

Self-Assessment: Focused Monitoring Implementation Checklist (FMIC)

REVISED MARCH 2005

Purpose

The Focused Monitoring Implementation Checklist is a means by which states/lead agencies and local programs/districts can assess

- the comprehensiveness of their data system and activities,
- the involvement and participation of stakeholders in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the monitoring system, and
- the monitoring procedures within a focused monitoring process.

Assumptions

To have a viable, useful, and effective focused monitoring system, states/lead agencies and local programs/districts must be able to collect, examine, evaluate, and report data at the child/student level. States/lead agencies and local programs/districts must involve and actively seek participation from persons who represent the diverse interests involved in ensuring that *IDEA* is being effectively implemented to produce results for children/students and compliance with legal and regulatory requirements in the evaluation of data and designation of priorities.

States/lead agencies and local programs/districts must use monitoring procedures that focus attention on specific areas of program performance that can be related to federal/state compliance as identified through an analysis of data. Monitoring procedures are to include reviews of data, determinations of specific indicators of compliance/noncompliance, data analysis, comparison, hypothesis development, on-site visitations/investigations, reporting, along with planning for corrective actions and feedback to produce results for children and youth and compliance.

The FMIC provides a general overview of the state or local program in the areas of

- data collection, analysis, reporting, and use;
- stakeholder involvement and participation;
- monitoring procedures; and
- feedback for improvement, and correction.

The FMIC is to be used as a starting point for identifying the state/lead agency and the local program/district need for technical assistance on focused monitoring. Additional, directed questions related to focused monitoring are used in assisting the state/lead agency and the local program/district in identifying specific needs. From the needs or concerns information gathered, desired results can be framed and used in the cooperative development of work plans aimed at meeting the identified needs.

SELF-ASSESSMENT: FOCUSED MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST

Part C Part B

Contact name: _____

Completion date: _____

Agency name: _____

Contact email: _____

1: Data System

	ANSWER: Yes or No	Comments/Notes
1.1 Data: Collection		
1.1.1. Is there an individual child/student record database system which includes children a) Birth through 2 years of age? b) 3 through 5 years of age? c) 6 through 21 years of age?		
1.1.2. Are individual child/student data in this system updated at least quarterly?		
1.1.3. Does this system maintain historical data?		
1.1.4. Does this system a) interface or communicate with other systems within the state/lead agency? b) interface or communicate with other systems across agencies? c) eliminate most paper reporting?		
1.1.5 Does the state/lead agency have a systematic method to collect data regarding a) family involvement? b) family perspectives?		
1.2 Data: Compilation and Reporting		
1.2.1. Are a) routine reports generated? b) ad hoc reports possible?		
1.2.2. Are local program or district profiles or report cards with data about IDEA a) disseminated to the programs/districts at least annually? b) made available to the public through print or electronic publication?		
1.2.3. Are aggregated data available for export?		
1.3 Data: Verification and Improvement		
1.3.1. Is verification conducted annually for randomly selected data?		

	ANSWER: Yes or No	Comments/Notes
1.3.2. Are data calculation methods evaluated?		
1.3.3. Is there a plan in place specifying a) regular reviews to the data system? b) regular updates to the data system?		
1.4 Data: Decision Making		
1.4.1. Are data analyzed to evaluate the status of services for children in the state?		
1.4.2. Are data analyzed to determine the progress students are making? (Part B only)		
1.4.3. Are data analyzed to determine progress toward priority goals?		
1.4.2. Are data trends examined at the a) state level? b) local program/district level?		
1.4.3. Are local program/district data compared to data in similar programs/districts to identify similarities or differences?		

2: Stakeholder Process

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
2.1 Stakeholder Process		
2.1.1. Does the Monitoring Stakeholder Group include a) parents? b) advocates? c) service providers/coordinators/educators? d) individuals with disabilities? e) parent organizations? f) advocacy organizations? g) policy makers?		
2.1.2. Does the Monitoring Stakeholder Group meet at least annually?		
2.1.3. Does the Monitoring Stakeholder Group a.1. determine priority goals for state-wide performance improvement in early intervention/special education? OR a.2 participate in the determination of priority goals for state-wide performance improvement in early intervention/special education? b.1 designate indicators of each goal? OR b.2 participate in the designation of indicators of each goal?		

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
<p>c.1 designate targets for each goal? OR c.2 participate in the designation of targets for each goal?</p> <p>d.1 designate a trigger for each goal? OR d.2 participate in the designation of triggers for each goal?</p> <p>e. identify indicators for selection for on-site monitoring? f. reconsider/review selection indicators annually?</p>		

3: Organizational Structure for Focused Monitoring

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
3.1 Focused Monitoring Procedures		
3.1.1. Are local programs/districts ranked on selection indicators?		
3.1.2. Is local program/district selection for on-site monitoring based on performance on the selection indicators?		
3.1.3. Do standards exist to determine compliance for each goal?		
3.1.4. Do protocols (objective measures) evaluating the extent of compliance for each selection indicator exist?		
3.1.5. Are local programs/districts not selected for on-site monitoring, monitored for Continuous Improvement?		
3.1.6. Is the monitoring process integrated into other state/lead agency administrative supervision components?		

4: Focused Monitoring of Agencies

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
4.1 Team Composition/Training		
<p>4.1.1. Does the On-Site Monitoring Team include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) parents? b) local program/district personnel? c) peers from other local programs/districts? d) state/lead agency personnel? 		

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
4.1.2. Is there annual training for On-Site Monitoring Team members?		
4.1.3. Is the reliability of On-Site Monitoring Team members' ratings examined?		
4.2 Site Visit Activities		
4.2.1. Is there a pre-visit examination of the selected local program/district to examine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) data in addition to that for selection? b) the program/district Self-Assessment or Self-Review documents? <i>(NA if not available)</i> c) parent/family participation and involvement? d) complaints/previous monitoring information? e) performance data from general education(such as the achievement of typical peers)? <i>(Part B only)</i> 		
4.2.2. Does the On-Site visit focus on areas specific to the indicator on which the local program/district was selected?		
4.2.3. Does the on-site visit include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) an open meeting or focus group with parents? b) a focus group with students? <i>(Part B only)</i> c) interviews with individual parents? d) analysis of parent survey data? <i>(NA if not available)</i> e) Interviews with graduates or exiters or with their parents? 		
4.3 Reporting and Follow-up		
4.3.1. Is a post-staffing meeting conducted with the On-Site Monitoring Team?		
4.3.2. Does the state/lead agency have prescribed timelines for report dissemination?		
4.3.3. Is the written report issued by the state/lead agency within prescribed timelines?		
4.3.4. Does the state/lead agency report on the timeliness of report dissemination?		
4.3.5. Are written monitoring reports available to the public through print or electronic publication?		
4.3.6. Do corrective actions have <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) measurable results directly related to noncompliant areas? b) timelines for completion established? c) connections to changes in child/student/family results data? 		
4.3.7. Are technical assistance needs incorporated into local agency corrective action plan?		
4.3.8 Is technical assistance available in all known areas of noncompliance?		

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
4.3.9. Is corrective action follow-up tracked to ensure progress toward correction?		
4.3.10. Is an on-site follow-up conducted to verify results?		
4.3.11. Are the results of the corrective action plan verified?		

5: Incentive and Sanction Process

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
5.1 Incentives		
5.1.1. Are incentives included for improvement of performance on priority goals?		
5.1.2. Have incentives been implemented as part of the focused monitoring process?		
5.1.3 Has the effectiveness of various incentives been evaluated?		
5.2 Sanctions		
5.2.1. Do explicit written procedures exist regarding the imposition of sanctions?		
5.2.2. Does a range of sanctions exist for violations?		
5.2.3. Have sanctions been applied according to the written procedures?		
5.2.4. Has the effectiveness of various sanctions been evaluated?		

6: Enhancement of Focused Monitoring

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Comments/Notes
6.1 Research and Evaluation		
6.1.1. Is an independent or third party evaluation of the monitoring system conducted at least biannually?		
6.1.2. Are the results of the independent or third party evaluation used to make changes in focused monitoring system/processes?		
6.1.3. Are studies conducted to determine effectiveness of separate focused monitoring components?		

Preparation of this tool was supported by a grant (H326Y02001) from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Office of Special Education Programs. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or opinions of the U.S. Department of Education or offices within it.

DEFINITIONS¹:

Baseline - Starting point or initial level of the goal's indicator measure against which future levels will be compared. A baseline may be a single data point, or a set of measures over time. (See definition of "trend" below.)

Data Analysis - Comparing present levels of system performance to baseline & targets in order to draw conclusions, identify strengths & weaknesses & areas for improvement by systematically examining why levels of performance were or were not reached.

Goal - Statement of the measurable condition(s) desired for the population of children with disabilities.

Hypothesis – an "educated guess" of causes of events or observed data based on an analysis of specific data

Indicator - Statement that helps quantify the goal and signals whether the goal is being achieved. There may be multiple indicators for a single goal. OSEP has issue the State Performance Plan document that delineates 19 indicators related to Part B Priority areas (see definition below) and ___ indicators related to Part C Priority areas.

Progress - Performance that exceeds baseline and is in the direction of the target.

Priority areas – key elements of the *IDEA*. These include:

Part B:

- 1) Effective State Supervision
 - a) Child Find
 - b) Dispute resolution and monitoring
 - c) Public Input
- 2) Meaningful and Effective Family Involvement
- 3) Development and Performance of Outcomes for Children, and Youth with Disabilities
- 4) Inclusion of Children, and Youth with Disabilities in Typical Community and School Settings with their Non-disabled Peers with Needed Supports
- 5) Effective Transitions:
 - a) for Infants and Toddlers, with Disabilities to Preschool
 - b) for Children and Youth with Disabilities to Adult Life

¹ Where applicable, definitions of terms as proposed by the Performance Measurement Workgroup in the Drafts (Parts C/B) of 4/20/2004 are used or adapted.

- 6) Enhanced Social, Emotional and Academic Development for Children and Youth with Disabilities through the use of positive behavior supports and strategies and improved school climate.

Part C:

- 1) Effective State Supervision
Child Find - All eligible infants and toddlers are appropriately identified
- 2) Meaningful and Effective Family Involvement
- 3) Development and Performance of Outcomes for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families
- 4) Embedding Early Intervention Services in Families' Daily Routines and Typically Occurring Community Activities
- 5) Effective Transitions for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities—Transition to Part B

Target - The desired level of each indicator to be reached within a time period. A target may be long or short term.

Trend - A summary of past performance over time that may be used to display progress toward a goal, maintenance and/or compliance.

Trigger - The numeric or other point at which something a predetermined action is taken.

Technical Assistance Work Plan Development

The State/Local program personnel and Center staff jointly develop work plans that include

- a. Description of need(s)/concern(s)
- b. Prioritization of these need(s)/concern(s)
- c. Statements of the desired results
- d. Statements of how the accomplishment of the desired results will be observed/measured
- e. Follow up evaluation includes
 - i. Annual re-administration of self-assessment FMIC (14 to 18 months after implementation of the work plan)
 - ii. Evaluation of progress and accomplishments

A format similar to the one below will be used.

National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring Work Plan

State/District: _____

Date Developed: _____ Date for Review: _____

Description of Concern/Need:		Priority Ranking:
Desired Results:	Data/Information Sources & Description:	
Measurement of Results:	Measurement Review Dates:	

Work Plan Developers:

Names: _____ Titles/Agencies: _____