

HI Part C

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

The Hawai'i Department of Health (HDOH) is designated as the Lead Agency (LA) for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and ensures the provision of early intervention services to eligible infants and toddlers with special needs and their families in accordance with the provision of Part C through the HDOH Early Intervention Section (EIS). EIS is under the supervision of the Children with Special Health Needs Branch within the Family Health Services Division, Health Resources Administration.

There are 20 early intervention (EI) programs statewide that serve the infants and toddlers that meet the eligibility criteria below and their families.

1. Developmentally Delayed

Children under the age of three (3) has a significant delay in one or more of the following areas of development: physical, cognitive; communication; social or emotional; and adaptive based on one of the following criteria:

- ≤ -1.0 SD in at least two or more area or sub-areas of development
- ≤ -1.4 SD in at least one area or sub-area of development
- Multidisciplinary team observations and informed clinical opinion when the child's score cannot be measured by the evaluation instrument

2. Biological Risk

Children under the age of three (3) with a signed statement or report by a qualified provider that includes a diagnosis of a physical or mental condition that the multidisciplinary team determines has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay if early intervention services are not provided. This includes, but is not limited to the following conditions:

- Chromosomal abnormalities
- Genetic or congenital disorders
- Severe sensory impairments
- Inborn errors of metabolism
- Disorders reflecting disturbance of the development of the nervous system
- Congenital infections
- Disorders secondary to exposure to toxic substances, including fetal alcohol syndrome
- Severe attachment disorders
- Autism Spectrum Disorder

The State of Hawai'i is committed to provide early intervention services to infants and toddlers with special needs and their families in accordance with Part C of IDEA. The provision of EI is guided by the following principles:

- A spirit of our island community embraces and values every child, woman, and man and is continually enriched by the diversity of its members.
- The community recognizes that families are the most important influence in their child's life.
- The development of infants and toddlers are best applied within the context of the family environment.
- Infants and toddlers with special needs and their families have inherent strengths and challenges and will be treated with respect and kindness.
- Families are viewed holistically and therefore, must be empowered to use their strengths in gaining

access to resources for their child across agencies and disciplines. These resources must be nurturing, value cultural diversity, and aimed at improvement outcomes that involve developmental growth, safety, health, education, and economic security.

- All early intervention effort are collaborative and work toward outcomes that are constantly evolving based on the changing priorities and needs of children with special needs and their families.
- The combined early intervention efforts and individual accountability across public and private agencies and providers can help make this vision a reality.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date | Remove |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--|
| icc certification.pdf | Stacy Kong | | <input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e |

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

A. Monitoring System

The Part C Lead Agency (LA) is responsible for ensuring that all the IDEA Part C requirements are met. To ensure compliance with IDEA Part C requirements, written monitoring procedures were developed as part of the Part C LA Continuous Quality Improvement System (CQIS). The CQIS is a two step process.

Step 1: Monitoring

All Part C early intervention (EI) programs are monitored annually. Data is gathered from the EI database, from 618 data, and from on-site monitoring utilizing the Self Assessment Monitoring (SAM) tool to ensure that the programs are in compliance with IDEA Part C requirements. The following data sources are used to gather and report data in the Annual Performance Report (APR):

- Indicator 1: SAM data
- Indicator 2: 618 Data
- Indicator 3: Database Data
- Indicator 4: Statewide Family Survey
- Indicator 5: 618 Data
- Indicator 6: 618 Data
- Indicator 7: Database Data
- Indicator 8: Database Data
- Indicator 9: 618 Data
- Indicator 10: 618 Data
- Indicator 11: N/A

In addition to monitoring on the above required indicators, Hawai'i identified the following Priority Areas and specific items in each area to monitor:

Priority Area 1: Timeliness

Rationale: Timely Individualized Family Support Plan (IFSP) reviews are necessary to ensure that appropriate services are identified and delivered based on the individual needs of the child and family.

Item 1a: IFSP Review within 6 months of Initial or Annual IFSP

Item 1b: Annual IFSP on time

Priority Area 2: IFSP Development

Rationale: All IFSPs must contain required components to ensure that appropriate services are delivered in a timely manner to enhance a child's development. Complete and accurate information supports the identification and delivery of appropriate services.

Item 2a: Complete Present Levels of Development

Item 2b: Complete Frequency, Intensity, Method, Location, and Payment for each service

Item 2c: IFSP Objectives Complete (include criteria, procedures, and timelines)

Item 2d: Justification for Services in "Non" Natural Environment

Priority Area 3: EI Child Outcomes

Rationale: EI Child Outcomes rating is a mechanism that the Part C LA can use to measure how children and families benefit from EI services.

Item 3a: Initial EI Child Outcomes ratings were completed

Item 3b: Exit EI Child Outcomes ratings were completed

Priority Area 4: Procedural Safeguards

Rationale: Part C LA must ensure that families understand their rights and their integral part in Part C.

Item 4a: Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) Notice - Given at Intake and discussed/offered at IFSP Meetings

Item 4b: Procedural Safeguards Brochure and IDEA Regulations – Given at Intake and discussed/offered at IFSP Meetings

Item 4c: Written Prior Notice prior to MDE, at eligibility determination, and prior to IFSP meeting

Item 4d: Written Consent for MDE

Item 4e: Written Consent Prior to Initiation of EI Services

Priority Area 5: Transition (originally Priority Area 3 – change effective FFY 2010)

Rationale: All children and families must receive appropriate transition planning to support them in exiting Part C.

Item 5a: Appropriate individuals were invited to the transition conference.

Priority Area 6: Data Validation

Rationale: Part C LA must ensure that the data being reported in the database is accurate.

Item 6a: Date of Birth

Item 6b: Part C Referral Date

Item 6c: Initial IFSP

Item 6d: Service Location

Item 6e: Exit Date

Item 6f: Transition Plan

- Item 6g: Transition Notice – Date sent or “opt out”
- Item 6h: Transition Conference – Date of conference or “decline”
- Item 6i: FERPA Notice – discussed and provided during Intake
- Item 6j: Family Rights – discussed and provided during Intake
- Item 6k: MDE Consent
- Item 6l: EI Goals Initial Rating Date
- Item 6m: EI Goals Rating 1B
- Item 6n: EI Goals Rating 2B
- Item 6o: EI Goals Rating 3B
- Item 6p: EI Goals Exit Rating Date
- Item 6q: EI Goals Exit Rating 1A
- Item 6r: EI Goals Exit Rating 1B
- Item 6s: EI Goals Exit Rating 2A
- Item 6t: EI Goals Exit Rating 2B
- Item 6u: EI Goals Exit Rating 3A
- Item 6v: EI Goals Exit Rating 3B

Step 2: Part C LA Responsibilities

The Part C LA is responsible for ensuring that: 1) the EI Programs provide data, as required, to show that their programs meet IDEA Part C compliance; 2) feedback is provided to the EI Programs as to whether the program's data is sufficient to show compliance; 3) areas of non-compliance are identified; 4) EI Programs are notified of areas of non-compliance; and 5) required actions are taken such as developing a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), submitting evidence to show correction, as well as, developing program specific improvement strategies to address non-compliance. In addition, the Part C LA does data validation as part of the SAM process. If the required actions are insufficient to show progress toward compliance, Part C LA may impose sanctions on the EI Programs.

B. Dispute Resolution

At Intake, families are provided information regarding their procedural safeguards, as described in the “Family Rights” brochure, which includes an insert of Section 303.400-303.460, the Part C procedural safeguards system. They are also informed of the process on who to contact if they have any concerns about services as well as, how to make a formal complaint and the due process procedure. It is recommended that if families have concerns, they should first discuss their concerns with their care coordinator so an IFSP Review meeting can be scheduled, if appropriate. If families feel their concerns are not adequately resolved, they can contact the program’s supervisor or the Part C Coordinator prior to filing a written complaint. A written complaint or due process should be filed if the family feels that the Part C program has violated a Part C requirement. Mediation will be offered if a request for a due process hearing is submitted.

| Attachments | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------------|---|--|
| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date | Remove | |
| hi part c - spp-apr ffy 2014-gs correction of findings-hi priority areas.doc | Stacy Kong | | <input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e | |

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to

early intervention service (EIS) programs.

Technical Assistance Provided to EI Programs by the State

The Part C LA coordinates quarterly meetings with the Early Intervention (EI) Program Managers to provide up-dates, provide training/technical assistance based on any concerns/issues, and create an opportunity for peer support, etc. EI Program Managers may also call and/or e-mail the Early Intervention Administrative Team if they have any questions regarding implementation of the EI Procedural Guidelines. They may also request on-site technical assistance.

Technical Assistance Accessed by the State

The Part C LA consulted with the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center, The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy), National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), and the IDEA Data Center on how to improve compliance and performance across APR indicators. ECTA , DaSy and NCSI provided clarification on DEC recommended practices and shared resources. The Part C LA sent representatives to various conferences to access TA such as the OSEP Leadership Conference and the DaSY Outcomes Conference. Representatives from ECTA and DaSY also facilitated a webinar on Child Outcomes and how to use the Local Contributing Factor Tool to support program improvement. In addition, the Part C LA problem-solved with TA providers on possible strategies to address EI Program issues. EI Programs used the information provided to implement and/or modify program procedures. DaSy and IDEA Data Center has been supporting the LA in completing the Data Systems Framework as Hawai'i works towards a web-based data system. The Part C LA participates on webinars and learning collaboratives/community of practices which provides an opportunity to hear what other States are doing as well as, ideas/strategies to enhance Hawai'i's system.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The Part C Lead Agency provides a four-day Part C Early Intervention Orientation for all new staff which is open to any staff that requests to attend. Annual Refresher trainings are offered at least once a year and may be on a specific topic to address a need identified through monitoring or training needs assessment.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Annual Performance Report (APR) Process

The process to develop Hawaii's APR for FFY 2014 included:

1. The Hawaii Department of Health (HDOH), Early Intervention Section (EIS) which is identified as the Part C Lead Agency (LA) worked with the Early Intervention (EI) System Improvement and Outcomes Team to address specific indicators as identified in the approved State Performance Plan (SPP).
2. On-going meetings with the identified EI System Improvement and Outcomes Team members were held to prepare them to facilitate workgroups at the statewide Annual Stakeholders' Meeting.
3. Broad dissemination of the Stakeholder meeting to ensure interested agencies, Hawai'i Early Intervention Coordinating Council (HEICC) and community members attended to provide input into the review process.
4. Group discussion at the Stakeholder Meetings on specific indicators. Each group was provided with copies of the Indicator targets, FFY 2013 APR data, draft FFY 2014 APR data, and other relevant data so the group could determine:
 - Whether the target was met.
 - The extent of progress/slippage for each indicator.
 - Possible reasons for slippage.
 - If performance indicator targets should be revised, including justification for any revisions.
5. Final recommendations by indicator were presented to all stakeholders.
6. Recommendations were reviewed by the identified members of the EI System Improvement and Outcomes Team and the Part C LA.
7. The APR was drafted by members of the EI System Improvement and Outcomes Team and the Part C LA.
8. The APR draft was reviewed and revised, as necessary, by the Part C Coordinator.
9. The APR was reviewed and approved by the HEICC. As authorized by the HEICC, the HEICC Chairperson reviewed and signed the APR certification form.
10. The APR was sent to the Director of Health to review.
11. The APR was submitted to OSEP as required.
12. The APR will be posted on the HDOH EIS website when GRADS360 generates a PDF document suitable for sharing with the public.

Broad Representation

A stakeholder group of approximately 75 individuals provided recommendations to the development of the APR. Due to Hawai'i's broad eligibility and geography, it was important to obtain broad representation that included: Part C early intervention (EI) service providers and family members from all islands, from urban and rural areas, as well as, the different ethnic and cultural groups that represent Hawai'i's population. The following stakeholders from the islands of Oahu, Hawai'i, Maui, Kauai, and Molokai were invited:

- Members of the HEICC
- HDOH administrators, care coordinators (Hawai'i's terminology for service coordinators), direct service providers, quality assurance specialists, data staff, personnel training staff, and contracted providers from:
 - Family Health Services Division (FHSD)
 - Children with Special Health Care Needs Branch (CSHNB)
 - Public Health Nursing Branch (PHNB)
 - EIS

- Department of Human Services (DHS) administrators
- Department of Education (DOE) Section 619 District Coordinators
- Community Members, including representatives from:
 - Early Head Start/Head Start
 - Parent Training Institute (Learning Disability Association of Hawai'i)
 - Parents

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The SPP/APR will be posted on the HDOH EIS website (<http://hawaii.gov/health/health/family-child-health/eis/index.html>) when GRADS360 generates a PDF document suitable for sharing with the public. In addition, information about how to access the SPP/APR will be included in various newsletters that reach providers and families (e.g., Special Parent Information Network (SPIN) newsletter, and newsletters of Part C providers such as, Easter Seals Hawai'i and Imua Family Services.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 69.00% | 71.00% | 78.00% | 84.00% | 88.00% | 86.00% | 85.00% | 69.00% | 63.03% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Key:

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 105 | 213 | 63.03% | 100% | 67.14% |

| | |
|---|----|
| Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) | 38 |
|---|----|

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

A total of 286 records were selected for on-site monitoring within the time period 7/1/14-6/30/15 across all 20 EI programs. The EI Self Assessment Monitoring (SAM) Tool which was developed by Part C LA with feedback from EI providers was utilized to gather data.

For FFY 2014, the Part C LA Monitoring Team completed the SAM tool for each of the EI programs.

Identification of Children. To ensure a random selection of children for review with the SAM Tool, the following criteria were followed:

- Names of all children from each Program with an Initial, Review, or Annual IFSP between 7/1/14-3/31/15 were obtained from the Part C EI Database. The time frame was chosen to ensure that there were three months to confirm that services were provided in a timely manner within FFY 2014.
- Part C LA identified 10% of children at each program based on the 12/1/14 child count, or a minimum of 15 children to be monitored, unless there were an insufficient number of children who met the above criteria. If there were an insufficient number of children, all were chosen to ensure a complete monitoring as possible. This resulted in a review of 286 charts.
- An Initial, Review, or Annual IFSP for each selected child was reviewed to determine if new services were timely. If the Review or Annual IFSP was the identified IFSP and there were no new services, N/A was noted for this indicator. Therefore, for this indicator the results were based on new and timely services for 213 children as 72 children had no new services identified on either their Review or Annual IFSP.

Determination of Timeliness. The SAM Tool was completed for each child selected using the specified IFSP (Initial, Review, Annual), following the guidelines developed by the Part C LA to determine if services were timely, consistent with Hawaii's definition for timely services.

For each service, the following documentation was required to confirm the service was both provided and timely:

- If the service was provided by the program providing service coordination, documentation must be included in anecdotal notes in the official child's record.
- If the service was provided by an EI program not providing service coordination, the provider must verbally inform the service coordinator of the date services were initiated or provide a copy of written documentation.
- If the service was provided by a contracted fee-for-service provider, documentation must be via the required Service Log developed by the Part C LA.
- If the service was not timely due to an "exceptional family reason," there must be confirmation of the family reason via an anecdotal note in the official child's record (e.g., child was sick; family on vacation).
- If the service was late and there was no documentation of an exceptional family reason (only a date of when the service occurred), it was considered a program reason and therefore did not meet the definition of timely services.
- If there was no documentation that the service was provided, it was considered a program reason and therefore, did not meet the definition of timely services.

Self Assessment Results. The following activities occurred by the Part C LA:

- Raw data were gathered.
- Data was inputted into the SAM database, which was developed by the Part C LA.
- Data was analyzed for non-compliance with Timely Services.
- Data was given to each program as part of the notification of FFY 2015 findings based on data from FFY 2014.

Verification of Data. The following activities occurred to verify the Self-Assessment results:

- The SAM results were reviewed to identify any possible inconsistencies.
- Program Managers were contacted, as necessary, for additional data to confirm results.
- The SAM results were revised, if necessary, based on additional data received.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Definition of Timely Services:

Hawai'i's definition of timely services is consistent with OSEP's direction as included in the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document of 10/13/06. Timely services are defined as: "within 30 days from when the parent provides consent for the IFSP service."

Actual Target Data for FFY 2014:

Data for the percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received the EI services on their IFSPs in a timely manner were gathered from on-site monitoring data (refer to the section above for a description of the "Monitoring Process").

- 143 of 213 (67%) of infants and toddlers monitored received EI services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
- Exceptional Family Circumstances. 38 of the 213 (18%) infants and toddlers monitored did not receive timely services due to exceptional family circumstances as defined by IDEA Part C. This number was included in both the numerator and denominator when calculating the percentage of infants and toddlers that received timely services. The following were the predominate family circumstances that impacted the scheduling of timely services.
 - Cancelled appointments
 - Child/Family sick
- Program Reasons. 70 of the 213 (33%) infants and toddlers monitored did not receive timely services, due to program reasons. The predominate program reason that impacted the scheduling of timely services was due to lack of documentation of why services were late.
- Identifying Non-compliance. Of the 70 infants and toddlers where services were not initiated in a timely manner due to program reasons, four (4) infants and toddlers left the programs' jurisdiction before the service was implemented and the remaining 66 infants and toddlers' services on their IFSP were initiated, although late.

| Range of Days to Initiate Services (For the 70 children not receiving services on their IFSP in a timely manner) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Range of Days Beyond the Due Date | # of Children | % of Children |
| 1-30 days | 25 | 36% |
| 31-60 days | 14 | 20% |
| 61-90 days | 11 | 16% |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----|-----|
| > 90 days | 15 | 22% |
| Left Program's Jurisdiction | 4 | 6% |

- The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance as identified through on-site monitoring (refer to the section above for a description of the "Monitoring Process"). There were 17 EI programs serving the 70 infants and toddlers who did not receive services in a timely manner.
 - 4 of the 17 programs were issued findings in FFY 2015, based on FFY 2014 data. They received a letter of notification of noncompliance and were informed that they must demonstrate correction, as soon as possible, but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).
 - 8 of the 17 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going noncompliance (programs did not demonstrate correction from the findings issued in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 data [five programs], FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 data [one program], and FFY 2012, based on FFY 2011 data [two programs]).
 - 1 of the 17 programs was not issued a finding because the program closed, effective June 30, 2105.
 - 4 of the 17 programs were not issued findings because they submitted required data that was verified by Part C LA to demonstrate correction prior to written issuance of findings. In other words, all individual child noncompliance was corrected although late and updated data was used to confirm that the program was correctly implementing the timely services requirement for all infants and toddlers (100%).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 |

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance through on-site monitoring (refer to preceding section on "Monitoring Process"). All Programs were notified in writing of any noncompliance. Programs are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), change policies and procedures, as appropriate, and demonstrate correction of all noncompliance (i.e., child specific and updated data) as soon as possible but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).

In verifying correction of noncompliance, the State determined if each of the EI programs with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the requirements as stated in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(i). Programs with identified noncompliance were required to complete “Worksheet A” from the SAM tool for every child who had an Initial IFSP, 6-month Review, and Annual IFSP. The Programs were required to submit this updated data to demonstrate correction based on the monitoring data percentage as follows:

- 95% - 100%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 2 records total
- 90% - 94%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 4 records total
- 80% - 89%: 2 months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 6 records total
- 70% - 79%: 2 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 8 records total
- Under 70%: 3 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 10 records total

The Part C LA verified what the Programs submitted and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2007 through FFY 2014 the Part C LA verified that each of the EI Programs with findings of noncompliance for not initiating services in a timely manner, initiated all services, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The status of child specific correction was included in previous APR’s target data. It included the percentage of children who received all services listed on their IFSP, though late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. At the time of the on-site monitoring, “Worksheet A” from the SAM tool was completed by the monitors. The actual start date of each service was documented on Worksheet A and verified at the time of the on-site monitoring. If the service(s) did not occur prior to the monitoring date, the Program had to immediately correct by providing those services(s) on the IFSP, though late, and submit documentation to Part C LA that indicated when the service(s) was initiated.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Program that was unable to demonstrate correction serves a rural community with a large geographic area. The Program is currently fully staffed with the exception of the Occupational Therapist who is working half-time instead of full-time. The Program has been directed to submit weekly status reports. The Part C LA staff works closely with the Program ensuring that they understand the requirement and suggests strategies for improvement. The Part C LA is also exploring the use of tele-health/video conferencing as an option for utilizing and sharing resources efficiently and for programs that serve a large geographic area.

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance through on-site monitoring (refer to preceding section on “Monitoring Process”). All Programs were notified in writing of any noncompliance. Programs are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), change policies and procedures, as appropriate, and demonstrate correction of all non-compliance (i.e., child specific and updated data) as soon as possible but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).

In verifying correction of noncompliance, the State determined if each of the EI programs with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the requirements as stated in 34 CFR §303.340(c), 303.342(e), and 303.344(f)(i). Programs with identified noncompliance were required to complete “Worksheet A” from the SAM tool for every child who had an Initial IFSP, 6-month Review, and Annual IFSP. The Programs were required to submit this updated data to demonstrate correction based on the monitoring data percentage as

follows:

- 95% - 100%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 2 records total
- 90% - 94%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 4 records total
- 80% - 89%: 2 months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 6 records total
- 70% - 79%: 2 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 8 records total
- Under 70%: 3 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 10 records total

The Part C LA verified what the Programs submitted and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of non-compliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2007 through FFY 2014 the Part C LA verified that each of the EI Programs with findings of noncompliance for not initiating services in a timely manner, initiated all services, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The status of child specific correction was included in previous APR's target data. It included the percentage of children who received all services listed on their IFSP, though late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. At the time of the on-site monitoring, "Worksheet A" from the SAM tool was completed by the monitors. The actual start date of each service was documented on Worksheet A and verified at the time of the on-site monitoring. If the service(s) did not occur prior to the monitoring date, the Program had to immediately correct by providing those services(s) on the IFSP, though late, and submit documentation to Part C LA that indicated when the service(s) was initiated.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One of the programs that continue to be in noncompliance has received support from another Program Manager who assisted the Program in creating a system to track and report noncompliance in a timely manner. The Program has also been required to submit weekly status reports. The Agency has been required to submit a plan that includes the following:

- Strategies that will be implemented to support the Program in completing their Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (e.g., support from another Program Manager; time set aside on a weekly basis to work on CAPs)
- How the Agency will monitor the Program's submission of CAPS (e.g., cc on e-mails; bi-monthly meetings)
- Any technical assistance needed from the State LA
- Template for the weekly status report that list all indicators

The other Program is from the same Agency. They recently hired a new Program Manager. The Program Manager is reviewing the system to track and report on noncompliance in a timely manner. The new Program Manager will receive support from the another Program Manager within the Agency. The State LA also provided technical assistance regarding the CAP process.

The Program Manger will have three reporting months to demonstrate correction of noncompliance. If there is no progress, weekly status reports will be required as well as a plan from the Agency as outlined above.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ | | | 74.50% | 80.00% | 85.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| Data | | 81.10% | 89.10% | 86.00% | 96.00% | 95.00% | 93.00% | 88.00% | 93.00% | 90.64% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Refer to Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction. Based on input from stakeholders, no revisions to targets will be made at this time.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|----------|---|-------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 1,364 | |
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 1,520 | |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1,364 | 1,520 | 90.64% | 90.00% | 89.74% |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----|---------------|----------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2013 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 58.00% | 58.50% | 58.50% | 58.50% | 53.14% |
| | | Data | | | | | 58.00% | 62.30% | 61.60% | 59.50% | 56.30% | 53.14% |
| A2 | 2013 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 82.00% | 82.50% | 82.50% | 82.50% | 79.32% |
| | | Data | | | | | 82.00% | 82.90% | 80.70% | 77.60% | 79.00% | 79.32% |
| B1 | 2013 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 70.00% | 70.50% | 70.50% | 70.50% | 70.81% |
| | | Data | | | | | 70.00% | 73.70% | 72.90% | 67.80% | 70.60% | 70.81% |
| B2 | 2013 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 77.00% | 77.50% | 77.50% | 77.50% | 65.19% |
| | | Data | | | | | 77.00% | 77.90% | 75.50% | 69.00% | 64.60% | 65.19% |
| C1 | 2013 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 74.00% | 74.50% | 74.50% | 74.50% | 67.99% |
| | | Data | | | | | 74.00% | 74.80% | 74.30% | 78.40% | 73.30% | 67.99% |
| C2 | 2013 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 74.00% | 74.50% | 74.50% | 74.50% | 80.63% |
| | | Data | | | | | 74.00% | 77.70% | 73.30% | 78.00% | 81.20% | 80.63% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 ≥ | 53.14% | 53.14% | 53.14% | 54.00% | 55.00% |
| Target A2 ≥ | 79.32% | 79.32% | 79.32% | 79.50% | |
| Target B1 ≥ | 70.81% | 70.81% | 70.81% | 71.00% | 71.50% |
| Target B2 ≥ | 65.19% | 65.19% | 65.19% | 65.50% | 66.00% |
| Target C1 ≥ | 67.99% | 67.99% | 67.99% | 68.50% | 69.00% |
| Target C2 ≥ | 80.63% | 80.63% | 80.63% | 81.50% | 82.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Refer to Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction. Based on input from stakeholders, no revisions to targets will be made at this time.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|--|---------|
| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed | 1437.00 |
|--|---------|

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 4.00 | 0.31% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 255.00 | 19.50% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 89.00 | 6.80% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 159.00 | 12.16% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 801.00 | 61.24% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d). | 248.00 | 507.00 | 53.14% | 53.14% | 48.92% |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e). | 960.00 | 1308.00 | 79.32% | 79.32% | 73.39% |

Explanation of A1 Slippage

Hawai'i demonstrated slippage and did not meet the target for 3A-1. There was a decrease of 189 children statewide from FFY13, with 88% (167) of these children coming from eight (8) of the top ten (10) largest programs statewide. Of the ten (10) largest programs, five (5) demonstrated significant slippage in 3A for Summary Statement 1. The decrease in children in EI coming from five (5) of the largest programs who also exhibited significant slippage directly impacted the statewide percentage.

The average number of children in the “B” category whose trajectory during their time with early intervention did not change were just as many as the average number of children whose trajectory did change and exited with age appropriate skills. This had a direct impact on the calculations for both summary statements, leading to slippage in all three indicators for both summary statements.

Explanation of A2 Slippage

Majority of all programs (17 of 20) statewide reported slippage in 3A-2 with the exception of the two (2) smallest programs serving rural neighbor island populations. The two (2) smallest programs improved to 100% but due to size of programs, it did not have a significant impact on the statewide data.

The average number of children in the “B” category whose trajectory during their time with early intervention did not change were just as many as the average number of children whose trajectory did change and exited with age appropriate skills. This had a direct impact on the calculations for both summary statements, leading to slippage in all three indicators for both summary statements.

Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 5.00 | 0.38% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 309.00 | 23.62% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 226.00 | 17.28% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 382.00 | 29.20% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 386.00 | 29.51% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 608.00 | 922.00 | 70.81% | 70.81% | 65.94% |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 768.00 | 1308.00 | 65.19% | 65.19% | 58.72% |

Explanation of B1 Slippage

Majority of the programs (13 of 20) of which eight (8) of the ten (10) largest programs reported slippage for 3B-1 with the exception of the two (2) smallest programs serving rural neighbor island populations. Of the two (2) smallest programs, one (1) maintained 100% and the other exceeded the target, but due to size of programs, it did not have a significant impact on the statewide data.

The average number of children in the “B” category whose trajectory during their time with early intervention did not change were just as many as the average number of children whose trajectory did change and exited with age appropriate skills. This had a direct impact on the calculations for both summary statements, leading to slippage in all three indicators for both summary statements.

Explanation of B2 Slippage

Majority of the programs (15 of 20) of which nine (9) of the ten (10) largest programs reported slippage for 3B-2 with exception of the two (2) smallest programs serving rural neighbor island populations. The two (2) smallest programs exceeded the target, but due to size of programs it did not have a significant impact on the statewide data.

The average number of children in “B” category whose trajectory during their time with early intervention did not change were just as many as the average number of children whose trajectory did change and exited with age appropriate skills. It had a direct impact on the calculations for both summary statements, leading to slippage in all three indicators for both summary statements.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 2.00 | 0.15% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 205.00 | 15.68% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 92.00 | 7.04% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 271.00 | 20.73% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 737.00 | 56.39% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 363.00 | 570.00 | 67.99% | 67.99% | 63.68% |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 1008.00 | 1307.00 | 80.63% | 80.63% | 77.12% |

Explanation of C1 Slippage

Majority of the programs (12 of 20) of which seven (7) of the ten (10) largest programs reported slippage for 3C-1 with the exception of the two (2) smallest programs serving rural neighbor island populations. Of the two (2) smallest programs, one (1) maintained 100% and the other improved to 100%, but due to size of programs it did not have a significant impact on the statewide data.

The average number of children in “B” category whose trajectory during their time with early intervention did not change were just as many as the average number of children whose trajectory did change and exited with age appropriate skills. It had a direct impact on the calculations for both summary statements, leading to slippage in all three indicators for both summary statements.

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Majority of the programs (12 of 20) of which seven (7) of the ten (10) largest programs reported slippage for 3C-2 with exception of the two (2) smallest programs serving rural neighbor island populations. Of the two (2) smallest program, both improved to 100% but due to size of programs it did not have a significant impact on the statewide data.

The average number of children in “B” category whose trajectory during their time with early intervention did not change were just as many as the average number of children whose trajectory did change and exited with age appropriate skills. It had a direct impact on the calculations for both summary statements, leading to slippage in all three indicators for both summary statements.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Progress Data for FFY 2014:

| PROGRESS DATA FOR FFY 2014 | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------|---|-------|--|-------|
| Measurement | A. Social Emotional Skills | | B. Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | | C. Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | |
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 4/1437 | 0.1% | 5/1437 | 0.1% | 2/1437 | 0.1% |
| b. Percent of infants and toddlers who | 255/1437 | 17.7% | 309/1437 | 21.5% | 205/1437 | 14.3% |

PROGRESS DATA FOR FFY 2014

| Measurement | A. Social Emotional Skills | | B. Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills | | C. Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs | |
|---|----------------------------|-------|---|-------|--|-------|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | | | | | | |
| c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 89/1437 | 6.2% | 226/1437 | 15.7% | 92/1437 | 6.4% |
| d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 159/1437 | 11.1% | 382/1437 | 26.6% | 271/1437 | 18.9% |
| e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 801/1437 | 55.7% | 386/1437 | 26.9% | 737/1437 | 51.3% |

Description of Process:

Tool:

The EI Child Outcomes Measurement tool is based on the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center's Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). The Design Team revised the COSF on the basis of parent and provider input prior to the initial implementation of the COSP in FFY 2008.

Measurement:

- Initial Rating: The initial data on child status is recorded at the initial IFSP meeting.
- Exit Rating: The exit data on child status is collected at the Exit IFSP or within three (3) months preceding exit from the program.

On-Going Data Collection:

For each of the three (3) EI Child Outcomes, the IFSP team assigns an initial and exit rating to each child. A rating compares the child's status to typical development and progress is calculated by comparing entry and exit ratings.

The rating is based on a combination of the following sources:

1. Developmental evaluation and/or assessment(s);
2. Professional opinion;
3. Parent input; and/or
4. Level of achievement of IFSP objectives relevant to the outcome

Reporting:

EI programs enter EI Child Outcomes ratings into their respective EI databases on a monthly basis and submits their EI database to the Part C LA.

Analyzing Data:

The Part C LA uses the rating for each outcome area for each child who received services for at least six (6) months to analyze the change in development from entry to exit. The calculator developed by ECO is used to determine each outcome area:

1. If the "Yes/No" question (which asks whether the child's functioning improved at all from the last rating occasion) on the COSF has never been answered as "Yes" at exit, then the child is counted in category (a).
2. If the "Yes/No" question (which asks whether the child's functioning improved at all from the last rating occasion) on the COSF has been answered "Yes" at exit, but not enough to move the child's functioning closer to typically developing peers, then the child is counted in category (b).
3. If ratings of child functioning compared to typically developing same aged peers are higher at exit than ratings at entry (but not at age level expectations), then the child is counted in category (c).
4. If ratings of child functioning compared to typically developing same aged peers are below age expectations, but at exit they are at age level expectations, then the child is counted in category (d).
5. If ratings of child functioning compared to typically developing same aged peers at entry and exit are both at age level expectations, then the child is counted in category (e).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|---------------|----------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2006 | Target ≥ | | | | | 91.00% | 91.50% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% |
| | | Data | | | 91.00% | 89.00% | 90.00% | 91.80% | 94.00% | 87.00% | 85.95% | 86.94% |
| B | 2006 | Target ≥ | | | | | 93.00% | 93.50% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% |
| | | Data | | | 93.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% | 92.20% | 94.00% | 88.00% | 85.12% | 87.74% |
| C | 2006 | Target ≥ | | | | | 93.00% | 93.50% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% |
| | | Data | | | 93.00% | 93.00% | 92.00% | 92.40% | 94.00% | 86.00% | 82.78% | 83.87% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A ≥ | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% | 92.00% |
| Target B ≥ | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% |
| Target C ≥ | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [Introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Refer to Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction. Based on input from stakeholders, no revisions to targets will be made at this time.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|--------|
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 615.00 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 543.00 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 614.00 |
| B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 543.00 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 614.00 |
| C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 521.00 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 612.00 |

| | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 86.94% | 92.00% | 88.44% |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 87.74% | 94.00% | 88.44% |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 83.87% | 94.00% | 85.13% |

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Actual Data for FFY 2014:

Each of the three (3) outcome areas are derived from Section B of the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Family Outcomes Survey: "Helpfulness of Early Intervention." Each section is made up of multiple questions which are added together to come up with a mean score. For a family's response to be considered in agreement with the outcome, the mean score must be four (4) or above. "Knowing Your Rights" is made up of five (5) questions, and "Communicating Your Child's Needs," and "Helping Your Child Develop and Learn" are each made up of six (6) questions. If a family did not answer a minimum of four (4) questions regarding "Knowing Your Rights," and five (5) questions for "Communicating Your Child's Needs," and "Helping Your Child Develop and Learn," their response was not part of the overall score.

| Statewide Family Survey Results July 2014 – June 2015 | | |
|--|---------|-----|
| Family Goal | # * | % |
| A. Percent of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights. | 543/614 | 88% |
| B. Percent of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs. | 543/614 | 88% |
| C. Percent of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn. | 521/612 | 85% |

- Of the 1526 surveys that were distributed, 615 (545 paper surveys and 70 web-based surveys) were completed and returned for a 40% statewide return rate.
- Programs that did not meet the target for each specific Family Outcome were not issued a finding since this is a performance indicator; however, they were required to complete the Local Contributing Factor Tool and develop strategies in their CAP to address the specific Family Outcome.
- Additional Data – Length of Time in Early Intervention

When comparing this year's data to last year's data, total percentages statewide have been relatively stable, with small increases in both knowing their rights and helping their children develop and learn. A striking change can be seen in the percentages for families receiving services for 1-2 years. Whereas they had reported higher percentages than other groups last year, those percentages all saw decreases across all indicators, with the biggest decrease seen in knowing their rights. Another point of interest can be seen with the families who have been receiving services for 2-3 years. There is a marked increase in the number of families who feel that they know their rights (88% vs. 95%), however less families felt they could help their children develop and learn (88% vs. 83%). Percentages are highest with families who are newest to Early Intervention (0-6 months in service).

| Length of Time in Service | # | Family Goal | | |
|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | Know Their Rights | Effectively Communicate their children's Needs | Help Their Children Develop and Learn |
| <i>Time not Specified</i> | 2 | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| 0-6 months | 184 | 90% | 90% | 89% |
| 6 months-1 year | 241 | 87% | 89% | 83% |
| 1 -2 years | 147 | 86% | 86% | 85% |
| 2 -3 years | 41 | 95% | 85% | 83% |
| Total | 620 | 88% | 88% | 85% |

Representative of the State’s Population

Three (3) factors were considered when determining whether the returned surveys were representative of the early intervention population

- Ethnicity
- County of residence
- Age of the child

Comparison by Ethnicity:

When analyzing data for representativeness by ethnicity, subtracting surveys that did not report an ethnicity resulted in the following observations, and comparing to 618 data, the following points are noted:

- As was found in last year’s data, Hispanics/Latinos were more likely to complete their surveys than were their Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander counterparts by nearly 2:1.
- When using the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center’s Response Rate and Representativeness Calculator, it was determined that the response rate for the Asian and Caucasian Ethnic Groups were representative of those population groups served as indicated in our 618 data. However, those with two (2) or more identified ethnicities, like the Hispanic group, was over represented in survey completion.

| Ethnicity | FFY 2014 | | |
|------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| | Family Survey | Child Count | Difference |
| Two or More | 37% | 36% | 1% |
| Asian | 26% | 29% | -3% |
| African American | 1% | 2% | -1% |
| American Indian | 0% | 0.1% | -0.1% |
| Caucasian | 13% | 14% | -1% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 19% | 10% | 9% |
| Native Hawaiian | 5% | 10% | -5% |

When looking at the data responses by ethnicity, the two largest groups—Two or more Ethnicities and Asians made up over 60% of responses.

- Both ethnic groups had similar perceptions for each survey question. The difference by question never exceeded 3%.
- Both ethnic groups had similar results when compared with the statewide total with the difference never exceeding 1%.

| Family Goal | Two or More (n=226) | Asian (n=160) | Statewide Total (n=615) |
|--|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Know their rights | 89% | 86% | 88% |
| Effectively communicate their children’s needs | 90% | 86% | 88% |
| Help their children develop and learn | 86% | 84% | 85% |

Comparison by County of Residence

When looking at Family Survey return rates and 618 data based on the County the child lives in, it appears that the proportion of surveys returned were spread among all islands in a generally consistent manner.

Based on the surveys returned:

- Honolulu was on target this year, with survey return rates reflecting the same percentage as the 618 data.
- Both Hawai’i and Kauai Counties were underrepresented, similar to what was seen last year.
- Maui was a little more overrepresented than it was last year, but just by 1%.

| County | Family Survey | Child Count | Difference |
|--------|---------------|-------------|------------|
|--------|---------------|-------------|------------|

| | # | % | # | % | % |
|-----------|-----|------|------|------|-----|
| Hawai'i | 39 | 6% | 157 | 10% | -4% |
| Honolulu | 450 | 73% | 1117 | 73% | 0% |
| Kauai | 14 | 2% | 69 | 5% | -3% |
| Maui | 112 | 18% | 177 | 12% | 6% |
| Statewide | 615 | 100% | 1520 | 100% | |

When comparing the survey results by county of residence and by the statewide total, there were some differences in perception based on the residence of the family:

In comparison to last year's results, Kauai County showed the greatest improvement in all three outcome areas, including 100% in effectively communicating their child's needs.

- One of the largest changes was seen for Kauai in helping their child develop and learn, with percentages going from 91% last year to 64% this year. It should be noted that the return rate went from 21 surveys to 14 surveys, and this could account for the change, but not entirely. Last year, two (2) families did not agree that Early Intervention helped their family in this area, while this year, the number went up to four (4). This is an area that the program may want to address in the coming year.
- Conversely, Kauai reported higher than all other counties in knowing their rights.
- Parent responses for all 3 areas were lower in Maui County in comparison to last year's data, however, their results were still higher than statewide totals.
- Hawai'i County posted lower results than the statewide totals in all three areas, while Kauai County came in lower in two (2) of the three (3) areas.

| Family Goal | Hawai'i | Honolulu | Kauai | Maui | Statewide |
|--|---------|----------|-------|------|-----------|
| Know their rights | 80% | 89% | 93% | 88% | 88% |
| Effectively communicate their children's needs | 84% | 89% | 86% | 88% | 88% |
| Help their children develop and learn | 82% | 85% | 64% | 88% | 85% |

Comparison by Age

When comparing the proportions of Family Surveys returned with the Child Count Data based on the age of the child, the difference was minimal for all age ranges. Family Survey responses appear to be representative of the population served when looking at it by age of child at the time of survey. The only group slightly under represented were the 2-3 year group, with 1% less filling out the survey than what is reflected in child count.

| Age | Family Survey | | Child Count | | Difference |
|--------------|---------------|------|-------------|------|------------|
| | # | % | # | % | |
| Not Reported | 4 | 1% | 0 | 0% | 1% |
| Birth-1 | 71 | 12% | 172 | 11% | 1% |
| 1-2 | 173 | 28% | 425 | 28% | 0% |
| 2-3 | 367 | 60% | 923 | 61% | -1% |
| Total | 615 | 100% | 1520 | 100% | |

When comparing the survey responses by age at the time of survey completion, the birth-1 group showed the highest scores in the three areas, with the 2-3 year group following. However, the differences were small, with the largest difference of 4% reflected between the birth-1 group and the 1-2 and 2-3 groups.

| Age | # | Know Their Rights | Effectively Communicate their children's Needs | Help Their Children Develop and Learn |
|--------------|-----|-------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Not Reported | 4 | 100% | 100% | 75% |
| Birth-1 | 71 | 92% | 89% | 89% |
| 1-2 | 173 | 88% | 87% | 82% |

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

| | | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2-3 | 367 | 88% | 89% | 86% |
| Total | 615 | 88% | 88% | 85% |

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, **not including correction of findings**

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | | | 7.10% | 7.10% | 7.20% | 2.97% | 3.00% | 1.03% | 1.03% | 1.03% |
| Data | | 5.44% | 6.98% | 5.00% | 4.48% | 1.27% | 0.96% | 0.94% | 0.78% | 0.99% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 1.03% | 1.03% | 1.03% | 1.03% | 1.03% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Refer to Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction. Based on input from stakeholders, no revisions to targets will be made at this time.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|----------|--|--------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 172 | null |
| U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013 | 4/3/2014 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 18,853 | null |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 172 | 18,853 | 0.99% | 1.03% | 0.91% |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2014:

- The actual data of 172 infants and toddlers birth to one (1) with IFSPs is consistent with 618 data submitted.
- Compared to National Data (based on OSEP 2014 data tables):
 - The national average for all states including Washington D.C. is 1.15%. Hawai'i was below the national average for infants and toddlers birth to one (1) with IFSPs by 0.24%
 - Hawai'i was ranked 36th, as it served 0.91% (172/18,853) of infants and toddlers birth to one (1) with IFSPs.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2010

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | | | 7.30% | 7.30% | 7.37% | 4.44% | 4.45% | 2.82% | 2.82% | 2.82% |
| Data | | 6.71% | 7.48% | 6.94% | 6.53% | 3.78% | 3.62% | 3.49% | 3.42% | 3.07% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 2.82% | 2.82% | 2.82% | 2.82% | 3.63% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Refer to Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction. Based on input from stakeholders, no revisions to targets will be made at this time.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|----------|--|--------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 1,520 | |
| U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013 | 7/2/2015 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 55,432 | |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1,520 | 55,432 | 3.07% | 2.82% | 2.74% |

Explanation of Slippage

Hawai'i changed its eligibility in October 2013. Prior to October 21, 2013, the MDE team would determine if children were eligible for EI if they had a developmental delay based on a -1 standard deviation in any

developmental domain and/or a biological risk whereby a diagnosis of a physical or mental condition has a high probability of resulting in a developmental delay if EI services are not provided. The current eligibility remains the same for biological risk and the new developmental delay criteria, effective October 21, 2013 is:

- ≤ -1.0 SD in at least two or more areas or sub-areas of development
- ≤ -1.4 SD in at least one area or sub-area of development
- Multidisciplinary team observations and informed clinical opinion when the child's score cannot be measured by the evaluation instrument

The slippage is a direct result of the change in eligibility.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2014:

- The actual data of 1,520 infants and toddlers birth to three (3) with IFSPs is consistent with 618 data submitted.
- Compared to National Data (based on OSEP 2014 data tables):
 - The national average for all states including Washington D.C. is 2.95%. Hawai'i was below the national average for infants and toddlers birth to three (3) with IFSPs by 0.21%
 - Hawaii was ranked 20th, as it served 2.74% (1,520/55,432) of infants and toddlers birth to three (3) with IFSPs.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 98.00% | 98.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 98.00% | 98.00% | 97.00% | 94.00% | 90.27% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Key:

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline | Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1,268 | 1,952 | 90.27% | 100% | 90.27% |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) | 494 |
|--|-----|

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Statewide data for all eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline was collected from the EI database for the period 7/1/14 - 6/30/15. The timelines were from the date of referral to the initial IFSP

meeting and were based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2014:

Statewide data for eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline was collected from the EI database for the period 7/1/14-6/30/15. The timelines were from the date of referral to the initial IFSP meeting and were based on actual, not average, number of days.

- 1762 (90%) of infants and toddlers received an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.
- Exceptional Family Circumstances. 494 of the 1762 (28%) infants and toddlers did not have an initial evaluation, initial assessment and initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline due to exceptional family circumstances as defined by IDEA Part C. This number is included in both the numerator and denominator. The following are the two predominate exceptional family circumstances:
 - Schedule conflict
 - Family request
- Program Reasons. 190 of the 1762 (11%) infants and toddlers did not have an initial evaluation, initial assessment and initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline due to program reasons. The predominate program reasons was late MDEs.
- Identifying Non-compliance. Of the 190 infants and toddlers who did not receive an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline, 190 (100%) infants and toddlers received an initial evaluation and initial assessment and had an initial IFSP meeting, although untimely.

| Range of Days Beyond the 45-day timeline to Receive an Initial Evaluation and Initial Assessment and Initial IFSP (For the 190 late IFSPs) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Range of Days Beyond the Due Date | # of Children | # of Children |
| 1-30 days | 93 | 49% |
| 31-60 days | 43 | 23% |
| 61-90 days | 27 | 14% |

| | | |
|-----------|----|-----|
| > 90 days | 27 | 14% |
|-----------|----|-----|

- The state accounted for all instances of noncompliance identified via the Part C database. There were 15 programs servicing the 190 children who did not receive an initial evaluation, initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline.
 - 4 of the 15 programs were issued findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, based on FFY 2014 data. They received a letter of notification of noncompliance and were informed that they must demonstrate correction, as soon as possible, but no later than one year of identification (e.g., date of written notification).
 - 4 of the 15 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going noncompliance (programs did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 data [three programs] and FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 data [one program]).
 - 1 of the 15 programs was not issued a finding because the program closed, effective June 30, 2105.
 - 6 of the 15 programs were not issued findings because the submitted required data that was verified by Part C LA to demonstrate correction prior to the written issuance of findings. The data demonstrated that all infants and toddlers received initial IFSPs, although late, unless the child was not under the program's jurisdiction. The programs are correctly implementing the Timely Evaluation and Assessments and initial IFSPs requirement for all children (100%).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 |

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance through on-site monitoring (refer to preceding section on "Monitoring Process"). All Programs were notified in writing of any noncompliance. Programs are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), change policies and procedures, as appropriate, and demonstrate correction of all noncompliance (i.e., child specific and updated data) as soon as possible but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).

In verifying correction of noncompliance, the State determined if each of the EI programs with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the requirements as stated in 34 CFR §303.321(e),

303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Programs with identified noncompliance were required to submit a copy of the signature page of all the Initial IFSPs completed along with a list from the EI Database that includes the child's name, Part 3 referral date, 45-day due date, and date of the initial IFSP. The Programs were required to submit this updated data to demonstrate correction based on the monitoring data percentage as follows:

- 95% - 100%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 2 records total
- 90% - 94%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 4 records total
- 80% - 89%: 2 months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 6 records total
- 70% - 79%: 2 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 8 records total
- Under 70%: 3 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 10 records total

The Part C LA verified what the Programs submitted and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2008 through FFY 2014, the Part C LA verified that each of the EI Programs with findings of noncompliance for not conducting an initial evaluation, initial assessment and initial IFSP within Part C's 45-day timeline, completed all evaluations, assessments and initial IFSPs, although late. The status of child specific correction was included in previous APRs target data. It included the percentage of children that received an initial evaluation, initial assessment and initial IFSP, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The report from the database includes the actual date of the initial IFSP and calculates how many days late it was from the 45-day timeline. If the initial IFSP did not occur prior to the date the data was pulled and the child is still enrolled in Part C, the Program must immediately correct by completing the initial IFSP, although late and submit a copy of the signature page of the IFSP to the Part C LA.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The programs that continue to be in non-compliance has received support from another Program Manager who assisted the Program in creating a system to track and report noncompliance in a timely manner. The Program have also been required to submit weekly status reports. The Agency has been required to submit a plan that includes the following:

- Strategies that will be implemented to support the Program in completing their Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (e.g., support from another Program Manager; time set aside on a weekly basis to work on CAPs)
- How the Agency will monitor the Program's submission of CAPS (e.g., cc on e-mails; bi-monthly meetings)
- Any technical assistance needed from the State LA
- Template for the weekly status report that list all indicators

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 86.00% | 99.00% | 97.00% | 99.00% | 98.00% | 99.80% | 98.00% | 99.00% | 96.97% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

Children referred fewer than 45 days prior to their third birthday and children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday are not included in the denominator.

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

| Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1,214 | 1,225 | 96.97% | 100% | 99.10% |

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) | 0 |
|---|---|

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Statewide data for the timely Transition Plan for all children who exited Part C in FFY 14 was collected from the EI Database for the period 7/1/14-6/30/15. Children referred fewer than 45 days prior to their third birthday and children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday are not included in the numerator and denominator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2014:

Transition Plan

- 1214 of 1225 (99%) children exiting Part C had a timely and complete Transition Plan in their IFSP that was completed at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday. Children referred fewer than 45 days from their 3rd birthday were not included in the calculation.
- 11 of 1225 (1%) children exiting Part C did not have a timely and complete Transition Plan in their IFSP, based on Hawai'i's requirements for a complete Transition Plan. To be considered "complete," Hawai'i requires the Transition Plan to be updated at each IFSP and it must include all the steps and services listed in the IDEA, Part C regulations.
- There were nine (9) programs serving the 11 children who did not have a timely and complete Transition Plan in their IFSP with steps and services.
 - 6 of the 9 programs were issued a finding in FFY 2015, based on FFY 2014 data. They received a letter of notification of noncompliance and were informed that they must demonstrate correction, as soon as possible, but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).
 - 1 of the 9 programs was not issued a finding due to on-going noncompliance (finding issued in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 data).
 - 1 of the 9 programs was not issued a finding because the program closed, effective June 30, 2105.
 - 1 of the 9 programs was not issued a finding because they submitted required data that was verified by Part C LA to demonstrated correction prior to the written issuance of findings. The data demonstrates that all infants and toddlers had a complete transition plan, although late, unless the child was not under the program's jurisdiction. Updated data was used to verify that the program is now correctly implementing the timely and complete transition plan requirement for all children (100%).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance through on-site monitoring (refer to preceding section on “Monitoring Process”). All Programs were notified in writing of any noncompliance. Programs are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), change policies and procedures, as appropriate, and demonstrate correction of all noncompliance (i.e., child specific and updated data) as soon as possible but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).

In verifying correction of noncompliance, the State determined that each of the EI programs with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the requirements as stated in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(4).

Programs with identified noncompliance were required to submit a copy of the transition plan along with a list from the EI Database of children that exited Part C that included the child's name, date of birth, exit date, and transition due date (at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday). The Programs were required to submit this updated data to demonstrate correction based on the monitoring data percentage as follows:

- 95% - 100%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 2 records total
- 90% - 94%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 4 records total
- 80% - 89%: 2 months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 6 records total
- 70% - 79%: 2 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 8 records total
- Under 70%: 3 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 10 records total

The Part C LA verified what the Programs submitted and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2007 through FFY 2014 the Part C LA verified that each of the EI Programs with findings of noncompliance for a complete and timely transition plan, developed a complete transition plan, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The Part C LA required EI Programs to revise and complete a child's transition plan if, through on-site monitoring it was discovered that the child's transition plan was incomplete. The EI Programs were required to submit the completed transition plan to the Part C LA.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 94.00% | 100% | 99.00% | 91.00% | 96.00% | 91.00% | 92.00% | 90.00% | 91.40% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

Children referred less than 45 days prior to their third birthday and children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday were not included in the denominator. Parents who opted out of notifying the SEA and LEA were not included in the denominator.

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 778 | 1,225 | 91.40% | 100% | 88.81% |

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)

349

Explanation of Slippage

Some programs were sending the Transition Notice to the LEA but not the SEA. The Part C LA requires the notice be sent to both the SEA and the LEA. If the Transition Notice is sent to only one of the two, it is considered incomplete; therefore, it is equivalent to a Transition Notice not being submitted to DOE.

Describe the method used to collect these data

Statewide data for the timely Transition Notice for all children who exited Part C in FFY 2014 was collected from the EI Database for the period 7/1/14-6/30/15.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Statewide data for the timely Transition Notice for all children who exited Part C in FFY 2014 was collected from the EI Database for the period 7/1/14-6/30/15. Children referred less than 45 days prior to their third birthday and children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday were not included in the numerator and denominator. Parents who opted out of notifying the SEA and LEA were not included in the denominator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Transition Notice

- 778 of 876 (89%) children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B services exited with timely notification to the SEA and LEA. The Part B and C programs mutually decided that any child served by Part C with a developmental delay was “potentially eligible for Part B services.” Therefore it is a requirement that, at a minimum, directory information on all children exiting Part C with a developmental delay be forwarded to Part B unless the family opts out of this requirement. Children referred fewer than 45 days from their third (3rd) birthday were not included in the calculation.
- Opt Out Option: 349 children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B services exited without providing notification to the SEA and LEA due to the family exercising the “opt out” policy. The “opt out” policy was presented to the community at a public hearing held May 4, 2009. The policy was officially forwarded to OSEP as part of the Part C Grant Application mailed to OSEP on May 14, 2009 and is officially on file. These children were not included in either the above numerator or denominator. Due to the high number of “opt outs” for the Transition Notice, the database was revised to track reasons why families were “opting out” of the Transition Notice. The predominate reason why families “opted out” of the Transition Notice was that they were not interested in having their child referred to DOE.

- **Program Reasons:** 98 of 876 (11%) children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B exited without timely notification to the SEA and LEA due to program reasons. It is Hawai'i's policy that the transition notice must be sent to the SEA and LEA at least 90 days prior to the child's third (3rd) birthday. The timeline is in place to support DOE's Child Find efforts to ensure that all children who are potentially eligible for DOE can receive a timely evaluation and start the Part B program by their third (3rd) birthday.
- Of the 98 children exiting without timely notification to the SEA and LEA, notification was provided to the SEA and LEA for 69 of these children, although untimely and 29 children left the jurisdiction of Part C prior to issuing the SEA and LEA notification.

| Range of Days for Notification to SEA and LEA (For the 98 children that exited without a timely notification to LEA) | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Range of Days Beyond the Due Date | # of Children | % of Children |
| 1-30 days | 47 | 48% |
| 31-60 days | 5 | 5% |
| 61-90 days | 4 | 4% |
| >90 days | 13 | 13% |
| No notice to LEA prior to leaving the jurisdiction of Part C | 29 | 30% |

- There were 19 programs serving the 98 children who exited Part C with either untimely notification to the SEA and LEA or insufficient documentation that notification to the SEA and LEA was provided:
 - 11 of the 19 programs were issued findings in FFY 2015, based on FFY 2014 data. They received a letter of notification of noncompliance and were informed that they must demonstrate correction, as soon as possible, but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).
 - 6 of the 19 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going noncompliance (programs did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 data [four programs], FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 data [one programs] and FFY 2012, based on FFY 2011 data [one program]).
 - 2 of the 19 programs were not issued findings because they submitted required data that was verified by Part C LA to demonstrated correction prior to the written issuance of findings. The data demonstrated that transition notices for all infants and toddlers were provided to the SEA and LEA unless the family "opted out" or child was not under the program's jurisdiction. Updated data was used to verify that the Programs are now correctly implementing the requirement of notifying the SEA and LEA of all children who are potentially eligible for DOE (100%).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 11 | 9 | 1 | 1 |

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance through on-site monitoring (refer to preceding section on “Monitoring Process”). All Programs were notified in writing of any noncompliance. Programs are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), change policies and procedures, as appropriate, and demonstrate correction of all noncompliance (i.e., child specific and updated data) as soon as possible but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).

In verifying correction of noncompliance, the State determined if each of the EI programs with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the requirements as stated in 34 CFR §303.344(h). Programs with identified noncompliance were required to submit a copy of the documentation of when the transition notice was sent to the SEA and LEA along with a list from the EI Database of children that exited Part C that included the child's name, date of birth, exit date, and transition due date (at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday). The Programs were required to submit this updated data to demonstrate correction based on the monitoring data percentage as follows:

- 95% - 100%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 2 records total
- 90% - 94%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 4 records total
- 80% - 89%: 2 months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 6 records total
- 70% - 79%: 2 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 8 records total
- Under 70%: 3 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 10 records total

The Part C LA verified what the Programs submitted and ensured that the Programs submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2008 through FFY 2014, the Part C LA verified that each of the EI Programs with findings of noncompliance for not providing timely notification to the SEA and LEA of potentially eligible children for Part B services, all children had a notification to the SEA and LEA, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The status of child specific correction was included in previous APRs target data. It included the percentage of children with notification to the SEA and LEA, though late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The report from the database includes the actual date the notification was sent to both the SEA and LEA. If the notice was sent on two separate dates, the later date is entered into the database. It also includes if it was late, how many days late it occurred.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Program that continues to be in noncompliance has been required to submit weekly status reports. The Agency has also been required to submit a plan that includes the following:

- Strategies that will be implemented to support the Program in completing their Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (e.g., support from another Program Manager; time set aside on a weekly basis to work on CAPs)
- How the Agency will monitor the Program's submission of CAPS (e.g., cc on e-mails; bi-monthly meetings)
- Any technical assistance needed from the State LA
- Template for the weekly status report which lists all indicators

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The program that continues to be in noncompliance has received support from another Program Manager who assisted the Program in creating a system to track and report on noncompliance in a timely manner. The Program has also been required to submit weekly status reports. The Agency have also been required to submit a plan that includes the following:

- Strategies that will be implemented to support the Program in completing their Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (e.g., support from another Program Manager; time set aside on a weekly basis to work on CAPs)
- How the Agency will monitor the Program's submission of CAPS (e.g., cc on e-mails; bi-monthly meetings)
- Any technical assistance needed by the State LA
- Template for the weekly status report which lists all indicators

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 94.00% | 96.00% | 97.00% | 94.00% | 93.00% | 93.00% | 89.00% | 88.00% | 88.43% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

Children referred less than 90 days prior to their third birthday and children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday were not included in the numerator and denominator. Parents who declined the transition conference were not included in the denominator.

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

Yes

No

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 390 | 1,194 | 88.43% | 100% | 90.34% |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data) | 728 |
| Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) | 31 |

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Statewide data for the timely Transition Conference for all children who exited Part C in FFY 2014 was collected from the EI Database for the period 7/1/14-6/30/15. Children referred less than 90 days prior to their third birthday and children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday were not included in the numerator and denominator. Parents who declined the transition conference were not included in the denominator.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Transition Conference

Hawai'i's policy is to offer a Transition Conference for all children exiting from Hawai'i's Part C program, as they are all potentially eligible for Part B services.

- 421 of 466 (90%) children exiting Part C where the timely transition conference occurred. Children referred less than 90 days prior to their third birthday and children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday were not included in the calculation.
- 728 families declined a Transition Conference and are not included in either the above numerator or denominator. Due to the high number of declines for a Transition Conference, the database was revised to track reasons why families were declining Transition Conferences. The two predominate reasons why families declined the Transition Conference were:
 - Families are familiar with the options
 - Families already decided on a setting/placement
- Exceptional Family Circumstances: 31 of 466 (7%) children exiting Part C did not have a timely Transition Conference due to exceptional family circumstances. They were included in both the above numerator and denominator. The two predominate exceptional family circumstances were family requested a date beyond the due date and conflict in schedules.
- Program Reasons: 45 of 466 (10%) children exiting Part C did not have a timely Transition Conference due to program reasons. The predominate program reasons were that the program's schedule was full and staff forgot to schedule within the required timeline.
 - Of the 45 families that did not receive a timely Transition Conference, 10 received a Transition Conference, although untimely and 35 children left the jurisdiction of Part C prior to having a

Transition Conference.

| Range of Days for the Transition Conference (For the 45 children that exited without a timely Transition Conference) | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| Range of Days Beyond the Due Date | # of Children | % of Children |
| 1-30 days | 9 | 20% |
| 31-60 days | 0 | 0% |
| 61-90 days | 1 | 2% |
| No Transition Conference prior to leaving the jurisdiction of Part C | 35 | 78% |

- There were 14 programs serving the 45 children who exited Part C with an untimely Transition Conference or having no Transition Conference prior to exiting Part C.
 - 7 of the 14 programs were issued findings in FFY 2015, based on FFY 2014 data. They received a letter of notification of noncompliance and were informed that they must demonstrate correction, as soon as possible, but no later than one year of identification (e.g. date of written notification).
 - 5 of the 14 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going noncompliance (programs did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 data [two programs], FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 data [two programs] and FFY 2012, based on FFY 2011 data [one program]).
 - 2 of the 14 programs were not issued findings because they submitted required data that was verified by Part C LA to demonstrate correction prior to the written issuance of findings. The data demonstrated that all children received a transition conference, although late, unless the family declined a transition conference or the child was no longer under the program’s jurisdiction. Updated data was used to verify that the Programs are now correctly implementing the transition conference requirements for all infants and toddlers (100%).

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

Responses to actions required in FFY 2013 response, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 7 | 5 | 0 | 2 |

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The State accounted for all instances of noncompliance through on-site monitoring (refer to preceding section on "Monitoring Process"). All Programs were notified in writing of any noncompliance. Programs are required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), change policies and procedures, as appropriate, and demonstrate correction of all noncompliance (i.e., child specific and updated data) as soon as possible but no later than one year of identification (i.e., date of written notification).

In verifying correction of noncompliance, the State determined if each of the EI programs with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the requirements as stated in 34 CFR §303.148(b)(2)(i) (as modified by IDEA sections 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(II)). Programs with identified noncompliance were required to submit a copy of the documentation of the transition conference along with a list from the EI Database of children that exited Part C that included the child's name, date of birth, exit date, and transition due date (at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday). Programs were required to submit this updated data to demonstrate correction based on the monitoring data percentage as follows:

- 95% - 100%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 2 records total
- 90% - 94%: 1 month of data that shows 100% with a minimum of 4 records total
- 80% - 89%: 2 months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 6 records total
- 70% - 79%: 2 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 8 records total
- Under 70%: 3 consecutive months of data that show 100% with a minimum of 10 records total

The Part C LA verified what the Programs submitted and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For FFY 2008 through FFY 2014, the Part C LA verified that each of the EI Programs with findings of noncompliance for not conducting timely transition conferences, all children had a transition conference, although late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The status of child specific correction was included in previous APRs target data. It included the percentage of children that had a transition conference, though late, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EI Program. The report from the database includes the transition due date (at least 90 days prior the child exiting Part C) and the actual date of the transition conference. It also includes if it was late, how many days late it occurred.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The two programs that continue to be in noncompliance has been required to submit weekly status reports. The Agency have also been required to submit a plan that includes the following:

- Strategies that will be implemented to support the Program in completing their Corrective Action Plan (CAP) (e.g., support from another Program Manager; time set aside on a weekly basis to work on CAPs)
- How the Agency will monitor the Program's submission of CAPS (e.g., cc on e-mails; bi-monthly meetings)
- Any technical assistance needed by the State LA
- Template for the weekly status report which lists all indicators

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Program that continues to be in noncompliance is hired a new Program Manager. The Program Manager is reviewing the system to track and report on noncompliance in a timely manner. The new Program Manager will receive support from another Program Manager within the Agency. The State LA also provided technical assistance regarding the CAP process.

The Program Manger will have three reporting months to demonstrate correction of noncompliance. If there is no progress, weekly status reports will be required as well as a plan from the Agency as outlined above.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data | | | | | | | | | | |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | | | | | |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|-----------|--|------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/5/2015 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | NA | null |
| SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/5/2015 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | NA | null |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| NA | NA | | | NA |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Mediation

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

There were no mediations for FFY 2014.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

| FFY | 2013 | 2014 |
|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | 53.14% |
| Data | 53.14% | |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 53.14% | 53.14% | 54.00% | 55.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions,

individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

Description

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

 Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Charlene Robles

Title: Part C Coordinator

Email: charlene.robles@doh.hawaii.gov

Phone: 808-594-0025