



Internal/External Reviews

Performance Period April 2009-June 2009

Introduction

During Fiscal Year 2009, complexes deemed to need an Internal or External review according to performance criteria had reviews conducted. This marks the end of the eighth consecutive year of internal implementation of Hawaii's system for examining the performance of local service systems providing services and supports for students with special needs. This report provides data regarding the results of the reviews conducted during the year.

Statewide Findings and Improvements Over Time

Three Complexes conducted External Reviews during Fiscal Year 2009. The three complexes were Maui High, Kaiser, and Baldwin. A total of 41 youth were reviewed using the Coordinated Services Review protocol. Of the total, 29% were attending high school, 24% were in middle school, 39% were in elementary school, and 7% were receiving services through the Early Intervention program. Of the sample 22% received services through Family Guidance Centers. A total of 48 Family Guidance Center, school and community members (including parents) participated in the reviews during the year. Originally, in the Third Quarter report, it was reported that there were 46 participants. Since then, it has been determined that there were an additional two participants from the Maui High and the Kaiser Complexes.

Review Results for the Fiscal Year

In the fiscal year, 100% of the complexes reviewed had acceptable system performance. This is identical to last year when 100% of complexes reviewed were found to have acceptable system performance. Likewise, child status was acceptable for 100% of the complexes reviewed which is the same as last year's results of 100% reviewed having acceptable child status. The goal is that all complexes will achieve the performance goal of 85% of students reviewed having acceptable child status and system performance in the complex review.

FY 2009 n=41
FY 2008 n=66

Test Outcome 1:	Test Outcome 2:	FY 2009 41% (n=100)	FY 2008 97% (n=64)
+ Child + System Performance	- Child + System Performance		
FY 2009 100% (n=41) FY 2008 92% (n=61)	FY 2009 0% (n=0) FY 2008 5% (n=3)		
Test Outcome 3:	Test Outcome 4:		
+ Child - System Performance	- Child - System Performance		
FY 2009 0% (n=0) FY 2008 0% (n=0)	FY 2009 0% (n=0) FY 2008 3% (n=2)		

FY 2009 41%
(n=100)
FY 2008 92%
(n=61)

Table 1. School Year 2008-2009 Internal/External Review Results (Fiscal Year 2009)

Tables 2 and 3 below compare the statewide average scores for each indicator of Child Status and System Performance against the previous five school year's averages. The findings for both child status and system performance at the statewide level are acceptable across all indicators. The data reflect a stable system performing its key functions well. Stability, which was a concern for 22% of youth reviewed last year, has improved statewide, but was still a concern in fourteen of the forty-one complexes, and is low for youth served through the Family Guidance Centers (54% acceptable).

Table 2. School Year 2008-2009 Internal Review Results for Child Status (Fiscal Year 2009)

INDICATORS OF CURRENT CHILD STATUS	STATE AVERAGE SY '03-'04	STATE AVERAGE SY '04-'05	STATE AVERAGE SY '05-'06	STATE AVERAGE SY '06-'07	STATE AVERAGE SY '07-'08	STATE AVERAGE SY '08-'09
Learning Progress	89	90	93	92	93	100
Responsible Behavior	88	87	88	89	88	98
Safety (of the child)	94	94	94	95	97	97
Stability	83	78	85	89	95	93
Physical Well-Being	98	97	98	98	100	97
Emotional Well-Being	92	91	92	94	94	100
Caregiver Functioning	92	91	93	93	94	88
Home Community (LRE)	95	95	93	96	97	95
Satisfaction	93	93	91	91	94	94
OVERALL CHILD STATUS	94	93	92	95	93	100

Table 3. School Year 2008-2009 Internal Review Results for System Performance (Fiscal Year 2009)

INDICATORS OF CURRENT SYSTEM PERFORMANCE	STATE AVERAGE SY '03-'04	STATE AVERAGE SY '04-'05	STATE AVERAGE SY '05-'06	STATE AVERAGE SY '06-'07	STATE AVERAGE SY '07-'08	STATE AVERAGE SY '08-'09
Child/Family Participation	95	95	96	97	96	95
Functioning Service Team	92	94	96	98	98	97
Focal Concerns Identified	90	88	92	96	98	100
Functional Assessments	91	93	95	98	94	100
OVERALL UNDERSTANDING	94	94	97	98	98	100
Focal Concerns Addressed	89	90	95	95	95	97
Long Term Guiding View	87	87	90	94	99	95
Unity of Effort Across Agencies	86	88	92	95	94	100
Individual Design/Good Fit	93	95	95	97	97	100
Contingency Plan (Safety/Health)	92	83	88	91	80	100
OVERALL PLANNING	90	93	94	96	97	100
Resource Availability for Implementation	93	94	97	97	95	100
Timely Implementation	91	92	94	95	96	95
Adequate Service Intensity	90	91	94	93	93	98
Coordination of Services	90	91	93	94	94	100
Caregiver Supports	96	94	97	97	98	100
Urgent Response	94	88	90	92	83	100
OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION	93	93	95	96	97	100
Focal Situation Change	90	91	94	94	96	95
Academic Achievement	87	88	88	92	93	95
Risk Reduction	93	93	92	92	94	100
Successful Transitions	92	93	94	95	93	97
Parent Satisfaction	94	94	93	93	93	97
Problem Solving	87	88	92	94	94	100
OVERALL RESULTS	92	92	94	94	97	97
OVERALL PERFORMANCE	93	94	95	96	97	100

Again, statewide System Performance continued to be strong. Several indicators should be carefully tracked as more than 25% of complexes struggled to meet performance goals. These indicators are in the areas of: Long Term Guiding View; Contingency Planning; Urgent Response; and Academic Achievement. The trend over time shows that overall performance of the system has been improving over the years for youth with special needs.

Complexes' Strengths and Challenges

Trends: (commonality across 2 or more complexes-66 cases were reviewed)

Strengths:

- Students enjoy school; are involved and benefiting from school and extra curricular activities
- Students were making academic progress and progress on their IEPs
- Students were able to identify at least one adult support/mentor
- Students have stable, intact homes
- Students were found to have expressed long term goals
- Team members understand student needs and are addressing them in a timely manner
- There was good communication, collaboration, and planning among team members
- Team members were caring, knowledgeable, and supportive of each other
- School/community resources were being accessed, teams are thinking outside the box
- Related services goals and objectives are incorporated in general and special education settings-integrated model
- Appropriate modifications and accommodations are provided in the general education classroom
- Good communication among team members, various modes are utilized
- Team has a unified long term view and good understanding of where the student is headed
- Transition needs are addressed
- Parents are involved, supportive, and satisfied

Challenges:

- Students with poor attendance rates
- Lack of assessment to support eligibility/needs
- Lack of data collection
- Lack of timely supports
- Fragmented communication-not all are informed, not all share the same level of understanding
- Records are not updated in a timely manner
- Parents lack understanding of the student's situation and disability

Kaiser Complex

Strengths:

- Good working relationships, collaboration, communication, and support among agencies and team members
- Good working relationship between general education and special education teachers
- Timely response from teams to address students needs
- Outstanding post-secondary transition planning and activities started from grade 9
- Good long-term guiding view of students
- Teams supported the students post-high school goals
- Parent were highly satisfied with students progress, supports, and services

- Monitoring of student status directed updating the plans and services
- Teams created their own organizational tools to track and update student status
- Students involved in community activities
- Self-initiated monitoring by students; knew strategies to do well
- Students identified mentor or someone they could go to for help at school
- Involved and supportive parents who followed through on strategies at home that were used in school
- Team members genuinely care about students and help student beyond their job responsibilities and work hours
- Strong Care Coordination
- Students had good attendance and progressing in IEP goals and objectives and coursework
- Students felt safe at and like school
- Accommodations are being provided
- Some students were fully involved in the general education setting

Challenges:

- Limited parent involvement or skills to engage as a team member
- Addressing social skills needs and peer interactions of students
- Students appeared to have sufficient cognitive skills, but are placed in Special Education classes
- Strategies weren't being shared with the home
- Not all team members had a complete understanding of the student

Baldwin Complex

Strengths:

- Good communication and collaboration among team members
- Accommodations and modification are made so that students can be successful
- Parents are involved, supportive, satisfied
- School teams are supportive of each other
- Regular monitoring through progress checks
- Students' report cards reflect that students are progressing in both general ed and special education classes
- As students' needs change the team is addressing those changes with meetings and communication
- Specific needs are identified in the IEP, and being addressed with appropriate services
- FAPE and LRE are appropriately met
- Assessments were conducted for triennial reevaluations
- Students are enjoying school
- Students can identify an adult mentor
- Students who have medical or safety concerns have a crisis plan
- Team members have advocated additional support for families through other agencies
- Transitions (school-to-school, provider-to-provider, special education-to-general education or inclusion) were well-planned
- Team members know and understand student needs and strengths

- Team members sincerely care about the whole student
- Before- and afterschool supports were provided (e.g., morning tutoring)
- Care coordination handled well by Special Education teachers

Challenges:

- Outdated assessments or no assessments sometimes were used to determine eligibility
- Alternate eligibility categories not considered
- Narrow battery of assessments: underutilizing more targeted reading assessments in evaluations
- Eligibility category questionable in some cases
- Parents declining to access outside services, particularly Department of Health
- Communication was fragmented among team members
- Parents do not always have a clear understanding of the processes or their options
- Parents not always fully involved
- Not all documented needs of the student addressed in the IEP (e.g. functional, academic)

Maui High Complex

Strengths:

- Students are making progress
- Team understands strengths and weaknesses
- Supportive and involved parents
- GE & SpEd Teacher collaborate communicate
- Differentiation of curriculum is provided
- Access to GE curriculum through GE and SpEd classes – delivery of inclusion models
- Parent satisfied with services
- General health
- Current IEP/Plans
- Follow up on progress in GE classes
- Study skills support on academic need areas
- Academic intensity
- PLEP includes all pertinent information
- Post secondary goals
- Student's participation in extra-curricular activities
- Continuity of services
- Overall transitions planning
- Attendance
- Teams utilizing peer review to monitor student progress, including other agencies
- Team meetings held to address student's needs
- Strong team communication – formal, informal
- Students were included in the planning
- Team accessing resources outside the school
- Team members felt supported
- Collect data to monitor and adjust services

- Administrative support integral to success of case (staff & student)

Challenges:

- Students behind in reading and math
- Delays in speech and language
- Some services provided not reflected in IEP
- Formalized assessments are outdated
- Planned services are not implemented in a timely manner
- Lack of parental involvement
- Limited extra-curricular activities
- Transition planning
- No monitoring of students in GE classes
- Support do not match student's academic needs
- PLEP does not include all pertinent information (functional performance, parental concerns)

Summary

Based on the scores from the External Reviews conducted over the year, system performance was acceptable for 100% of the complexes reviewed. In the child status domain, 100% were doing well overall. The state continues to demonstrate that on the whole the majority of youths with special needs continue to do well, and consistently receive services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results.