through 300.311.
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 97% based on the timeline that the State measures for this indicator. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 94%, which the State recalculated in the FFY 2006 APR. The State reported that the FFY 2005 data were recalculated because those data included both initial evaluations and reevaluations.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported under Indicator 15 that one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, the range of days beyond the timeline when evaluations were completed, as required in the instructions for this indicator. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 96%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 90.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 83.1% that the State recalculated in its FFY 2006 APR, as required by OSEP's June 15, 2007 response table.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected by the February 1, 2008 FFY 2006 APR submission.</p>	<p>response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, a composite baseline that reflects the required measurement for this indicator. The State provided the required data.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 85.91%. Because States were not required to establish a baseline for this indicator until FFY 2006, OSEP considers the State's FFY 2006 data as its baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008: (1) a composite baseline that reflects the required measurement for this indicator and targets and improvement activities in accordance with its revised baseline; and (2) the definitions of competitive employment and postsecondary school. The State provided the required data, information and definitions.</p> <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These</p>	<p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 regarding requirements for secondary transition and providing parents periodic reports of their</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 94%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 92 of 96 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 were corrected in a timely manner. For the uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported that two findings were corrected after the one-year timeline. For one finding, the State reported that ongoing technical assistance was provided and a report was submitted to the deputy superintendent of the complexes exhibiting noncompliance for appropriate follow-up and correction. For the finding related to Indicator 10, the State reported that it was focusing on training District Education Specialists to ensure the fidelity of implementation of applicable policies, practices, and procedures.</p>	<p>child's progress was corrected. The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the requirement regarding when a regular education teacher must be a member of the Individualized Education Program Team was not corrected. However, the State specified the steps it was taking to correct this noncompliance. The State reported that the noncompliance related to Indicator 10 was not corrected, but specified the steps it is taking to correct this noncompliance.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the remaining noncompliance identified in Indicator 15 from FFY 2005 has been corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with (Part B) 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600. In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, 12, and 13 the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>achieving compliance with the timely due process resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 6%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 16%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 18%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that 3 of 5 mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. The State reported fewer than 10 mediations held in FFY 2006. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which 10 or more mediations were conducted.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>