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Purpose of Act 289

To study the feasibility of expanding eligibility, pursuant to Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, for services from the Department of Health’s Early Intervention Section to children between 3 and 5 years old who have developmental disabilities.
“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
<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>
## Return Rate for Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Surveys Distributed</th>
<th>SurveysReturned</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>
Ages of the Children

(Birth years)

2003 – 235 (51%)

2004 – 204 (44%)
### Description of Child Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Language</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-Medical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Delay</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age When Early Intervention Services Began

Average age: 19 months
Median age: 24 months
Range: 0-35 months
How did you feel when you learned your child could not have early intervention services after your child’s third birthday?
Comments – Question 6

Positive: 28 (10%)
Negative: 140 (52%)
Uncertain/Mixed: 99 (37%)
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

Yes: 22%
No: 46%
N/R: 31%
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%
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%
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.
Recommendation from Study Authors

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

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.
www.cds.hawaii.edu/3to5

- Task Force Members
- Information on all meetings
- Copies of all presentations
- Resource materials
II.
Independent Study on Part C Option

- 32 states did not give specific reasons
- 9 states indicated lack of funding as primary reason for not considering Part C option
- Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, Massachusetts, Washington
Oklahoma made attempt at proposing to state legislature but proposal was declined.

New Mexico waiting for final regulations to be released and then apply for Part C option because already giving families the option to remain in EI until the next school year.

Oregon, Pennsylvania & Wyoming – Part C Option is relatively irrelevant because EI is already serving children from birth to five or school age programs.
Vermont expressing interest in the Part C option.