

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 57.9%. The State's FFY 2009 data for this indicator were 58.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 85%.</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 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 5.8%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 5.8%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 3%.</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 2011 APR.</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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96% for reading and math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 97% for reading and math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>
with IEPs. [Results Indicator]	The State met its FFY 2010 targets of 95% for reading and math. The State provided a Web link to 2010 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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 17% for reading and 11% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 20% for reading and remain unchanged for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 72% for reading and 64% for math. The State provided a Web link to its 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.	OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.
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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 0.34%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 1%. The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy." The State reported that no schools were identified as having a significant discrepancy, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion: 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	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%. The State reported its definition of "significant discrepancy." The State reported that no schools were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs. OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to clarify in the FFY 2010 APR, due February 1, 2012, how it is complying with 34 CFR §300.170(a)(2). Specifically, HIDOE changed the methodology for identifying	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>“significant discrepancy” in the rates of long-term suspension and expulsion by race or ethnicity based on a comparison between children with disabilities and nondisabled children within the HIDOE’s unitary system. The State provided all of the required information.</p>																					
<p>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>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 581 1583 1055"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 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">28</td> <td align="center">31</td> <td align="center">30</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">30</td> <td align="center">23</td> <td align="center">2.00%</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">2.9</td> <td align="center">0.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5B and remain unchanged for 5C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 5A and 5C, but did not meet its FFY 2010 targets for 5B.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	28	31	30	3.00%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	32	30	23	2.00%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2	2	2.9	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 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	28	31	30	3.00%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	32	30	23	2.00%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	2	2	2.9	0.00%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the SPP that it submits with the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																																
facility. [Results Indicator; New]																																		
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]	The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's reported data for this indicator are: <table border="1" data-bbox="548 513 1583 1490"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 513 957 613"><u>Summary Statement 1</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 513 1163 613"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 513 1373 613"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 513 1583 613"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 613 957 748"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 613 1163 748">89.6</td> <td data-bbox="1163 613 1373 748">95</td> <td data-bbox="1373 613 1583 748">89.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 748 957 919"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 748 1163 919">91.6</td> <td data-bbox="1163 748 1373 919">93.7</td> <td data-bbox="1373 748 1583 919">89.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 919 957 1024"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 919 1163 1024">92.3</td> <td data-bbox="1163 919 1373 1024">93.2</td> <td data-bbox="1373 919 1583 1024">90.9</td> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1024 957 1122"><u>Summary Statement 2</u></th> <th data-bbox="957 1024 1163 1122"><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1163 1024 1373 1122"><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th data-bbox="1373 1024 1583 1122"><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1122 957 1256"><b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1122 1163 1256">50.4</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1122 1373 1256">46.5</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1122 1583 1256">50.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1256 957 1427"><b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 1256 1163 1427">51.7</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1256 1373 1427">49.7</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1256 1583 1427">52.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1427 957 1490"><b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to</td> <td data-bbox="957 1427 1163 1490">63.1</td> <td data-bbox="1163 1427 1373 1490">60.6</td> <td data-bbox="1373 1427 1583 1490">63.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.6	95	89.9	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	91.6	93.7	89.2	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	92.3	93.2	90.9	<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	50.4	46.5	50.9	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	51.7	49.7	52.2	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	63.1	60.6	63.6	OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance and looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR. The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
<u>Summary Statement 1</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.6	95	89.9																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	91.6	93.7	89.2																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	92.3	93.2	90.9																															
<u>Summary Statement 2</u>	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>																															
<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	50.4	46.5	50.9																															
<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	51.7	49.7	52.2																															
<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to	63.1	60.6	63.6																															

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps				
	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 266 1583 298"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 266 957 298">meet their needs (%)</td> <td data-bbox="957 266 1163 298"></td> <td data-bbox="1163 266 1373 298"></td> <td data-bbox="1373 266 1583 298"></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="548 321 1583 386">These data represent progress and slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>	meet their needs (%)				
meet their needs (%)						
<p data-bbox="92 418 520 618">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.</p> <p data-bbox="92 638 310 670">[Results Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 418 1507 488">The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 505 1549 574">The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 51%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 48%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 45%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 591 1562 651">In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 418 1990 488">OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 703 520 902">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 data-bbox="92 922 369 954">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 703 1507 773">The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 789 1549 886">As a unitary system, the State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 902 1577 1032">The State reported disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. 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 data-bbox="548 1049 1360 1081">The State reported its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 703 1990 773">OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>				
<p data-bbox="92 1117 520 1284">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 data-bbox="92 1304 369 1336">[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p data-bbox="548 1117 1507 1187">The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1203 1549 1300">As a unitary system, the State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1317 1583 1446">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 special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1463 1360 1495">The State reported its definition of "disproportionate representation."</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 1117 1990 1187">OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>				

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 data for this indicator are 98.8%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 22 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02)). In the FFY 2011 APR,</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 birthdays.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 98%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all seven of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (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</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 79%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 76%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 11 of 12 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining finding subsequently was corrected by January 31, 2012.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, 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 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. [Compliance Indicator]</p>		<p>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 LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</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; B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school. C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 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 1182 1583 1490"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">38</td> <td align="center">37</td> <td align="center">42</td> <td align="center">-1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed</td> <td align="center">69</td> <td align="center">73</td> <td align="center">71</td> <td align="center">4.00%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	38	37	42	-1.00%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	69	73	71	4.00%	<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 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>													
A. % Enrolled in higher education	38	37	42	-1.00%													
B. % Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed	69	73	71	4.00%													

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed</p>	77	79	78	2.00%	
<p>These data represent progress for 14B and 14C from the FFY 2009 data. The State met its FFY 2010 targets for 14B and 14C, but did not meet its FFY 2010 target for 4A.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</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 FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 96.66%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 99%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 116 of 120 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the remaining four findings subsequently were corrected by January 31, 2012.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 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> <p>When reporting on correction of findings of noncompliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (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</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2011 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2011 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 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>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 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</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR</p>

**Hawaii Part B FFY 2010 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>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>2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>§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 revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 47%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 36%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 30%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that all nine mediations resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2010. 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>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</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 FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 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 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>