

HI Part C

FFY2013 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

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

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 programs and sections are monitored annually. Data is gathered from the EIS 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 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, Hawaii identified the following Priority Areas and specific items in each area to monitor:

Priority Area 1: Timeliness

Rationale: Timely 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 Goals (effective FFY 2010. Transition was originally Priority Area 3 and has been moved to become Priority Area 5).

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

Item 3a: Initial EI Goals ratings were completed

Item 3b: Exit EI Goals 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: 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

Data on Timeliness (Priority Area 1) is from each Agency's database; data on all other priority areas is from the EI SAM Tool.

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.

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 Agencies provide data, as required, to show that their Programs/Sections meet IDEA Part C compliance; 2) feedback is provided to the Agencies as to whether the Programs data is sufficient to show compliance; 3) areas of non-compliance are identified; 4) Programs are notified of areas of noncompliance; and 5) required actions are taken such as developing a Corrective Action Plan (CAP), submitting evidence to show correction, as well 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 Agencies.

B. Dispute Resolution System

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, contact the Part C Coordinator prior to filing a written complaint. A written complaint or due process should be filed if the family feels that they Part C program has violated a Part C requirement. Mediation will be offered if a request for a due process hearing is submitted.

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, Western Regional Resource Center (WRRRC) and The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) on how to improve compliance and performance across APR indicators. ECTA and WRRRC provided clarification on DEC recommended practices and shared resources developed by ECTA (e.g. Powerpoint on Writing Functional Outcomes) that the Part C Lead Agency was able to use to provide TA and training to EI Programs. The Part C LA also problem-solved with TA providers on possible strategies to address EI Program issues. EI Programs have used the information provided to implement and/or modify program procedures. DaSy supported the Part C LA with analyzing data and ECTA/DaSy shared resources on how to use child and family outcome data for program improvement.

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 that is also open to any staff that requests to attend. Annual Refresher trainings are also offered at least once a year and may be on a specific topic to address a need identified through monitoring or training needs assessment.

Stakeholder Involvement:

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 2013 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. There was broad dissemination regarding the Stakeholders' Meeting to determine interest by agency,

Hawai'i Early Intervention Coordinating Council (HEICC), and community members to ensure appropriate input into the review process.

4. Groups were separated based on the specific indicator. Each group was provided with copies of the Indicator targets, FFY 2012 APR data, draft FFY 2013 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 Children with Special Health Needs Branch Chief since the Part C Coordinator position is vacant.
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 can generate a PDF document suitable for sharing with the public.

Broad Representation

A stakeholder group of approximately 60 individuals provided recommendations to the development of the APR. Because of Hawai'i's broad eligibility and geography, it was important that there was 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:

- o Early Head Start/Head Start
- o Parent Training Institute (Learning Disability Association of Hawai'i)
- o Parents

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 can generate 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 (e.g., Easter Seals Hawai'i, Imua Family Services).

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	69.00%	71.00%	78.00%	84.00%	88.00%	86.00%	85.00%	69.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1,709	211

Explanation of Alternate Data

Hawaii utilizes a random sample for Indicator 1: Timely provision of services. See below under "...methods used to select EIS Programs for monitoring" for description of the monitoring process specific to Indicator 1.

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
105	211	69.00%	100%	63.03%

Explanation of Slippage

Slippage may be a result of staff vacancies which also impacts lack of documentation. A service may have been provided but if there is no documentation of the service being provided then it is not counted as being delivered (refer below in "Describe the method used to select EIS program for monitoring, in the "Determination of Timeliness" section for more information). Therefore, documentation templates and guidelines have been developed and will be implemented by July 1, 2015. Slippage may also be a result of change in timely service definition. Effective July 1, 2013, all service providers are required to initiate services within 30 days from when the parent provided consent for the IFSP service, instead of "...as projected based

on the date provided in the IFSP (i.e., quarterly services).

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)	28
---	----

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 292 records were selected for on-site monitoring within the time period 7/1/13- 6/30/14 across all 20 Part C programs. The Early Intervention (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 2013, the LAQuAT Team completed the SAM tool for each of the EIS 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 with an Initial, Review or Annual IFSP between 7/1/13 – 3/31/14 were obtained by Part C LA from each program. The timeframe was chosen to ensure that there were 3 months to confirm that services were provided in a timely manner within FFY 2013.
- Part C LA identified 10% of children at each program/section based on the 12/1/13 child count, or a minimum of fifteen (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 as complete monitoring as possible. This resulted in a review of 292 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 211 children as 81 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 Part C LA to determine if services were timely, consistent with Hawai'i'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 a Part C program not providing service coordination, the provider must verbally inform the service coordinator of the date services were initiated or provide 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 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

- Raw data was gathered by Part C LA.
- Part C LA inputted the data into the SAM database, which was developed by Part C LA.
- Part C LA analyzed the data for noncompliance with Timely Services. The data was given to each program/section as part of the notification of FFY 2014 findings based on data from FFY 2013.

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/Supervisors 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:

Hawaii'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 2013:

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

- 133 of 211 (63%) of infants and toddlers monitored received EI services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.
- Exceptional Family Circumstances. 28 of the 211 (13%) infants and toddlers monitored did not receive timely services due to exceptional family circumstances as defined by IDEA Part C. This number is included in both the above numerator and denominator. The following are the predominate family circumstances that impacted the scheduling of timely services:
 - Child/Family sick
 - Cancelled appointment
- Program Reasons. 78 of the 211 (37%) infants and toddlers monitored did not receive timely services, due to program reasons. The predominate program reason that impacted the scheduling of timely services is that there was no documentation of a reason why services were late.
- Identifying Noncompliance. Of the 78 children where services were not initiated in a timely manner due to program reasons, 6 children left the program's jurisdiction before the service was implemented; for 1 child, the service was discontinued before it was initiated; and the remaining 71 children's services on their IFSP were initiated, although late.

Range of Days to Initiate Services (For the 78 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	32	41%
31-60 days	11	14%
61-90 days	14	18%
> 90 days	14	18%
Service Discontinued	1	1%
Left Program's Jurisdiction	6	8%

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 19 programs serving the 78 children who did not receive services in a timely manner.

- o 9 of the 19 programs were issued findings in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 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).
 - o 5 of the 19 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going non-compliance (program did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 data).
 - o 5 of the 19 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 (e.g., 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 children (100%).

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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	4	0	3

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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 (e.g., child specific and up-dated 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 at 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 LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

For FFY 2007 through FFY 2013 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

The primary reason the three Programs have not been able to demonstrate correction has been due to staff shortages. Currently, the programs now have staff to address the areas of need. The Programs continue to provide monthly status reports to the Part C LA. Programs that have not consistently submitted monthly reports have been directed to submit weekly status reports. The Part C LA staff work closely with the Programs ensuring that they understand the requirement and suggest strategies for improvement.

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2005 data to the FFY 2013 data). OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance

identified in FFY 2012 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥		74.50%	80.00%	85.00%	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%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%

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 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	1,549	
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	1,709	

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,549	1,709	93.00%	90.00%	90.64%

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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)

Historical Data

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	53.14%	53.14%	53.14%	53.14%	54.00%	55.00%
Target A2 ≥	79.32%	79.32%	79.32%	79.32%	79.50%	80.00%
Target B1 ≥	70.81%	70.81%	70.81%	70.81%	71.00%	71.50%
Target B2 ≥	65.19%	65.19%	65.19%	65.19%	65.50%	66.00%
Target C1 ≥	67.99%	67.99%	67.99%	67.99%	68.50%	69.00%
Target C2 ≥	80.63%	80.63%	80.63%	80.63%	81.50%	82.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Refer to Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction. Based on input from stakeholders, targets were revised using FFY 2013 as new baseline data due to the Hawaii's eligibility becoming more stringent, effective October 21, 2013. Therefore, infants and toddlers with a -1 standard deviation in a single domain are no longer eligible which may decrease the number infants and toddlers demonstrating substantial progress. Also, staff are completed the EI Child Outcomes ratings more consistently.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	null
--	------

Does the 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

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	1
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	223
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	60
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	194
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	895

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	254	478	56.30%	53.14%	53.14%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1,089	1,373	79.00%	79.32%	79.32%

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

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	1
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	269
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	208
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	447
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	448

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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 $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	655	925	70.60%	70.81%	70.81%
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 $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	895	1,373	64.60%	65.19%	65.19%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	3
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	183
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	80
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	315
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	792

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 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).	395	581	73.30%	67.99%	67.99%
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).	1,107	1,373	81.20%	80.63%	80.63%

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 2013:

PROGRESS DATA FOR FFY 2013						
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	1/1507	0.1%	1/1507	0.1%	3/1507	0.2%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	223/1507	14.8%	269/1507	17.9%	183/1507	12.1%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to	60/1507	0.4%	208/1507	13.8%	80/1507	5.3%

PROGRESS DATA FOR FFY 2013						
Measurement	A. Social Emotional Skills		B. Acquiring and Using Knowledge and Skills		C. Taking Appropriate Action to Meet Needs	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
same-aged peers but did not reach it						
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	194/1507	12.9%	447/1507	29.7%	315/1507	21.0%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	895/1507	63.9%	448/1507	29.7%	792/1507	52.6%

Description of Process

Tool:

The EI Goals 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.

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 months preceding exit from the program.

On-Going Data collection:

For each of the three EI Goals, 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. the developmental evaluation or assessment(s);
2. professional opinion;
3. parent input; and
4. level of achievement of IFSP objectives relevant to the outcome

Reporting:

EI programs enter EI Goals ratings into their respective agency databases on a monthly basis. The agencies provide summarized data annually or as requested by the Part C LA. Data is then compiled by the Part C LA.

How data are analyzed:

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

1. If the “Yes/No” question (which asks whether the child’s functioning improved at 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, 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 they will be counted in category (c).
4. If ratings of child functioning compared to typically developing same aged peers at entry are below age expectations, but at exit they are at age level expectations, then the children will be 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 children will be counted in category (e).

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2013 in the FFY 2013 APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

Refer to FFY 2013 data section.

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2008 data to the FFY 2013 data). OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A	2006	Target ≥				91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
		Data		91.00%	89.00%	90.00%	91.80%	94.00%	87.00%	85.95%
B	2006	Target ≥				93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
		Data		93.00%	91.00%	92.00%	92.20%	94.00%	88.00%	85.12%
C	2006	Target ≥				93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
		Data		93.00%	93.00%	92.00%	92.40%	94.00%	86.00%	82.78%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%	92.00%
Target B ≥	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%
Target C ≥	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%	94.00%

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.

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	620
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	539
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	620
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	544
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	620
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	520
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	620

	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	85.95%	92.00%	86.94%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	85.12%	94.00%	87.74%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	82.78%	94.00%	83.87%

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 2013:

Each of the three outcome areas are derived from Section B of the new 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 4 or above. “Knowing Your Rights” is made up of five questions, and “Communicating Your Child’s Needs,” and “Helping Your Child Develop and Learn” are each made up of six questions. If a family did not answer a minimum of four questions regarding “Knowing Your Rights,” and five 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 2013 – June 2014		
Family Goal	# *	%
A. Percent of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.	539/617	87%
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.	544/618	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.	516/613	84%

- Of the 1540 surveys that were distributed, 620 surveys were completed and returned for a 40% statewide return rate.
- Programs that did not meet the target for each specific Family Goal 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 Goal
- Additional Data – Length of Time in Early Intervention

When comparing the survey results by the length of time the child was enrolled in early intervention services, the data suggests that families who were receiving services for 1-2 years rated the three goal areas higher across the board than any of the other length of time in service areas.

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>	7	83%	100%	83%
0-6 months	184	87%	87%	81%
6 months-1 year	241	85%	88%	84%
1 -2 years	147	92%	89%	88%
2 -3 years	41	88%	85%	88%
Total	620	87%	88%	84%

Representative of the State’s Population

Three 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:

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

Hispanics/Latinos were more likely to complete their surveys than were their Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander counterparts by nearly 2:1. It is not clear why this is, but it may be that the Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander population present a greater challenge for IFSP teams to explain the importance of the survey to, but it is really not clear at this time.

Our two largest populations (Asians and Two or More) both were pretty representative of the population with the percentage of surveys returned varying only slightly from the population served.

Ethnicity	FFY 2013		
	Family Survey	Child Count	Difference
Two or More	37%	36%	1%
Asian	26%	27%	-1%
African American	1%	2%	-1%
American Indian	0%	.1%	-.1%
Caucasian	13%	16%	-3%
Hispanic/Latino	19%	10%	9%
Native Hawaiian	5%	10%	-5%

When looking at the data responses by ethnicity, we followed what we did with representativeness, and focused on our two largest groups—Two or more Ethnicities and Asians since this 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=161)	Statewide Total (n=620)
Know their rights	86%	89%	87%
Effectively communicate their children's needs	88%	88%	88%
Help their children develop and learn	84%	83%	84%

Comparison by County of Residence

When comparing the proportions of Family Survey return rates with the Child Count 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:

- For the first time in a long time, Honolulu County was underrepresented in the Family Survey by 2% when compared to the Child Count.
- Hawaii and Kauai County were also underrepresented, while Maui County was overrepresented by 5%

County	Family Survey		Child Count		Difference
	#	%	#	%	
Hawai'i	44	7%	164	10%	-3%
Honolulu	454	73%	1285	75%	-2%

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Kauai	21	3%	68	4%	-1%
Maui	101	16%	192	11%	5%
Statewide	620	100%	1709	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.

- Hawaii'i and Honolulu Counties also showed across the board improvements.
- Although Maui County dipped slightly in all three areas in comparison to last year's results, their results were still higher than the statewide totals.
- Only Hawaii'i County posted lower results than the statewide totals

Family Goal	Hawaii'i	Honolulu	Kauai	Maui	Statewide
Know their rights	75%	88%	91%	90%	87%
Effectively communicate their children's needs	75%	89%	100%	89%	88%
Help their children develop and learn	65%	84%	91%	93%	84%

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 biggest difference was in the 2-3 year age group, which could be due to a number of families going through transition. The families may not have had time to complete the survey or simply forgot in the process of transitioning their child out of Early Intervention.

Age	Family Survey		Child Count		Difference
	#	%	#	%	
Not Reported	7	1%	0	0%	1%
Birth-1	71	11%	185	11%	0%
1-2	173	28%	443	26%	2%
2-3	369	60%	1080	63%	-3%
Total	620	100%	1709	100%	

When comparing the survey responses by age at the time of survey completion, there were similar responses for all 3 age groups by question with very little variance:

Age	#	Know Their Rights	Effectively Communicate their children's Needs	Help Their Children Develop and Learn
Not Reported	7	86%	100%	86%
Birth-1	71	89%	89%	82%
1-2	173	86%	87%	85%
2-3	369	88%	88%	84%
Total	620	87%	88%	84%

Was sampling used? No

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.03%	1.03%	1.03%	1.03%	1.03%	1.03%

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 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	185	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	18,735	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
185	18,735	0.78%	1.03%	0.99%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2013:

- The actual data of 185 infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs is consistent with 618 data submitted.
- Compared to National Data (based on OSEP 2013 data tables):
 - The national average for all states including Washington D.C. is 1.26%. Hawai'i was below the

national average for infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs by 0.27%.

- Hawai'i was ranked 31st, as it served 0.99% (185/18,735) of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2005 data to the FFY 2010 data). OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

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

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.82%	2.82%	2.82%	2.82%	2.82%	3.63%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Refer to Stakeholder Involvement section in the Introduction. The stakeholders recommended that no revisions to targets be made at this time; however, based on OSEP requirements, FFY 2018 target was increased to be higher than the baseline data.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	9/24/2014	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	1,709	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013	12/16/2014	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	55,637	

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,709	55,637	3.42%	2.82%	3.07%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2013:

- The actual data of 1,709 infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs is consistent with 618 data submitted.
- Compared to National Data (based on OSEP 2013 data tables):

- The national average for all states including Washington D.C. is 3.03%. Hawai'i surpassed the national average for infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs by 0.04%.
- Hawai'i was ranked 19th, as it served 3.03% (1,709/55,637) of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State revised its previously established baseline data for this indicator (from the FFY 2005 data to the FFY 2010 data). OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.00%	98.00%	97.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	97.00%	94.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,291	1,839	94.00%	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)	369
--	-----

Explanation of Slippage

Slippage may be due to staff shortages and new staff needing time to familiarize themselves with EI, including administering the evaluation and assessment.

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).

07/01/2013 - 06/30/2014

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 Agency data system for the period 7/1/13 - 6/30/14. 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 2013:

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 Agency data systems for the period 7/1/13 – 6/30/14. The timelines were from the date of referral to the initial IFSP meeting and were based on actual, not an average, number of days. ^{1,658 of}

- 1,839 (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: 369 of the 1,839 (20%) 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:
 - Family cancelled appointment
 - Family schedule conflict
- Program Reasons. 181 of the 1,839 (10%) 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 following are the two predominate program reasons:
 - Late MDEs
 - Program schedule full due to staff shortages
- Identifying Noncompliance. Of the 181 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, 181 (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 181 late IFSPs)		
Range of Days Beyond the Due Date	# of Children	% of Children
1-30 days	101	55.8%
31-60 days	36	19.9%
61-90 days	21	11.6%
> 90 days	23	12.7%

- The state accounted for all instances of noncompliance identified via the EI Agency Database. There were 17 programs serving the 181 children who did not receive an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline.

- 12 of the 17 programs were issued findings in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 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).
- 3 of the 17 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going non-compliance (program did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 data).
- 2 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 the written issuance of findings. The data demonstrates that all infants and toddlers had 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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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	7	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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 (e.g., child specific and up-dated 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 is correctly implementing the requirements at 34 §§ CFR 303.321(e), 303.322(e)(1), and 303.342(a). Programs/Sections with identified noncompliance were required to submit a copy of the signature page of all the Initial IFSPs completed along with the list from the database the includes the 45-day timeline. The Programs/Sections 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 LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

For FFY 2008 through FFY 2013, 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, though 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/Section must immediately correct by completing the initial IFSP, though late and submit a copy of the signature page of the IFSP.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	86.00%	99.00%	97.00%	99.00%	98.00%	99.80%	98.00%	99.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

The alternate data provided is based on not including the following children in the numerator and denominator:

1. Children that exited Part C more than 90 days prior to their third birthday; and
2. Children who had an Initial IFSP fewer than 90 days prior to their third birthday

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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
1,088	1,122	99.00%	100%	96.97%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting

0

Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)

Explanation of Slippage

Slippage may be due to staff vacancies and documentation may not be accurately reflecting the transition discussion/activities that may be happening.

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).

7/01/2013-06/30/2014

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 2013 was collected from the EI Database for the period 7/1/13-6/30/14.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2013:Transition Plan

- 1,088 of 1,122 (97%) 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.
- 34 of the 1,083 (3%) 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 include all the steps and services listed in the IDEA, Part C regulations. Hawai'i requires the Transition Plan to be updated at each IFSP meeting.
- There were 13 programs serving the 34 children who did not have a timely and complete Transition Plan in their IFSP with steps and services.
 - 11 of the 13 programs was issued a finding in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 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).
 - 1 of the 13 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going non-compliance (finding issued in FFY 2010, based on FFY 2009 data).
 - 1 of the 13 programs were not issued a finding because the program submitted required data that was verified by Part C LA to demonstrate correction prior to written issuance of findings. The data demonstrated that all infants and toddlers had a complete transition plan, although late unless the child was no longer under the program's jurisdiction. Up-dated 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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, **not including correction of findings**

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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 (e.g., child specific and up-dated 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 is correctly implementing the requirements of 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 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 exiting Part C). 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 the data submitted by the Program and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

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

For FFY 2008 through FFY 2013, 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.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has

corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.00%	100%	99.00%	91.00%	96.00%	91.00%	92.00%	90.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

The alternate data provided reflects that 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 are not included in the numerator and 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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
818	1,235	90.00%	100%	91.40%

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 2013 Data)

340

Describe the method used to collect these data

Statewide data for the timely Transition Notice for all children who exited Part C in FFY 2012 was collected from the EI Database for the period 7/1/13-6/30/14.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2013:

Transition Notice

Per Hawaii's Department of Education (DOE), "State Educational Agency" (SEA) – is the State agency primarily responsible for the State supervision of the public elementary and secondary schools. In the State of Hawaii, the Hawaii Department of Education is the SEA and the Local Educational Agency (LEA) and functions as a unitary system. DOE requested that the Transition Notice be sent to the home school of the child being referred for FFY 2012 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; hereafter known as LEA. However, effective July 1, 2013, DOE and Part C Early Intervention agreed that the Transition Notice will be sent to the child's home school (LEA) and the SEA 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.

- 818 of 895 (91%) children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B services exited with timely notification to the LEA and SEA. 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 3rd birthday were not included in the calculation.
- **Opt Out Option:** 340 children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B services exited without providing notification to the LEA and SEA 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 are 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:** 77 of 895 (9%) children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B exited without timely notification to the LEA and SEA due to program reasons. It is Hawaii's policy that the transition notice must be sent to the LEA and SEA at least 90 days prior to the child's 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 3rd birthday.
 - Of the 77 children exiting without timely notification to the LEA and SEA, notification was provided to the LEA and SEA for 43 of these children, although untimely; 40 children left the jurisdiction of Part C prior to issuing the notification to the LEA.

Range of Days for Notification to LEA and SEA (For the 77 children that exited without a timely notification to LEA and SEA)		
Range of Days Beyond the Due Date	# of Children	% of Children
1-30 days	32	42%
31-60 days	1	1%
61-90 days	0	0%
>90 days	0	0%
No notice to LEA prior to leaving the jurisdiction of Part C	44	57%

The state accounted for all instances of noncompliance identified via the EI Agency Database. There were 18 programs serving the children who exited Part C with either untimely notification to the LEA and SEA or insufficient documentation that notification to the LEA and SEA was provided.

- o 12 of the 18 programs were issued findings in FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 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).
- o 2 of the 18 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going non-compliance (programs did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2012, based on FFY 2011 data).
- o 10 of the 18 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 transition notices for all infants and toddlers were provided to the LEA and SEA 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 LEA and SEA of all children who are potentially eligible for DOE (100%).

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

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

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	4	1	1

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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 (e.g., child specific and up-dated 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 is correctly implementing the requirements of 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 LEA along with a list from the 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 exiting Part C). 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 the data submitted by the Program and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

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

For FFY 2008 through FFY 2013, the Part C LA verified that each of the EI Programs with findings of noncompliance for not providing timely notification to the LEA and SEA of potentially eligible children for Part B services, all children had a notification to the LEA and SEA, 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 LEA and SEA, 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 to the LEA was sent. It also includes if it was late, how many days late it occurred.

FFY 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The Program is required to submit weekly status reports. The Program receives individualized TA from Part C LA and the Agency has identified a mentor for the Program Manager to help develop and implement program improvement strategies.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets. Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status

of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

--

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	94.00%	96.00%	97.00%	94.00%	93.00%	93.00%	89.00%	88.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

Explanation of Alternate Data

The alternate date provided reflects that children referred fewer than 90 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.

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 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
443	1,208	88.00%	100%	88.43%

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 2013 Data)	681
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)	23

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

07/01/2013- 06/30/2014

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 2013 was collected from the EI Database for the period 7/1/13-6/30/14.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2013:

Transition Conference

- Hawaii's policy is to offer a Transition Conference for all children exiting from Hawaii's Part C program, as they are all potentially eligible for Part B services.
- 466 of 527 (88%) children exiting Part C where the timely transition conference occurred. Children referred fewer than 90 days from their 3rd birthday were not included in the calculation.
- 681 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: 23 of 527 (4%) children exiting Part C did not have a timely Transition Conference due to exceptional family circumstances. They are included in both the above numerator and denominator. The two predominate exceptional family circumstances were:
 - Family did not return calls in a timely manner/unable to contact
 - Family request a date beyond due date
- Program Reasons: 61 of 527 (12%) children exiting Part C did not have a timely Transition Conference due to program reasons. Primarily staff did not document the reason why the transition conference was later.
 - Of the 61 families that did not receive a timely Transition Conference, 10 received a Transition Conference, although untimely and 51 children left the jurisdiction of Part C prior to having a Transition Conference.

Range of Days for the Transition Conference (For the 61 children that exited without a timely Transition Conference)

Range of Days for the Transition Conference (For the 61 children that exited without a timely Transition Conference)		
Range of Days Beyond the Due Date	# of Children	% of Children
1-30 days	8	13%
31-60 days	1	1%
61-90 days	1	1%
No Transition Conference prior to leaving the jurisdiction of Part C	51	85%

- There were 16 programs serving the 61 children who exited Part C with an untimely Transition Conference or having no Transition Conference prior to exiting Part C.
 - 8 of the 16 programs were issued findings in FFY 2014, based on FFY 2013 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).
 - 2 of the 16 programs were not issued a finding due to on-going non-compliance (one program did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2013, based on FFY 2012 data and one program did not demonstrate correction from the finding issued in FFY 2012, based on FFY 2011 data).
 - 6 of the 16 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 demonstrates 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. Up-dated 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 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, not including correction of findings

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	5	0	1

FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with 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 (e.g., child specific and up-dated 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 is correctly implementing the requirements of 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 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 exiting Part C). 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 the data submitted by the Program and ensured that the Program submitted required evidence of correction documentation based on the percentage of noncompliance.

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

For FFY 2008 through FFY 2013, 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 2012 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Any EI Program with on-going noncompliance is required to submit a weekly status report to the Part C LA for all findings that were not corrected within one year of notification. The Program receives individualized TA from Part C LA and two of the Programs' Agency has identified a mentor for the Program Manager to help develop and implement program improvement strategies.

Explanation of Alternate Data

FFY 2011 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The Program submitted required evidence to demonstrate correction. Refer to the above, "FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected," in the section that provides a description of "...how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements" for more information.

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

The Program submitted required evidence to demonstrate correction. Refer to FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected section above for more information.

OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2013 through 2018 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2013, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2014 APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2014 APR, that it has verified that each EIS program with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 and each EIS program or provider with remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2014 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

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	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Not applicable, as Part B due process procedures were not adopted.

Prepopulated Data

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

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
null	null			

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable.

Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

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)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Target ≥								
Data								

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥						

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no mediation requests during FFY 2013.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2014	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2012 Data*	FFY 2013 Target*	FFY 2013 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2012 response table

None

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2012. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Required Actions

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.

Baseline Data

FFY	2013
Data	53.14%

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	53.14%	53.14%	53.14%	54.00%	55.00%

Description of Measure

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

FFY 2013 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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)

OSEP Response

Required Actions

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: Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

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: Patricia Heu, M.D., M.P.H.

Title: Children with Special Health Needs Branch Chief

Email: patricia.heu@doh.hawaii.gov

Phone: 808-733-9058