

Table A – Hawaii Part C

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

| SPP Indicator | Issue | Required Action |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> The State reported a 74% level of compliance for this indicator in the SPP, specifically the early intervention service provision requirements at 34 CFR §§303.340(c), 303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1).</p> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hawaii reported that its timely standard for this indicator is “30 days from the IFSP date.” The Part C regulations at 34 CFR §§303.342(e) and 303.344(f)(1) require that the lead agency provide the early intervention services that are consented to by the parent as soon as possible after the IFSP meeting. OSEP assumes that the “IFSP date” under Hawaii’s timely standard is when parents provide consent under 34 CFR §303.404(a)(2). 2. The State did not use the correct standard in collecting and reporting its data. The State used monitoring data that indicated, “Services listed on the IFSP are services the child is currently receiving.” Timeliness of services was not monitored. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPP, page 4, concludes, “Hawaii’s monitoring was not specific enough to respond to this indicator...” as required in SPP. • Numbers used in the calculation were not included. SPP instructions (Section I-1) | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> The State must ensure that this noncompliance is corrected within one year of its identification and include data in the APR, due February 1, 2007, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. The State should review and, if necessary revise, its improvement strategies included in the SPP to ensure they will enable the State to include data in the APR, that demonstrate full compliance with this requirement. Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The State must confirm in Indicator 1 in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007 that its 30-day time period runs from parent consent. 2. The State must include the required data and calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the APR due by February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA. |

Table A – Hawaii Part C

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

| SPP Indicator | Issue | Required Action |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>stated, “In addition to the percentages required in the indicators, Lead Agencies are required to provide actual numbers used in the calculations.”</p> <p>3. In the State’s computation of its baseline data for this compliance indicator, the State may have included, in its reported percentage, children for whom reasonable delays were attributable to exceptional child or family circumstances documented in the child’s record.</p> | <p>3. In the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State should not include in its compliance calculation for this indicator children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional child or family circumstances documented in the child’s record. The State must include in its discussion of data, the numbers it used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to child or family circumstances.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 3:</p> <p>Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs 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</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p> <p>(20 USC 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)</p> | <p><u>Other:</u></p> <p>OSEP could not determine if the State plans to use sampling in collecting data for this indicator. If so, it is important that the State have a technically sound sampling plan to ensure that data used for entry, baseline, or to report on progress are valid and reliable. The submission of invalid data is inconsistent with Federal statute and regulations, including section 616(b)(2)(B) of the IDEA, and will affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> | <p>If the State intends to collect information through sampling, the SPP must include sampling methodology to ensure the collection of valid and reliable data on which to base your targets and improvement activities. The State must submit the revised sampling methodology that describes how data were collected with the State’s FFY 2005 APR that is due February 1, 2007. If the State decides not to sample, but rather gather census data, please inform OSEP and revise your SPP accordingly.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 7:</p> <p>Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> See Table B.</p> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <p>1. Numbers used in the calculation were not included. SPP instructions (Section I-1) stated, “In</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> See Table B.</p> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <p>1. The State must include the required calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the</p> |

Table A – Hawaii Part C

Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

| SPP Indicator | Issue | Required Action |
|---|---|--|
| <p>within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p> | <p>addition to the percentages required in the indicators, Lead Agencies are required to provide actual numbers used in the calculations.”</p> <p>2. In the State's computation of its baseline data for this compliance indicator, the State may have included, in its reported percentage, children for whom reasonable delays were attributable to exceptional child or family circumstances documented in the child's record.</p> | <p>APR due by February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>2. In the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State should not include in its compliance calculation for this indicator children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional child or family circumstances documented in the child's record. The State must include in its discussion of data, the numbers it used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to child or family circumstances.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 8: Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;</p> <p>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and</p> <p>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>(20 USC 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> See Table B for 8A, 8B and 8C.</p> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <p>1. 8A, 8B and 8C: Numbers used in the calculations calculation were not included. SPP instructions (Section I-1) stated, “In addition to the percentages required in the indicators, Lead Agencies are required to provide actual numbers used in the calculations.”</p> <p>2. 8C: In the State's computation of its baseline data for this compliance indicator, the State may have included children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the conference or for whom the conference was not timely held due to documented exceptional child or family circumstances.</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> See Table B for 8A, 8B and 8C.</p> <p><u>Other:</u></p> <p>1. The State must include the required calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the APR due by February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP's determination of the State's status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> <p>2. 8C: In the FFY 2005 APR, due February 1, 2007, the State should not include in its compliance calculation for this indicator, children for whom the State has identified the lack of a timely conference attributable either to exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record or lack of family approval. The State must include in its discussion of data, the numbers it used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to child or family</p> |

Table A – Hawaii Part C
Issues Identified in the State Performance Plan

| SPP Indicator | Issue | Required Action |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>circumstances and the number of children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the conference.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> See Table B. <u>Other:</u> Numbers used in the calculation were not included. SPP instructions (Section I-1) stated, “In addition to the percentages required in the indicators, Lead Agencies are required to provide actual numbers used in the calculations.”</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> See Table B. <u>Other:</u> The State must include the required calculations in reporting its performance on this indicator in the APR due by February 1, 2007. Failure to include this information may affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> |
| <p>Indicator 14: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)</p> | <p><u>Noncompliance:</u> The State has identified several areas in the SPP where additional data fields or modifications are needed in the Early Track data system. The State indicated these changes are necessary in order to provide baseline data and demonstrate progress in areas of noncompliance. Additionally, the State has demonstrated continued difficulties in obtaining accurate and reliable data necessary to meet reporting requirements.</p> | <p>The State should reconsider the baseline data provided for Indicator 14 of the SPP and provide accurate data and include improvement activities, in the APR, due February 1, 2007. Failure to accurately report information in this indicator will affect OSEP’s determination of the State’s status under section 616(d) of the IDEA.</p> |