

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 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. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 77%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 79.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 81%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 5.8%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 2.95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 3.0%.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> |
| <p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p> | <p>Not applicable.</p> | <p>The reporting requirements for Indicator 3A are not applicable to the Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) because the HIDOE 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: 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</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.10% for reading and 95.91% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 reported data of 95.2% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 95% for math. The State met its FFY 2007 targets of 95% for reading and 95% for math.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| <p>against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | | |
| <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's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 15.79% for reading and 8.39% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 13.51% for reading and progress from the FFY 2006 data of 6.61% for math.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets of 16% for reading and 9% for math.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 1.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of .07%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 4%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, a description of the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2006 (2006-2007). The State provided the required information. OSEP's response table also required the State to 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 FFY 2006.</p> <p>The State described how the State reviewed, and if appropriate, revised (or required the affected schools to revise), the schools' 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, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the schools identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2006.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p> <p>In addition, the State must describe the State's 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 schools, including public charter schools, identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2007, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).</p> |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------|---|----|----|----|--------|--|----|----|----|-------|---|---|---|---|-------|--|
| <p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p> | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the targets for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 781 1467 1260"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">21</td> <td align="center">18</td> <td align="center">30</td> <td align="center">-3.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">35</td> <td align="center">32</td> <td align="center">29</td> <td align="center">3.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td align="center">2</td> <td align="center">2</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent slippage for 5A, progress for 5B, and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target for 5C and did not meet its targets for 5A and 5B.</p> | | FFY 2006 Data | FFY 2007 Data | FFY 2007 Target | Progress | A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. | 21 | 18 | 30 | -3.00% | B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. | 35 | 32 | 29 | 3.00% | C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0.00% | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> |
| | FFY 2006 Data | FFY 2007 Data | FFY 2007 Target | Progress | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day. | 21 | 18 | 30 | -3.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day. | 35 | 32 | 29 | 3.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements. | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|-----|----|----|---|-----|-----|-----|--|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|--|
| <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>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p> | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 651 1465 1369"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 651 1037 824">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="1037 651 1184 824">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1184 651 1325 824">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1325 651 1465 824">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 824 1037 894">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1037 824 1184 894">.30</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 824 1325 894">.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 824 1465 894">.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 894 1037 1029">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1037 894 1184 1029">7.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 894 1325 1029">7.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 894 1465 1029">7.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1029 1037 1130">c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1037 1029 1184 1130">37.6</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 1029 1325 1130">37.1</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 1029 1465 1130">26.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1130 1037 1230">d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1037 1130 1184 1230">43.3</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 1130 1325 1230">43.8</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 1130 1465 1230">48.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1230 1037 1331">e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1037 1230 1184 1331">11.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 1230 1325 1331">11.2</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 1230 1465 1331">18.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1331 1037 1369">Total (approx. 100%)</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1037 1331 1184 1369">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1184 1331 1325 1369">100.00%</td> <td align="center" data-bbox="1325 1331 1465 1369">100.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | 07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data | Social Emotional | Knowledge & Skills | Appropriate Behavior | a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning. | .30 | .3 | .3 | b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.0 | c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. | 37.6 | 37.1 | 26.1 | d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 43.3 | 43.8 | 48.3 | e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 11.2 | 11.2 | 18.3 | Total (approx. 100%) | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | <p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p> |
| 07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data | Social Emotional | Knowledge & Skills | Appropriate Behavior | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning. | .30 | .3 | .3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers. | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. | 37.6 | 37.1 | 26.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 43.3 | 43.8 | 48.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. | 11.2 | 11.2 | 18.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (approx. 100%) | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1,</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|---|--|
| <p>parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 30%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 33%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 34.8%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population and provided improvement strategies to address this issue.</p> | <p>2010.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were based on a parent survey response group that is not representative of the State's population. In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must continue to indicate whether its response group is representative of the State's population and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised a timeline for one of its improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts that revision.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0% for the State. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0% for the State.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0% for the State.</p> <p>The State reported no disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification based on the State's calculation of the data.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> |
| <p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0% for the State. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 100% for the State.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0% for the State.</p> <p>The State reported no disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification based on the State's calculation of the data.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, data demonstrating that the uncorrected noncompliance identified for FFY 2005 and 2006 was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified for FFY 2005 was not</p> | <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311 was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p> |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>corrected within the one-year timeline, but was subsequently corrected by December 19, 2008. The State also reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified for FFY 2006 that the State had disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification was corrected by December 19, 2008, and that the State is in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311.</p> | |
| <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 revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 97%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the timely evaluation 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 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that with respect to noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, the HIDEOE: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure</p> |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|---|
| <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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 99%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that its FFY 2006 monitoring resulted in no findings for this indicator because it verified that the noncompliance was corrected before the State issued a finding of noncompliance.</p> | <p>compliance.</p> <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in its FFY 2006 monitoring with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b) was corrected before it issued a finding.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b), including correction of the noncompliance the State reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that with respect to the noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, the HIDOE: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> |
| <p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 83.4%. These data</p> | <p>The State reported that the noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely</p> |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|--|--|
| <p>that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 90.3%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all two of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 related to this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> | <p>manner.</p> <p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that with respect to noncompliance reported under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, the HODOE: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for each individual case of noncompliance, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</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]</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.0%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 85.91%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 84.4%.</p> | <p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010.</p> |
| <p>15. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p> | <p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 reported data of 96%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 91 of 92 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner and the remaining finding</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified by the State in FFY 2007, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e) and OSEP Memo</p> |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>subsequently was corrected by December 19, 2008.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to demonstrate in the FFY 2007 APR that the remaining noncompliance identified from FFY 2005 has been corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that all remaining findings of previously identified noncompliance for FFY 2005 have been corrected.</p> | <p>09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of the noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State's monitoring system, through the State's data system and by the Department); and (2) verified that the HIDOE is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements that resulted in noncompliance reported in the FFY 2007 APR, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 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> |

Hawaii Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

| Monitoring Priorities and Indicators | Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues | OSEP Analysis/Next Steps |
|--|---|---|
| <p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due 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>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timelines 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 2007 reported data for this indicator are 40%. The State's FFY 2006 data for this indicator were 16%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 20%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> |
| <p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p> | <p>The State reported that six of seven mediations held resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more mediations were conducted.</p> | <p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</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 and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 95.5%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> | <p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p> |