

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 58.3%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 72.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 80%.</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).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 5.8%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 5.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 3%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
with IEPs. [Results Indicator]	The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 97% for reading and math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96% for reading and 95% for math. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 95% for reading and math. The State provided a Web link to 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.	
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards. [Results Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 20% for reading and 11% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 17% for reading and 8% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 58% for reading and 46% for math. The State provided a Web link to its 2009 publicly-reported assessment results.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and [Results Indicator]	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012. The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0.34%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 1.4%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 3%. The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy." The State reported that it reviewed the school's 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 school identified with significant discrepancies based on FFY 2008 data. The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 through the review of policies, procedures, and practices, pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b), was corrected in a timely manner.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: B. Percent of districts that have: (a)	The State provided FFY 2009 baseline, using FFY 2008 data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator. OSEP will be carefully reviewing

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps										
<p>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 procedural safeguards.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p>	<p>each State’s methodology for identifying “significant discrepancy” and will contact the State if there are questions or concerns.</p> <p>Based on the State’s description of risk ratios under this Indicator and because the State is a unitary system, OSEP could not determine whether the State is meeting the requirements of 34 CFR §300.170(a)(2). That is, whether the State’s determination of significant discrepancy in the rates of long-term suspension and expulsion by race or ethnicity is based on a comparison between children with disabilities and nondisabled children within the unitary LEA. In the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must clarify how it is complying with 34 CFR §300.170(a)(2).</p>										
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 1287 1583 1495"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">26</td> <td align="center">28</td> <td align="center">27</td> <td align="center">2.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	26	28	27	2.00%	<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>FFY 2008</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009</u> <u>Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>								
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	26	28	27	2.00%								

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	32	32	26	0.00%
	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2	2	3	0.00%
	These data represent progress for 5A and remain unchanged for 5B and 5C from the FFY 2008 data. The State met its FFY 2009 targets for 5A and 5B, but did not meet its FFY 2009 target for 5C.				
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2009 APR.				The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State provided FFY 2009 progress data for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State's submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p>				<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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A:				

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	83.1	89.6	89.9	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	81.8	91.6	89.2	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	79.3	92.3	90.9	
	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2008 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Target</u>	
	Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	47.7	50.4	47.7	
	Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	49.2	51.7	49.2	
	Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	60.5	63.1	60.5	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data. The State met part of its FFY 2009 targets for this indicator.				
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. [Results Indicator]	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 48%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 46%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 40%.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2009 data, the State addressed whether the response group</p>				OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	was representative of the population.	
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>As a unitary system, the State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services in the State. The State also reported no disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>As a unitary system, the State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories. The State also reported no disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories in the State that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 subsequently was corrected by January 28, 2011.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of 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>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2008 data of 96%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, 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%</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>compliance for FFY 2009, 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that for noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data, 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 Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2010 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 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are	The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.	OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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 2009 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2008 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2008, the State did not make any findings of noncompliance for this indicator during FFY 2008. The State explained that it verified correction of the noncompliance, consistent with the requirements of OSEP Memo 09-02, prior to issuing findings of noncompliance.</p>	<p>reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data the State reported for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that for noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data, 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 2010 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 2010</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
<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 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>The State provided FFY 2009 baseline data and targets, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported baseline data for this indicator are 76%.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2009, 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 on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2010 APR, that for noncompliance reflected in the FFY 2009 data, the State: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(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 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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</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 provided FFY 2009 baseline data, targets for FFY 2010, FFY 2011, and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the State’s submission for this indicator. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State’s reported FFY 2009 baseline data for this indicator are:</p> <p>A. 38% enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. 69% enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; and</p> <p>C. 77% 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>The State must report actual target data for FFY 2010 with the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 99%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 102 of 103 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 were corrected in a timely manner and that the one remaining finding was subsequently corrected by January 28, 2011.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>In reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must report that it verified that for noncompliance identified in FFY 2009, 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 2010 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2010 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicator 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2010 APR due February 1, 2012, 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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>100%.</p>	<p>CFR §300.152.</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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2009 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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 36%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 36%. The State met its FFY 2009 target of 24%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the targets for FFY 2011 and 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that one of five mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2009. 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 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012.</p>

Hawaii Part B FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<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 provided targets for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012, and improvement activities through FFY 2012, and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2009 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2008 data of 100%. The State did not meet its FFY 2009 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>