

DMS REPORT

DIFFERENTIATED MONITORING AND SUPPORT OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS U.S. Department of Education

STATE HAWAII

DATE SEPTEMBER 11, 2019

IDEA PART B

CONTENTS	LETTER.....	1
	ENCLOSURE.....	3
	DMS NOTICE	11





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

September 11, 2019

Honorable Christina Kishimoto
State Superintendent
Hawaii Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Dear Superintendent Kishimoto:

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the results of the differentiated monitoring and support (DMS) activities conducted by the United States Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) during an on-site visit to the Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) on January 4–11, 2019.

Participants during the visit included staff from HIDOE. OSEP conducted planning calls on October 29, November 16, November 27, December 3, 7, 21, and 29, 2018, with Christina Tydeman and Drew Saranillio of the HIDOE staff, and Cesar D'Agord, technical assistance provider with the National Center for Systemic Improvement.

As part of the DMS process, OSEP conducts an organizational assessment (OA) of factors to identify States' progress in meeting performance standards and complying with the requirements of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and its implementing regulations, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards. OSEP uses the information from the OA and an Engagement Decision Tree to make decisions about how it will engage with States over the course of the Federal fiscal year (FFY). The FFY 2018 DMS areas were: 1) Results; 2) Compliance; 3) State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP); and 4) Fiscal.

On December 19, 2018, OSEP sent HIDOE's DMS notice to Hawaii's Director of Monitoring and Compliance, Christina Tydeman. OSEP's notice provided a level of engagement of universal, targeted, or intensive for each of the four areas OSEP identified for DMS. The levels of engagement in the notice are based on a snapshot of the most recently available data in the corresponding four areas. The notice also identified the monitoring and support activities that would be carried out to address the factors contributing to the elevated need for monitoring and support in each of the areas that were identified for intensive engagement. We have attached a copy of the DMS notice for your convenience.

400 MARYLAND AVE., S.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparedness for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

The enclosure describes the: 1) Background; 2) Monitoring¹ and Technical Assistance Activity for each DMS area; 3) Summary; and 4) OSEP's conclusion including Next Steps and Required Actions. If OSEP issued findings of noncompliance with the IDEA requirements, you will find specific details pertaining to the finding of noncompliance, along with the respective citation(s); and the corrective action required to address the identified finding of noncompliance.

We appreciate Hawaii's efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Barrett-Zitkus, your OSEP State Lead, at 202-245-8417.

Sincerely,

/s/

Laurie VanderPloeg

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

cc: Cara Tanimura, State Director of Special Education

Enclosure
DMS Notice

¹ Monitoring is broadly defined as including activities examining both compliance and performance issues, and encompasses traditional monitoring reviews and technical assistance activities

ENCLOSURE

Background

OSEP's Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system is a component of Results Driven Accountability to improve results for children with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). DMS is designed to help the Department identify potential grantee risk and to assist OSEP in effectively using its resources to monitor State grantees. DMS addresses State-specific and Entity²-specific needs in the areas of results, compliance, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and fiscal by differentiating levels and types of monitoring and support based on each State's and Entity's unique strengths, progress, and challenges in each area.

In reviewing the State's systems for results and SSIP, OSEP:

- Reviewed the State's policies and procedures for collecting and reporting data the State submitted for selected indicators in the State's Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2016 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)
- Reviewed the following—
 - The State's previous IDEA Part B SPP/APRs, including its SSIP submissions
 - The State's FFY 2018 IDEA Part C Application
 - Information on the State's website related to the IDEA Part B and
 - Other pertinent information related to the State's IDEA Part B efforts to improve results for children with disabilities
- Gathered additional information through surveys, focus groups, or interviews with—
 - Christina Kishimoto, State Superintendent
 - Phyllis Unebasami, Deputy Superintendent
 - State personnel responsible for implementing the SSIP and improving the State's performance on results indicators in the SPP/APR and results elements in the RDA Matrix, including:
 - Heidi Armstrong, Assistant Superintendent
 - Christina Tydeman, Director Monitoring and Compliance
 - Drew Saranillio, Educational Specialist

² States include each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and Entities include freely associated States, outlying areas, and the Bureau of Indian Education.

During the visit, OSEP did not examine the areas of compliance and fiscal, because the State received a universal level of engagement in each of these areas. However, OSEP will continue to provide technical assistance (TA) in these areas during regular phone calls, national TA calls, webinars, and guidance documents posted on our websites.

Improving Educational Results and Functional Outcomes for Children with Disabilities

In order to effectively monitor implementation of Part B of the IDEA, as required by IDEA Sections 612(a)(11) and 616, and 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), the State must have policies and procedures that are reasonably designed to ensure that the State can meet:

1. Its general supervisory responsibility in 34 C.F.R. § 300.149;
2. Its monitoring responsibilities in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.600 through 300.602; and
3. Its responsibility to annually report on performance of the State and of each local educational agency (LEA), as provided in 34 C.F.R. § 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A) and (b)(2).

Under 34 C.F.R. § 300.600(b), the State's monitoring activities must focus on:

1. Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and
2. Ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.

The State must monitor the LEAs located in the State, using quantifiable indicators in each of the following priority areas, and using such qualitative indicators as appropriate to adequately measure performance in those areas:

1. Provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment; and
2. State exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 300.43 and in 20 U.S.C. 1437(a)(9).

Results

Hawaii was identified as needing intensive support in the area of results due to low percentages of 4th grade children with disabilities scoring at basic or above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in both reading and math, and low percentages of 8th grade children with disabilities scoring at basic or above on the NAEP in both reading and math.

In FFY 2016, HIDOE reported:

- 14% of children with disabilities in 4th grade scored at or above basic in reading
- 17% of children with disabilities in 8th grade scored at or above basic in reading

- 30% of children with disabilities in 4th grade scored at or above basic in math
- 19% of children with disabilities in 8th grade scored at or above basic in math

To explore the potential causes for low performance in reading and math, OSEP met with the State staff and representatives from OSEP-funded TA centers. The State discussed the strategies currently being implemented to improve outcomes for children with disabilities, as well as the specific activities underway in the State to address low performance on assessments.

During the 2017–18 school year, the State Superintendent commissioned a Special Education Task Force that was charged with:

1. Conducting analysis on data and evidence-based research in order to consider current best practices for improving outcomes for children with disabilities and the supports needed to implement best practices; and
2. Recommending steps to improve access to quality education for children with disabilities and ensure appropriate inclusion in the general education classroom.

In its report, issued on May 2018, the task force identified inconsistencies in procedures, practices, and communication between the levels of State offices, complex areas, and schools; a lack of cohesive, high quality professional development; and an ineffective system of monitoring and assessment as key barriers to improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The report provides short- and long-term recommendations that are guiding the State's current efforts in these areas. Specifically, during OSEP's onsite visit, HIDOE reported that they are continuing to assess the governing structure of the State educational agency (SEA) to ensure a cohesive and effective statewide system of support. Additionally, there are plans to create and implement a professional development system across the State, complex areas, and schools, and the State is exploring ways to improve data collection and monitoring practices.

OSEP Conclusion

Based on the review of documents, analysis of data, and interviews with State and local personnel, as described above, OSEP concludes that HIDOE has developed a plan that, when fully implemented, will assist the State in improving educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities, including improving their performance on assessments in reading and math.

Required Actions/Next Steps

No action is required.

SSIP

HIDOE was identified as needing intensive support in the area of the SSIP based on OSEP's analysis of the State's progress related to:

1. Infrastructure changes to support SSIP initiatives;

2. Stakeholder Engagement;
3. Evidence-based practices; and
4. Progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR).

Hawaii’s SiMR is focused on improving results by narrowing or eliminating the achievement gap for a subset of its student population and by improving reading for the majority (67%) of the population currently amongst the lowest performing student—3rd and 4th grade students with disabilities identified in the eligibility categories of Other Health Disabilities (OHD), Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), and Speech or Language Disabilities (SoL).

HIDOE’s key measures (proficiency and growth) for the SSIP are:

1. The percentage of 3rd and 4th grade students with disabilities identified in the eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL who are proficient on the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) for English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy; and
2. The median growth percentile (MGP) of 4th grade students with disabilities identified in the eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL on the SBA for ELA/Literacy.

SBA Results: Statewide, Grades 3 and 4

State Year	Target	SiMR	Percent Increase/Decrease	SiMR Target Number Tested
2014-15	Baseline	8.3%	N/A	1824
2015-16	11%	9.6%	+15.7%	1907
2016-17	20%	9.1%	-5.2%	1960
2017-18	35%	10.2%	+12%	1849

Data Source: HIDOE State Year 2017-2018 SBA

To explore the potential barriers that have impacted the State’s progress toward achieving its SSIP targets, OSEP met with the State staff and representatives from OSEP-funded TA centers.

HIDOE identified factors impacting the State’s overall ability to improve results for students with disabilities, including:

- Teacher shortages and low rate of highly qualified teachers;
- Shortages in Principals and Vice Principals;
- High percentages of English Learners (ELs);
- High student mobility rate; and
- Chronic student absenteeism.

HIDOE reported specific factors impacting progress on the SSIP, including:

- New leadership and shifting priorities;
- Changes to infrastructure, roles, responsibilities, and line authority;
- Limited access to data at the complex area; and
- Communication barriers.

The State indicated that in addition to these issues that have significantly impacted the State's ability to implement its SSIP, there have been challenges with collecting and analyzing results data at the State-level. Specifically, there are multiple evidence-based practices being implemented across complex areas and various progress monitoring tools are being utilized to measure student outcomes. Additionally, HIDOE has several data systems in place for the State, complex areas, districts, schools, and teachers in managing and tracking student data. Although HIDOE continues to make efforts to evaluate and aggregate school-level data, the variability across local programs makes it difficult to look at trends, fidelity of implementation, and possible correlations between student outcomes and performance on statewide assessments. Since data are not consistently reported from the school level to the State, HIDOE has not been able to evaluate the effectiveness of implementation across the State. HIDOE seeks to improve the consistency of implementation and progress monitoring data by obtaining technical assistance from National Center Education Outcome and to facilitate a more focused data collection and analysis process.

In order to achieve the goals identified in its SSIP, the State reported that it has aligned its SSIP with the HIDOE strategic plan and aspects of Consolidated State Plan, as required under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Students Succeeds Act. HIDOE is implementing its SSIP statewide and has identified three main improvement strategies:

1. Build capacity and collaboration for sustainable statewide improvements utilizing State-level Professional Learning Communities and Complex Area Teams to provide resources and the training and coaching necessary for implementation fidelity of evidence-based practices (Infrastructure);
2. Implement and evaluate effectiveness of chosen evidence-based practices for improving student performance as documented in complex area plans; and
3. Engage students, parents, and community members by utilizing the Leading by Convening (LbC) framework to address specific issues that affect the HIDOE's system of support (Stakeholder Engagement). This report will only address the State's efforts related to infrastructure and evidence-based practices.

Infrastructure

As part of its overview, the State described itself as a unitary or single SEA and LEA with three levels of governance: State, complex areas, and schools. The State reported that IDEA requirements are implemented by State-level offices, complex area offices, and schools. Through

the State's General Supervision and Support (GSS) system, HIDOE monitors all public schools, including public charter schools and complex areas using the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) and the Longitudinal Data System (LDS) databases. HIDOE reported that findings of noncompliance are issued to the appropriate complex area through the Special Education Compliance Action Table (SPED CAT) database. HIDOE reported that any findings of noncompliance are issued to the appropriate complex area through the SPED CAT database in Hawaii's system of general supervision. After findings are issued through the SPED CAT the complex areas are required to correct all instances of noncompliance in a timely manner in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.600(e). The State described that prior to May 2018, HIDOE was responsible for ensuring that findings of noncompliance were verified as corrected through the SPED CAT database, in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, dated October 17, 2008.

Subsequent to May 2018, HIDOE experienced changes to its organizational structure. The Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support was divided into two separate offices: the Office of Curriculum and Instructional Design (OCID) and the Office of Student Support Services (OSSS) with each supervised by an Assistant Superintendent. According to HIDOE, the OCID advances the design of innovative and responsive instructional support systems working in tandem with OSSS. OSSS is responsible for providing targeted assistance, guidance, and professional development to complex area staff, classroom teachers, and others to ensure that the necessary resources and supports are available to students with disabilities. The monitoring and compliance branch, within the OSSS and led by a Director of Monitoring and Compliance, is charged with implementing monitoring activities specific to IDEA.

The State clarified that, even though the Director of Monitoring and Compliance oversees IDEA monitoring activities, the person in the position does not have the authority to ensure that complex areas and schools are consistently implementing the requirements in IDEA. According to HIDOE, the Deputy Superintendent has line authority over the complex areas and as a result, it is the Deputy Superintendent that is responsible for ensuring that complex areas comply with Federal laws, U.S. Department of Education requirements, Hawaii State Board of Education policies, and HIDOE administrative rules for Federally-funded programs. The State also described that each complex area Superintendent has direct oversight and monitoring responsibilities over principals who in turn have direct supervision over teachers and their classrooms. HIDOE reported that the Director of Monitoring and Compliance operates outside of this structure and is frequently not part of IDEA-related discussions at the complex area level.

HIDOE acknowledged that there have been continued challenges with communication, including gaps in how information and data are collected and shared across their system. These challenges impacted the HIDOE's ability to make data-based decisions and report progress in implementing the infrastructure improvement strategies identified in their SSIP, as required by SPP/APR measurement table. HIDOE also shared that prior to the current superintendent the State has had significant turnovers in key leadership roles including two Superintendents and four Deputy Superintendents.

Evidence-Based Practices

HIDOE has multiple data systems in place for the State, complex areas, and schools to manage and track student data. Additionally, each school has autonomy to choose the evidence-based practices that are being implemented, as well as the progress monitoring tools that are utilized to measure student outcomes and evaluate effectiveness of evidence-based practices. The State indicated that although HIDOE reports statewide assessment data for the purposes of its SiMR, it is unable to report any progress data at this time. Because HIDOE does not require the local programs to report school-level data related to the implementation of evidence-based practices or associated student outcomes, the State does not have access to data from every complex area. Although HIDOE has worked to aggregate local data, the variability across complex area and individual schools makes it difficult to look at trends, fidelity of implementation, and possible correlations between student outcomes and performance on statewide assessments. HIDOE has been unable to consistently report progress on its implementation of coherent improvement strategies, including progress in the areas of infrastructure improvement strategies or the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity, as required by the SPP/APR measurement table.

Required Action/Next Steps

In the State's FFY 2020 APR submission of the SSIP, as required by Section 616(b)(2)(B)(i) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.601(b)(1), HIDOE must:

1. Report FFY 2018 data for the SiMR. Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide:
 - a. A narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4;
 - b. Measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019);
 - c. A summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies, and evidence-based practices that were implemented by the State and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and
 - d. Any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data. If, in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR due in February 2020, the State is not able demonstrate progress in implementing its coherent improvement strategies, including progress in the areas of infrastructure improvement strategies or the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity, the State must provide its root cause analysis for each of these challenges.

2. 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.
3. The State must 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.
4. Within 90 days, the State must provide a written update on the progress and effectiveness of activities currently underway specific to data, evidence-based practices, evaluation planning, stakeholder engagement, and other State-specific needs.

HIDOE and OSEP will discuss the State's progress towards completing these required actions during monthly TA calls.

DMS NOTICE

Differentiated Monitoring and Support Engagement Decisions:

Hawaii 2018–2019

This year we have selected four States for on-site visits as part of OSEP's Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system. These selections were based on the relative number of intensive and targeted Levels of Engagement (LOEs) across all states. **Your State has been selected for an on-site visit.**

OSEP's Differentiated Monitoring and Support (DMS) system is a component of Results Driven Accountability. DMS is designed to identify potential grantee risk to the Department and to assist OSEP in effectively using its resources to monitor grantees. DMS addresses State-specific needs in the areas of results, compliance, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and fiscal by differentiating levels and types of monitoring and support based on each State's unique strengths, progress, and challenges in each area.

DMS is a multi-tiered model for monitoring and providing support based on the principle that supports are first provided at a core or universal level to effectively address the needs of all States. Targeted monitoring and support is generally based on OSEP's identification of common needs among multiple States. Intensive monitoring and support is reserved for those States with the most intense or complex challenges to implementation.

OSEP has assessed States' and Entity's progress in meeting performance standards and compliance with the legal requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards. This information was used to help OSEP make decisions about a State's or Entity's levels of engagement for monitoring and support.

The charts below specify your State's level of engagement in each area — results, compliance, fiscal and SSIP.

Results | Level of Engagement: *Intensive*

Factors	Existing/Current Engagement
<p>Reading Assessment Elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress 14% • Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress 17% <p>Math Assessment Elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress 30% • Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress 19% 	<p>OSEP continues to make information and technical assistance (TA) resources available and provide universal support to all States.</p>

New Engagement

OSEP will offer to provide the State, in collaboration with OSEP’s technical assistance providers, intensive technical assistance and support in its work to improve the State’s graduation rate, dropout rate, or reading and math proficiency rates based on the State’s needs. OSEP’s support may include establishing a schedule of regular contact, engaging in conversations to explore improvement activities, and discussing the progress and effectiveness of activities currently underway in the State to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. OSEP may also work with the State to conduct a root cause analysis of the factors that contribute to low results outcomes for students with disabilities.

Fiscal | Level of Engagement: *Universal*

Factors	Existing/Current Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors are only listed when the level of engagement is targeted or intensive. 	<p>OSEP continues to make information and TA resources available and provide universal support to all States.</p>

New Engagement

OSEP will provide universal support related to Part B fiscal requirements.

Compliance | Level of Engagement: *Universal*

Factors	Existing/Current Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors are only listed when the level of engagement is targeted or intensive. 	OSEP continues to make information and TA resources available and provide universal support to all States.

New Engagement

OSEP will provide universal support related to IDEA compliance.

SSIP | Level of Engagement: *Intensive*

Factors	Existing/Current Engagement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure changes to support SSIP initiatives. • Evidence-based practices. • Progress toward the SiMR. 	OSEP continues to make information and TA resources available and provide universal support to all States.

New Engagement

OSEP will offer to establish a schedule of regular contact to provide the State targeted TA and support around its work to develop and implement the SSIP. OSEP TA may focus on data, evidence-based practices, evaluation planning, stakeholder engagement or other State-specific needs. As appropriate, OSEP will also work collaboratively with the State and OSEP-funded TA providers to identify relevant TA resources.