Hawaii 3-5 Transition Task Force  
January 3, 2008, 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.  
Kinau Hale Board Room  
1250 Punchbowl Street

**MINUTES**

**Present:** Arakaki (for Chun-Oakland), Cabral, Chun, Coloma, Fahey, Fuddy, Gentry, Iwamoto, Jackson, Jayne, Kawakami, Medeiros, Mizuno, Parlin

**Absent:** Ban, Barrett, Dela Vega, Farmer, Morita, Murphy, Sheehey, Sinclair, Toiolo, Uehara, Vara

**Facilitator:** Johnson, Shapiro

**Staff:** Baron, Brown, Heu

**Visitors:** Elento, Eller, Farnum, Kei, Kajiwara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TOPIC</strong></th>
<th><strong>DISCUSSION</strong></th>
<th><strong>DECISION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welcome</strong></td>
<td>From Fuddy: Wishing all a Happy New Year and a productive meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductions</strong></td>
<td>Everyone introduced themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Force Legislative Report</strong></td>
<td>Report was distributed. Heu introduced the report. Fuddy said that the Department of Health (DOH) followed the submission schedule to the Governor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Description of Survey/ Process/ Return** | Johnson said that Shapiro has been invaluable in drafting the survey, overseeing the distribution, establishing the database, and completing the analysis. Survey instrument was distributed to meeting participants.  

   Johnson quoted Albert Einstein who said, “Not everything that can be counted counts and not everything that can counts can be counted.” This set the stage for explaining her data results.  

   The initial $120,000 in Act 289 was not released. However, $15,000 in state funds was provided by the DOH (Children with Special Health Needs Branch). Due to limited funds, only a survey was completed.  

   The survey committee developed and implemented the survey. Previous preschool surveys and their results were reviewed. A subcommittee was delegated to develop the survey. IRB approval from UH was obtained.  

   The survey was sent to Special Ed teachers statewide to give to families with whom they work. The teacher response rate was high statewide – Kauai 37.5%, Oahu 50.7%, Hawaii 32.4%, Maui 41.9%, and statewide average 47.1%.  

   The overall response rate back to the Center on Disability Studies (CDS) from families was less than or equal to 64% statewide. Kauai returned more surveys than teachers reported distributing; presumably some teachers distributed surveys but did not report that to CDS. This may also have been the case on other islands, which would decrease the real return rate. Children were ages 3 and 4 years. |
The survey asked families if the child was served by Early Intervention (EI). Data showed that 73% statewide had received EI services, while 27% did not go through EI. It is concerning that a quarter of the children in preschool special education were not identified first by EI.

This survey was higher in response rate than any previous preschool surveys conducted statewide. This survey was intended to be given to all children in Part B. The survey asked parents to indicate the one category which described the child’s needs while in EI. Data showed: 31% speech language delays, 2% health-medical problems, 31% developmentally delayed, 8% autism, and 28% missing data. The age when EI services began averaged 19 months old, the median age was 24 months, and the range was from 0-35 months.

**Summary:**

Response rate was excellent, but it did not reach every child in preschool special ed. The overall impression is that many families were initially leery of transition; but after transition, the large majority of families do not feel that longer EI services, rather than Part B services, would have been best.

Johnson indicated that it is important for children with special needs to be involved with their typically developing peers. More data is needed to further elucidate needs, but additional funding is needed to complete other tasks (see PowerPoint presentation).

Data do not support expanding 3-5 EI services; however, there may be ways that Part C and Part B services could be improved.

Johnson’s recommendations:

1. No change in policy unless we have further study and adequate funding for those expanded services.

2. Ask the Hawaii Early Intervention Coordinating Council (HEICC) to review the data and comments on how EI could be more responsive to family needs.

3. Ask the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) to review data and comments to see how Part B can be more responsive to family needs.

4. Ask the STEPS (Sequenced Transition to Education in the Public Schools) team to work with all parties on the process of improving transition for families.

**Survey Findings**

See PowerPoint slides (distributed at the end of presentation).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Taskforce Discussion of Survey Findings   | Brown asked for clarification on the non-responders. Shapiro said there was a skip pattern included in the survey, so that if a question was not appropriate, the respondent skipped to another question. If a respondent indicated their child did not have EI services, but answered the EI questions anyway, the data entry staff did not record those answers.  

Johnson said her initial impression was that generally people are not as happy on the neighbor islands as Oahu with services or transition. However, no formal analysis of responses by county was done.  

Kawakami would like data in response to question 5 as to whether the family likes services in home because it is a major mandate in Part C. Johnson said that more funding was needed to further analyze these data. Shapiro reported that this analysis has been completed.  

Iwamoto asked if confidentiality will be maintained but with allowing feedback to specific schools to improve services. Johnson said that they will maintain confidentiality and will not release specific information targeting specific schools or principals to protect family privacy.  

Iwamoto asked if EI programs could request that data be made available on their programs. Johnson said that it is not allowed because of confidentiality and IRB (Institutional Review Board) rules. Shapiro said that personally identifiable data cannot be shared because of oversight by the UH IRB.  

Arakaki asked if Johnson’s recommendation not to expand services meant no changes in services. She said no change in the basic policy that Part C ended at age 3, but that DOH and Department of Education (DOE) should look at data and work to improved services and reduce family anxiety around transition.  

Families wanted more opportunities to interact with other families of children with special needs.  

Elento asked if there was any further discussion on transferring funds from DOE to DOH to further serve children with severe delays and continue services in the home. Johnson responded that there was not – the work reported only relates to the information obtained from the survey.  

Gentry would like to look more closely at the percentage of families that would like to continue services in EI. Even if the percentage is low, it probably equates to several hundred children or so statewide.  

Johnson would like Act 289 to continue and the requested tasks completed with additional funding. Out of 14 things that were asked to be done, only the survey was completed.  

Iwamoto would like to see the responses to other answers to the questions, and Johnson said that the additional answers may be included if the DOH would like. Gentry seconded Iwamoto’s request and said that since the... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>survey was completed with public monies, the results should be available to the public.</td>
<td>Elento said that when families don’t think that continuation is possible, they may not write it as an option in response to the survey. She would also like to see more discussion about the high-needs children receiving continued services in the home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnum said that some children did not receive much EI, went into DOE, and thought they got great services. But there was a variation in quality of DOE services.</td>
<td>Eller said that her son who has autism is having great difficulties in transition. She would like to see a specialized smaller program for children 3-5 who need more specialized services than DOE preschool special ed can offer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson says that we need a motion or recommendation to go to the DOH for sending on to the legislature. Members would like to see the next report in draft before sending to the legislature.</td>
<td>Arakaki said that if Johnson’s recommendation is written into the report, then the legislature isn’t going to move on renewing the Act. Mizuno agreed and said that it was very difficult passing this legislation last year, and legislators are not likely to be motivated to do it again if a conclusive recommendation is included in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeiros said that she would like to know why almost 1,500 surveys didn’t get distributed. With the cost to expand EI estimated at $17 million, she would like to address existing funding shortfalls in existing services prior to expanding services.</td>
<td>Coloma said that both the DOH (serving the 0-3 population) and DOE (serving the 3-5) have mechanisms in place to develop and implement appropriate services for children. For the DOE, that process is through the IEP (Individual Education Plan), and the responsibility and accountability of developing appropriate services lies with the IEP team. Flexibility in the delivery of services should be discussed within that process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlin would like to hold DOE accountable to provide appropriate services and make them more flexible to provide some DOE services in the home.</td>
<td>Johnson said there are ways to make EI and DOE to be more accountable for improving services, including improving transition and making special education preschool more inclusive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arakaki said that the $120,000 in funding won’t lapse. Mizuno and Arakaki recommended continuing the study and completing all areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeiros said again that funding is not there for existing services, and that existing funding shortfalls in existing services should be addressed prior to expanding services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlin said that we should maybe focus on specialized services for the small population that needs services outside of DOE’s current structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Recommendations by Task Force to the Legislature** | There was a consensus to continue the Task Force work and request the Governor to release the $120,000 to complete the Task Force activities, as well as recommendations 2, 3, and 4 on the PowerPoint presentation:  

  2. Ask HEICC to review the data and family comments to determine how EI services could be more responsive to family needs.  
  3. Ask SPED Advisory Council to review the data and family comments to determine how preschool services could be more inclusive and responsive to family needs.  
  4. Ask STEPS Team to review the data and continue to work to make the transition process as seamless and supportive of families as possible.  

Add to findings that EI is under funded and not feasible to expand EI until stable funding is secured.  
Report must include a focus on the findings and recommendation of survey results. Also mention that the full $120,000 has not yet been released and most of the duties of the taskforce have therefore not been carried out. | Recommendations per discussion note. |
| **Approval of Survey Report to the Legislature Submission Process** | Consensus approved by Task Force with the understanding that the draft of the report will be submitted to all members of the Task Force for comment prior to submission to the Legislature.  
Draft report to be reviewed by Task Force members. |                                               |
| **Announcement** | Kawakami announced that he’s working with Senators Norman Sakamoto and Suzanne Chun Oakland’s offices and with CDS on a loan forgiveness bill to introduce in the 2008 legislative session that would bring back Speech Language Pathologists, Physical Therapists, and Occupational Therapists in graduate programs on the mainland to work in Hawaii. |                                               |
| **Adjournment** | Meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m. No further meetings are scheduled. |                                               |
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“Not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted.”
Albert Einstein

Work of Survey Committee
- Reviewed all previous preschool surveys and results in Hawai‘i
- Identified items to be included
- Delegated to a sub-committee responsibility for developing survey
- Reviewed drafts by email
- Approved final survey and process
- Obtained IRB approval for survey

Teacher Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O‘ahu</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate for Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Surveys Distributed</th>
<th>Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O‘ahu</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Surveys Returned by whether Served by Early Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Number Surveys for Child Served by EI</th>
<th>Percent Surveys for child Served by EI</th>
<th>Number Surveys for Child not served by EI</th>
<th>Percent Surveys for child not served by EI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaua’i</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’ahu</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O‘ahu</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Island</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total 2005</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total 2006</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total 2007</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ages of the Children

(Birth years)

2003 – 235 (51%)

2004 – 204 (44%)

Description of Child Needs

Speech-Language 142 (31%)
Health-Medical 8 (2%)
Developmental Delay 144 (31%)
Autism 35 (8%)
Missing Data 130 (28%)

Age When Early Intervention Services Began

Average age: 19 months
Median age: 24 months
Range: 0-35 months

Question 6

How did you feel when you learned your child could not have early intervention services after your child's third birthday?
### Comments – Question 6

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>28 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>140 (52%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain/Mixed</td>
<td>99 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sample Positive Comments

- It was fine and worked out well because she got to start the Head Start-DOE.
- I was feeling ok and I was happy she was moving forward to new stage.
- Disappointed at first, but I like the special education program very much.
- Happy because he would start school.
- Transition services provided non-interrupted therapy for my child.

### Sample Negative Comments

- I was disappointed because she only had 6 months of early intervention.
- I was shocked and worried that he might not receive the help he needed.
- I was sad because services were about to end just as he was making progress.
- Wondered why services were limited to 0-3 in age, felt frustrated.

### Question 7

*When your child turned three years old, did you want your child to stay in early intervention longer instead of starting DOE preschool?*

### At age 3 – wanted continued early intervention services

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R:</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### If “yes,” why?

- I was not ready to be without her for 6 hours every day.
- My daughter’s development was only 9 months, she had excellent services and was not ready to transfer, I thought.
- Because I felt early intervention takes more care about my child.
- I felt he was not ready to be in a school setting.
If “no,” why?
- Because he would be around other kids.
- He would receive more hours of learning and therapy and interaction with his peers.
- I felt preschool would help her with speech and socialization.
- I thought he was ready so I’m glad.
- It helps me get a break when he is in school.

Question 8

Now, after your experiences, would you have wanted your child to stay in early intervention longer instead of starting preschool?

Now think staying in early intervention services would have been better:

Yes: 11%
No: 57%
N/R: 31%

If “yes,” why?
- She wasn’t ready, and the school wasn’t ready for her.
- He’s a special case, he needs more services.
- I still feel he is too young to attend an all day, every day program.
- I would still prefer him to start preschool at 4 years and enjoy him at home where young children belong.

If “no,” why?
- Preschool helped her much more because of the everyday reinforcement.
- The DOE teachers are way more proactive and engaged, interested in her.
- He loves school and wants to learn.
- He is learning so much more and in a great atmosphere with other children – he is very happy.

Site of DOE Preschool Services

- DOE Classroom for children with disabilities: 78%
- Head Start or Community Preschool: 17%
- Missing data: 4%
Transition Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had transition conference</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited PS classroom</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations explained</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive IEP meeting</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcomed by DOE staff</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked amount of services</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 12

*Please tell us about the IEP meeting for your child.*

- I went to the meeting and people listened to my ideas. 86%
- I went to the meeting but people did not listen to my ideas. 4%
- I did not go to the meeting. 5%

Sample Positive Comments

- Everyone took me step-by-step, that's great because it makes a nervous parent comfortable, was positive, encouraging.
- Everyone seemed very concerned for my son's needs.
- Everyone was very helpful and made transition go smoothly.
- They showed concern and support.

Sample Negative Comments

- My ideas were seen as coming from a Mom who didn't know what she was talking about.
- I felt insulted.
- The whole transition process was bad, mishandled, the meeting was very tense.
- I felt everyone against me.
- We wanted an inclusion class and there was none available in the complex.

Question 13

*Did you feel welcomed by DOE Staff?*

- Yes: 94%
- No: 2%
- N/R: 4%

Sample Positive Comments

- They were so pleasant and helpful.
- They truly care about the child and family.
- They helped our family and put us at ease.
- Extremely welcomed and satisfied.
- They are great!
- The entire staff were friendly, informative.
- Not only welcoming, but also encouraging.
- DOE staff has been wonderful.
Sample Negative Comments
- The principal and SSC were very rude.
- I had to fight with them for certain services. They wanted to base everything solely on my son’s evaluations with strangers that had seen him once.
- Administration does not make parents feel welcome on campus.
- 1st IEP meeting was overwhelming. DOE staff used lingo, acronyms I was unfamiliar with.

Question 16
Below is a list of some ways DOE preschool may help children and families.
Comments:

Sample Positive Comments
- My child has progressed so much in the past 11 months.
- I like the individualized attention each child receives.
- The change I’ve seen is unbelievable – all the teachers and staff do an amazing job.
- She loves her class and enjoys going to school every day.

Sample Negative Comments
- Families don’t talk much to one another.
- My child needs more services.
- Quality and quantity of services are 50% of EI (0-3). No family involvement.
- Believe my son needs more services, but they are fighting me.
- We would like him to be exposed to other children his age without disabilities.

Question 17
Compared with your feelings when your child started DOE preschool, how do you feel now?

Current Feelings
Less satisfied: 3%
Feelings unchanged: 9%
More satisfied: 84%
No response: 4%
### Sample Positive Comments
- I was nervous about him going to school, but now, I'm so glad he is in school.
- My child is improving and I see that my child enjoys school and other kids.
- I was a little nervous in the beginning, but he loves his school.
- He gets more services through DOE.
- I feel my child will be ready for kindergarten.

### Sample Negative Comments
- Concerned with speech more now than before.
- Need better support for my son with autism. After school care is also needed.
- The teacher is SPED certified, but does not have any ECE credentials. Not the best learning environment for my child.
- I was optimistic at first, but there’s no communication with parents.

### Question 18

*Is there anything else you want to share?*

### Sample Positive Comments
- The DOE teachers and therapists are out of this world – they are just great!
- I really appreciate the amount of communication there is between myself and my son’s teacher – she writes us daily.
- Being in a school for my child is much better because she gets to interact with other children.

### Sample Negative Comments
- I do recommend that our children in 0-3 should continue the program until age 5.
- …even our EI care coordinator did not advocate for him.
- Early intervention needs to be provided in private preschools to encourage inclusion.
- I would like to see more screening of preschool teachers.
- Why doesn’t DOE have after school care for preschoolers with special needs?

### Summary
- The response rate was excellent in terms of the number of surveys distributed.
- However, for reasons that are not clear, the responses probably represent less than one-fourth of the number of children enrolled in preschool special education.
- Families feel strongly about the issues as evidenced by the great many comments.
What was counted…
- Families are initially apprehensive about the transition to DOE preschool.
- But at age three, less than one-fourth of the families wanted more early intervention services.
- Then, after experiencing DOE preschool, a majority of families do not think further early intervention services would have been better for their child.

What wasn’t counted …
- How the other three-fourths of families might feel.
- Whether all families understand the importance of inclusion for young children with disabilities.
- Data on the small percentage of families who felt their child would benefit from a longer transition period with continued Part C services – and how they would “benefit.”

No data are available…
- On the number of Part C/Part B-eligible children who may benefit from a longer transition period with continued early intervention services.
- On the number of Part C/Part B non-eligible children who still may benefit from early intervention services.
- On the number of non-Part C children ages 3-5 who might benefit from early intervention services.

Summary Statements
- Resources were inadequate to complete the work outlined for the Task Force.
- However, the work completed provides valuable information for policy formation.
- Available data do not support a change in policy regarding provision of services to preschool children with disabilities.
- Available data do suggest significant areas for improvement in early intervention and preschool special education.

Recommendations
1. Make no changes in current policy unless there is significant further study and adequate funding to support any changes in policy.

Recommendations
2. Ask the Early Intervention Coordinating Council to review the data and family comments to determine how early intervention services could be more responsive to family needs.
Recommendations

3. Ask the Special Education Advisory Council to review the data and family comments to determine how preschool services could be more inclusive and responsive to family needs.

Recommendations

4. Ask the STEPS Team to review the data and continue to work to make the transition process as seamless and supportive of families as possible.

Final Message

Blend the skepticism of a scientist, With the passions of an advocate, The pragmatism of a policy maker The creativity of a practitioner, And the devotion of a parent, To create a decent quality of life for all children with disabilities.

www.cds.hawaii.edu/3to5

- Task Force Members
- Information on all meetings
- Copies of all presentations
- Resource materials