

2021 OSEP Determination

Monitoring and Compliance Branch
SEAC Meeting
August 13, 2021



Today's Objectives

Participants will learn:

- Hawaii's Determination in the Results-Driven Accountability Matrix (RDA Matrix)
- How Determinations are Made
 - The elements included in the Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) State Determination
 - How the rating of a State is determined



Resources for Today's Presentation



- IDEA Part B Reports & Resources
 - Hawaii's Determination
 - RDA Matrix
 - How the Department Made Determinations
- 2021 Determination Letters on State Implementation of IDEA June 24, 2021 Fact Sheet

Hawaii's 2021 Determination

IDEA Part B Reports & Resources

In accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as amended in 2004, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires public reporting of all data submitted under Section 618. These reports are used to ensure implementation of programs designed to improve results for children and youth with disabilities.

SHARE THIS:  

State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) requires each state to develop a state performance plan/annual performance report (SPP/APR) that evaluates the state's efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of the IDEA and describes how the state will improve its implementation. A state is required to submit a state performance plan (SPP) at least every six years. Each year, states must report against the targets in its SPP in an annual performance report (APR). The Annual Performance Report includes targets and data for 17 indicators. The Hawaii Department of Education worked with Hawaii's State advisory panel, Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) to establish measurable and rigorous annual performance targets.

[2019-20 Annual Performance Report](#) (click to download)

[2018-19 Annual Performance Report](#) (click to download)

State Determination

Section 616(d) of the IDEA requires the USDOE/OSEP to review each state's APR annually. Based on the information provided in the APR, information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information, on June 25, 2020, the USDOE/OSEP issued State Determinations for 2020 SPP/APR.

- [Hawaii's Determination 2021](#)
- [Hawaii's Determination 2020](#)



How Does OSEP Hold States Accountable?

- OSEP holds States accountable for:
 - Compliance-related requirements of IDEA; and
 - Improved outcomes for children with disabilities (Results).

Thus, the primary focus of the State's monitoring activities must be on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and ensuring that States meet the program requirements under Part B of the Act, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.

- A State's determination is based on the data reflected in the State's Results-Driven Accountability Matrix (RDA Matrix).



How Does OSEP Hold States Accountable?

State Determination

- Every year, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) provides states with a **State Determination** on their performance relating to the State's implementation of the requirements of Individual with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA).



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

June 24, 2021

Honorable Christina Kishimoto
Superintendent
Hawaii Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, Hawaii 96804

Dear Superintendent Kishimoto:

I am writing to advise you of the U. S. Department of Education's (Department) 2021 determination under section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Hawaii **needs assistance** in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of the State's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2019 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.



Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

The RDA Determination is defined as:

Meets Requirements

A State's 2020 RDA Determination is Meet Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%.

Needs Assistance

A State's 2020 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%.

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination¹

Percentage (%)	Determination
64.38	Needs Assistance

Needs Intervention

A State's 2020 RDA Determination is Needs Intervention if the RDA Percentage is less than 60%.

Needs Substantial Intervention

The USDOE did not make a determination of Needs Substantial Intervention for any State in 2021 due solely to data impacted by COVID-19.



Hawaii's Rating Compared to Other States

Hawaii was 1 of 28 States to receive a *Needs Assistance* Determination for two or more consecutive years.

2021 Determination Letters on State Implementation of IDEA
June 24, 2021 Fact Sheet



IDEA PART B DETERMINATIONS

Following is a list of each State's performance in meeting the requirements of IDEA Part B, which serves students with disabilities, ages 3 through 21:

MEETS REQUIREMENTS

Connecticut	Minnesota	Republic of the Marshall Islands
Florida	Missouri	South Dakota
Illinois	Nebraska	Tennessee
Indiana	New Hampshire	Utah
Kansas	New Jersey	Virginia
Kentucky	North Dakota	Wisconsin
Maine	Oklahoma	Wyoming
Massachusetts	Pennsylvania	

NEEDS ASSISTANCE (one year)

Arkansas	North Carolina	Vermont
Bureau of Indian Education	New York	West Virginia
Georgia	Palau	
	Virgin Islands	

NEEDS ASSISTANCE (two or more consecutive years)

Alabama	Federated States of Micronesia	Montana
Alaska	Guam	New Mexico
American Samoa	Hawaii	Nevada
Arizona	Iowa	Ohio
California	Idaho	Oregon
Colorado	Louisiana	Puerto Rico
Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands	Maryland	Rhode Island
Delaware	Michigan	South Carolina
District of Columbia	Mississippi	Texas
		Washington

NEEDS INTERVENTION

Scoring of Results Elements Reading Assessment

Results Elements	RDA Score= 0	RDA Score= 1	RDA Score= 2
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessments (reading and math, separately)	<80	80-89	>=90
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<23	23-27	>=28
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<27	27-31	>=32
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<40	40-46	>=47
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<20	20-27	>=28

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	14	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	21	0
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	90	1



Scoring of Results Elements Math Assessment

Results Elements	RDA Score= 0	RDA Score= 1	RDA Score= 2
Participation Rate of 4th and 8th Grade CWD on Regular Statewide Assessments (reading and math, separately)	<80	80-89	>=90
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<23	23-27	>=28
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on reading NAEP	<27	27-31	>=32
Percentage of 4th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<40	40-46	>=47
Percentage of 8th grade CWD scoring Basic or above on math NAEP	<20	20-27	>=28

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	N/A	N/A
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	29	0
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	15	0
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	86	1



Scoring of Results Elements

Graduation and Dropout

Results Elements	RDA Score= 0	RDA Score= 1	RDA Score= 2
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Graduating with a Regular High School Diploma	<70	70-78	>=79
Percentage of CWD Exiting School by Dropping Out	>21	21-14	<=13

Exiting Data Elements

Exiting Data Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out	12	2
Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma ¹	73	1



Scoring of Compliance Elements

Hawaii Determination			
Part B Compliance Elements	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion	0	NA	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification	0	NA	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0	NA	2

OSEP Scoring		
Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
<p>The indicator data were valid and reliable and at least 95% compliance (or no greater than 5% compliance)</p> <p>or</p> <p>Valid and reliable data and at least 95% compliance (or no great than 10% compliance)</p>	<p>The indicator data were valid and reliable and at least 75% compliance (or no greater than 25% compliance)</p> <p>and</p> <p>The state did not meet either of the criteria for 2 points</p>	<p>The indicator data reflects less than 75% compliance (or greater than 25% compliance)</p> <p>or</p> <p>Not valid and reliable data</p> <p>or</p> <p>Did not report FFY 2019 data</p>



Scoring of Compliance Elements

Hawaii Determination			
Part B Compliance Elements	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018	Score
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	92.52	Yes	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	85.86	Yes	1
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	13.57	Yes	0

OSEP Scoring		
Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
<p>The indicator data were valid and reliable and at least 95% compliance (or no greater than 5% compliance)</p> <p>or</p> <p>Valid and reliable data and at least 95% compliance (or no great than 10% compliance)</p>	<p>The indicator data were valid and reliable and at least 75% compliance (or no greater than 25% compliance)</p> <p>and</p> <p>The state did not meet either of the criteria for 2 points</p>	<p>The indicator data reflects less than 75% compliance (or greater than 25% compliance)</p> <p>or</p> <p>Not valid and reliable data</p> <p>or</p> <p>Did not report FFY 2019 data</p>



Scoring of Compliance Elements

Hawaii Determination			
Part B Compliance Elements	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017	Score
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	97.25		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	100		2
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Special Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

OSEP Scoring - Timely and Accurate Data		
Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
At least 95% compliance	At least 75% compliance and less than 95% compliance	Less than 75% compliance

OSEP Scoring - Timely State Complaint Decisions & Due Process Hearing Decisions		
Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
Valid and reliable data and at least 95% compliance	At least 75% compliance and less than 95% compliance	Less than 75% compliance

OSEP Scoring - Noncompliance		
Score 2	Score 1	Score 0
<p>No remaining findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016 or earlier</p> <p>No specific conditions on its FFY 2019 grant award</p>	<p>Has remaining findings (2014, 2015, 2016) for which State has not yet demonstrated correction or</p> <p>Specific conditions have been imposed on FFY 2019 grant award and are in effect</p>	<p>Has remaining findings (2013 or earlier) for which State has not yet demonstrated correction or</p> <p>Specific Conditions have been imposed on the last 3 grant awards and are in effect</p>



Stakeholder Engagement Upcoming Meeting

Friday, September 10, 2021

- Indicator 7 - Preschool Outcomes
- Indicator 8 - Parent Involvement

