

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 72.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 77%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 80%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet to graduate with a regular diploma.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2008 data for this indicator.</p> <p>The State explained that FFY 2008 data are the most recent data that the State has reported to the Department as part of its CSPR.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 5.8%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 3.0%.</p> <p>The State provided a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported the required dropout rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA. This means that the State submitted the most recent dropout data that the State reported to the Department as part of its CSPR. In its APR submitted February 1, 2010, the State reported FFY 2008 data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:</p> <p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 96% for reading and 95% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State met its FFY 2008 targets of 95% for reading and math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p><a href="http://arch.k12.hi.us/">http://arch.k12.hi.us/</a></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>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), baseline, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 17% for reading and 8% for math. The data source for this indicator has changed. Therefore, OSEP cannot determine progress or slippage from the State’s reported FFY 2007 data. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 targets of 58% for reading and 46% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a web link to 2008 publicly-reported assessment results.</p> <p><a href="http://arch.k12.hi.us/">http://arch.k12.hi.us/</a></p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of</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%. Because the State’s actual target data for this indicator are from the same year as the data</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>reported for this indicator in the State’s FFY 2007 APR, OSEP cannot comment on whether there is progress or slippage. The State met its FFY 2007 target of 4%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that it, as required by OSEP’s June 1, 2009 FFY 2007 SPP/APR response table, reviewed 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 four schools identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that it 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, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) for the schools identified with significant discrepancies for FFY 2007.</p> <p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in December 2008 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.</p>	<p>Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009.</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator; New for FFY 2009]																						
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served: A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day; B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State revised the indicator and measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table), target for 5B, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised target. The revised target is more rigorous than the previously-established target.</p> <p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 667 1467 1135"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Data</th> <th>FFY 2008 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">18</td> <td align="center">15</td> <td align="center">25</td> <td align="center">-3.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">32</td> <td align="center">27</td> <td align="center">29</td> <td align="center">5.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/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 progress for 5B, slippage for 5A, and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2007 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2008 targets for 5B and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2008 target for 5A.</p>		FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	18	15	25	-3.00%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	32	27	29	5.00%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2	2	3	0.00%	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2009 APR.
	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2008 Data	FFY 2008 Target	Progress																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	18	15	25	-3.00%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	32	27	29	5.00%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2	2	3	0.00%																		
6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR.	The instruction package for the FFY 2009 APR/SPP will provide guidance regarding the information that States must report for this indicator in their FFY 2009 APRs.																				

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>									
<p>of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and                      B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.                      [Results Indicator; New]</p>											
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:                      A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);                      B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and                      C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2008 baseline data, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 816 1444 1237"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 816 919 932">08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data</th> <th data-bbox="919 816 1192 932"><u>Summary Statement 1</u><sup>1</sup></th> <th data-bbox="1192 816 1444 932"><u>Summary Statement 2</u><sup>2</sup></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 932 919 1068"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 932 1192 1068">83.1</td> <td data-bbox="1192 932 1444 1068">47.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1068 919 1237"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="919 1068 1192 1237">81.8</td> <td data-bbox="1192 1068 1444 1237">49.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	83.1	47.7	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	81.8	49.2	<p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2009 with the FFY 2009 APR.</p>
08-09 Preschool Outcome Baseline Data	<u>Summary Statement 1</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Summary Statement 2</u> <sup>2</sup>									
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	83.1	47.7									
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	81.8	49.2									

<sup>1</sup> Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

<sup>2</sup> Summary Statement 2: The percentage of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program.

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues			OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	79.3	60.5	
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]	The State revised the targets and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets. The revised targets are more rigorous than the previously-established target.  The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 46%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 30%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 35.2%.  In its description of its FFY 2008 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
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]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  As a unitary system, the State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 0%.  The State reported disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in the State. However, the State reported no disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in the State that was the result of inappropriate identification.  The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation.			OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.  OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State's definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.
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]	The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  As a unitary system, the State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 0%.  The State reported disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups			OSEP looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating compliance. Because Hawaii is a unitary system, it either reports data of 0% if it finds no noncompliance or data of 100% if it finds any noncompliance.  Because the State reported noncompliance

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
	<p>in specific disability categories in the State. The State also reported that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in the State was the result of inappropriate identification. The State provided its definition of disproportionate representation.</p>	<p>for FFY 2008 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111 and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the State, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02 dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance with those requirements in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p> <p>OSEP will be carefully reviewing each State’s definition of disproportionate representation and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 96%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting correction of noncompliance, the State must report in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that the State: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the State, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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</p>	<p>The State revised the measurement language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 99%. The State did not meet its</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2009 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>birthdays. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>FFY 2008 target of 100%.  The State reported that its FFY 2007 monitoring resulted in no findings for this indicator because in three situations where the State identified noncompliance, it verified that the noncompliance was corrected before the State could issue a finding of noncompliance.</p>	<p>CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that the State: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the State, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.  The State is not required to provide actual target data for FFY 2008 for this indicator.  The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 was not corrected in a timely manner, but subsequently was corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>		
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State is not required to provide actual target data, targets or improvement activities for FFY 2008 for this indicator.</p>	<p>In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints,</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>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>accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 77 of 78 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 were corrected in a timely manner, and that the one remaining finding subsequently was corrected by February 1, 2010.</p>	<p>2009 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance, identified in FFY 2008, in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e); and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system, and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the State, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 10, 11, and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described 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</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data</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 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the indicator language (consistent with revisions in the Indicator Measurement Table) for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2007 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline 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 2008 reported data for this indicator are 36%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2007 data of 40%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 22%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that seven of nine mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2008. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten mediations were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2008 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2007 data of 95.5%. The State met its FFY 2008 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2008 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
accurate. [Compliance Indicator]		IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).  In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, due February 1, 2011, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.