

GENERAL SUPERVISION OF IDEA: MEASURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A STATE'S ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

Purpose

This checklist is a means by which states and lead agencies can assess comprehensiveness of their system of general supervision [Section 616(a)(1)].

Components include

- capacity of the state and/or lead agency,
- involvement of stakeholders,
- data collection, analysis and reporting mechanisms,,
- monitoring activities at the state/lead agency level and on-site,
- corrective action and sanction process,
- improvement activities and incentives, and
- research and evaluation.

Assumptions

To have a viable, useful, and effective system of general supervision that focuses on “(A) on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; (B) ensuring that States meet the program requirements under this part, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities” Section 616(a)(2)]

States and lead agencies must

- be able to collect, examine, evaluate, and report data at the child/student level.
- involve and actively seek participation from persons who have a stake in results for children/students and compliance with legal and regulatory requirements in the evaluation of data and designation of priorities.
- use monitoring procedures that focus attention on specific areas of program performance related to federal/state compliance and improved results as identified through an analysis of data.
- identify and promote improved performance, including the use of incentives.
- require correction of noncompliance through local corrective actions and sanctions.

The checklist can be used to determine state/lead agency needs for technical assistance to implement focused monitoring.

NOTE: items of the checklist that are in **bold** were identified as essential according to the Focused Monitoring Implementation Checklist (2003) as approved by the NCSEAM Advisory Board.

GENERAL SUPERVISION OF IDEA: MEASURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A STATE'S ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

Part C Part B

Contact name: _____ Completion date: _____

Agency name: _____ Contact email: ____

1: Components of General Supervision

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Descriptions
1.1. Do state <i>statutes and regulations</i> support the implementation of IDEA?		
1.2. Does the state ensure local <i>policies and procedures</i> are in accordance with statutes and regulations?		
1.3. Does the state use a <i>stakeholder</i> group to guide general supervision?		
1.4. Are <i>data</i> collected, examined, and analyzed to inform general supervision?		
1.5. Does the state have methods for <i>monitoring</i> every program/district every year?		
1.6. Does the state have methods that ensure <i>correction</i> of noncompliance within a year?		
1.7. Does the state use <i>targeted technical assistance</i> to improve performance of children and youth with disabilities?		
1.8. Does the state use <i>targeted professional development activities</i> to improve performance of children and youth with disabilities?		
1.9. Does the state have a method for using <i>dispute resolution</i> information in monitoring activities?		
1.10. Do <i>interagency agreements</i> exist that support identification and correction of noncompliance?		
1.11. Does the state have <i>enforcement</i> mechanisms to ensure correction when noncompliance is not corrected within a year?		
1.12. Does the state have a method for using information related to child/student outcomes/results in general supervision?		
1.13. Does the state have a method for using information related to family involvement in general supervision? (<i>Part B</i>)		
1.14. Does the state have a method for using information related to family outcomes in general supervision? (<i>Part C</i>)		
1.15. Does the state have a process for integrating all of the components of general supervision to identify noncompliance and improve results?		

2. State Capacity

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
2.1. Is the leadership <u>above</u> the level of special education director/Part C coordinator involved in the planning of monitoring?		
2.2. Is the leadership <u>above</u> the level of special education director/Part C coordinator involved in the evaluation of monitoring?		
2.3. Is the special education director/supervisor or Part C coordinator involved in the planning of monitoring?		
2.4. Is the special education director/supervisor or Part C coordinator involved in the evaluation of monitoring?		
2.5. Is the special education director/supervisor or Part C coordinator involved in the implementation of monitoring activities?		
2.6. Does the special education director/supervisor or Part C coordinator have the ability to shift staff and staff roles/responsibilities within the special education organizational unit?		
2.7. Does the special education director/supervisor or Part C coordinator have the ability to shift monetary resources within the special education organizational unit?		
2.8. Does the special education director/supervisor or Part C coordinator have the capacity to draw on resources outside the special education organizational unit within the state agency?		
2.9. Does the special education director/supervisor or Part C coordinator have the capacity to draw on resources outside the state agency?		

3: Stakeholder Involvement

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
3.1. Does the Stakeholder Group include a) parents? b) advocates? c) service providers/service coordinators/special educators? d) general educators/regular early childhood? e) individuals with disabilities? f) parent organizations? g) advocacy organizations? h) policymakers? i) state education/lead agency personnel?		
3.2. Does the Stakeholder Group meet at least annually?		

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
3.3. Does the Stakeholder Group a) participate in setting of rigorous targets for each SPP indicator? b) identify indicators for selection of programs/districts for on-site monitoring? c) review the evaluative data on the state's performance on achievement of State Performance Plan targets? d) review the process from the on-site focused monitoring? e) review the results from the monitoring activities? f) reconsider/review annually selection indicators for on-site monitoring?		

4: Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting

	ANSWER: Yes or No	Description
4.1 Data: Collection and Examination		
4.1.1. Is there a statewide individual child/student record database system?		
4.1.2. Are individual child/student data in the system updated at least quarterly?		
4.1.3. Does the system maintain historical data for each child/student?		
4.1.4. Does this system a) interface or communicate with other databases or systems within the state/lead agency? b) interface or communicate with other systems across agencies?		
4.1.5 Does this system eliminate most paper reporting?		
4.1.6. Are state level a) routine reports generated? b) ad hoc reports possible?		
4.1.7. Are district/program level a) routine reports generated? b) ad hoc reports possible?		
4.1.8 Are aggregated data available for export?		
4.2 Data: Analysis and Reporting		
4.2.1. Are data trends examined at the a) state level? b) local program/district level?		

	ANSWER: Yes or No	Description
4.2.2. Are data on local programs or districts compared to the rigorous targets of State Performance Plan?		
4.2.3 Are data analyzed to determine the progress children/students are making? (Part C-indicator 2; Part B-indicator 3)		
4.2.4. Are local program/district data compared to data in similar programs/districts to identify similarities or differences?		
4.2.5. Are local program or district profiles or report cards with data about IDEA a) disseminated to the programs/districts at least annually? b) made publicly available through print or electronic means?		
4.2.6. Are the district profiles/report cards included with or linked to the NCLB district report? (<i>Part B only</i>)		
4.3 Data: Verification		
4.3.1. Is there a state data system plan in place that specifies when regular a) reviews of the system will occur? b) updates to the system occur?		
4.3.2. Are there electronic edits to check that data are entered according to the definitions established by the state?		
4.3.2. Is verification of the accuracy of the data submitted by programs/local districts conducted annually for selected data?		

5: Monitoring for General Supervision

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
5.1 State Level Activities		
5.1.1. Are local programs/districts ranked on performance indicators (e.g., SPP)?		
5.1.2. Does the state annually review data or documents of local programs/districts, including a) complaints? b) previous monitoring information?		
5.1.3. Are local programs/districts not selected for on-site monitoring, monitored for requirements under IDEA?		
5.1.4. Are local programs/districts not selected for on-site monitoring, monitored for Continuous Improvement?		
5.2 On-Site Activities: Selection		
5.2.1. Are local programs/districts ranked on selection indicators?		

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
5.2.2. Is local program/district selection for on-site monitoring based on performance on the selection indicators?		
5.3 On-Site Activities: Teams		
5.3.1. Does the On-Site Monitoring Team include a) parents? b) local program/district personnel? c) peers from other local programs/districts? d) state/lead agency personnel?		
5.3.2. Is there annual training for On-Site Monitoring Team members?		
5.3.3. Is the reliability of On-Site Monitoring Team members' ratings on record reviews examined?		
5.4 On-Site Activities: Preparation		
5.4.1. Is there a pre-visit examination of the selected local program/district to examine data related to selection indicator, including a) the program/district Self-Assessment or Self-Review documents? (NA if not available) b) parent/family participation and involvement? c) complaints? d) previous monitoring reports?		
5.4.2. Are preliminary hypotheses of noncompliance/reasons for low performance developed based on the data reviewed?		
5.4.3. Do written standards (level of evidence) exist to determine compliance for requirements related to each selection indicator?		
5.4.4. Do protocols (objective measures) exist that determine a. the extent of compliance for each selection indicator? b. the opportunities for improvement for each selection indicator?		
5.5 On-Site Activities: Visit		
5.5.1 Does the On-Site visit focus on areas specific to the indicator on which the local program/district was selected?		
5.5.2. Does the on-site methodology include, but is not restricted to, hypotheses testing based on preliminary hypotheses?		
5.5.3. Does the on-site visit include a) an open meeting or focus group with parents? b) a focus group with students? (Part B only) c) interviews with individual parents? d) interviews with program staff? e) reviews of files and/or written documentation? f) analysis of parent survey data? (NA if not available) g) interviews with graduates or exiters or with their parents?		

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
5.6 Reporting		
5.6.1 Is a final team meeting conducted with the On-Site Monitoring Team to ensure team consensus on findings?		
5.6.2. Does the state/lead agency have prescribed timelines for report dissemination?		
5.6.3. Is the written report issued by the state/lead agency within prescribed timelines?		
5.6.4. Does the state/lead agency report on the timeliness of report dissemination?		
5.6.5. Are written monitoring reports made publicly available through print or electronic means?		

6. Correction and Sanctions

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
6.1. Corrective Actions		
6.1.1. Does the state/lead agency have prescribed timelines for approval of corrective action plans?		
6.1.2. Is technical assistance provided to districts/programs in the development of local agency corrective action plans?		
6.1.3. Do corrective action plans identify <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) measurable, sequential activities that directly relate to the noncompliant areas that will result in correction (<u>evidence of correction</u>)? b) measurable, sequential activities directly related to the required evidence of improvement in the district/program's performance on the indicator (<u>evidence of improvement</u>)? c) specific timelines for completion/correction of compliance? d) persons responsible for implementing activities? e) persons responsible for supervising activities? f) why each activity will enable the district/program to meet the required evidence of correction and improvement? g) deliverables that will result from the activity? h) strategies the district/program will use to measure progress and to determine the activities are effective in meeting the required evidence of change and correction? i) resources that will be used to implement the plan? j) names and positions of team members that developed the plan? 		

6.1.4. Does the state approve all corrective action plans?		
6.1.5. Does the state assist programs/districts in identifying technical assistance resources available to districts/programs for the implementation of the corrective action/improvement plan?		
6.1.6. In the past two years, has the state been able to provide technical assistance related to needs identified in the corrective action plan?		
6.1.7. Is corrective action follow-up tracked to ensure progress toward correction/improvement?		
6.1.8. Does the state have strategies to intervene if the progress of districts/programs suggests the program/district will not meet the required evidence of change (SPP target) and correction?		
6.1.9. Are the results of the corrective action plan verified?		
6.1.10. Is an on-site follow-up conducted to verify results?		
6.2 Sanctions		
6.2.1. Do written procedures exist regarding the imposition of sanctions?		
6.2.2. Does a range of sanctions exist for violations?		
6.2.3. Are there written procedures when a local program/district does not correct noncompliance within twelve months?		
6.2.4. Have the procedures been applied when a local program /district does not correct noncompliance within twelve months?		
6.2.5. Have sanctions been applied according to the written procedures?		
6.2.6. Has the effectiveness of various sanctions been evaluated?		

7: Improvement and Incentives

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
7.1. Are programs/districts performing at or above the state targets recognized or provided some other form of incentive?		
7.2. Does a range of incentives exist?		
7.3. Are incentives provided to programs/districts making the greatest improvement in achieving state targets?		
7.4. Have incentives been implemented as part of the system of general supervision?		
7.5 Has the effectiveness of the various incentives been evaluated?		

8: Research and Evaluation

	ANSWER : Yes or No	Description
8.1. Has the state evaluated the methods of monitoring?		
8.2. Is this state evaluation a routinely recurring activity?		
8.3. Is an independent or third party evaluation of the monitoring system conducted?		
8.4. Are the results of the independent or third party evaluation used to make changes in focused monitoring system/processes?		
8.5. 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.

Clarification of Terminology

Methods of monitoring (See Component 1: Components of General Supervision)

- Analysis of district/program performance on targets of the State Performance Plan
- Desk audits
- Self-assessment
- On-site visits
- Examination of dispute resolution data by district/program
- Previous monitoring reports and findings
- Follow up on evidence of correction and evidence of improvement

Involved (see Component 2: State Capacity)

It is important for the leadership of the state that all responsible for general supervision are routinely involved. Involvement presumes a level of participation that is more than being informed and implies participation in decision making.

Advocates (see Component 3: Stakeholder Involvement)

In the context of this item it includes trained advocates or attorneys who represent clients or classes of clients and are not associated with a state advocacy agency.

Policymakers (see Component 3: Stakeholder Involvement)

In the context of this item policymakers are those persons at the state level who can directly affect policy.

Verification (see Component 4: Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting)

Verification of data consists of activities used to determine the accuracy of the information collected and/or entered into the state data system. Verification in this context is more than electronic edits of the consistency or parameters of the data collected. Verification is a test of the accuracy and match to practice.

Protocol (see Component 5: Monitoring for General Supervision)

Protocols are the written set or sequence of procedures that are used to investigate compliance.

Incentive (see Component 7: Improvement and Incentives)

Incentives are interventions designed to stimulate improved performance. In this context, incentives include those actions taken by the state that recognizes or rewards improved performance of local districts or programs. These may range from public acknowledgement to financial payments.

Sanction (see Component 6: Correction and Sanctions)

Sanctions are interventions designed to ensure the correction of noncompliance. In this context, sanctions include those actions taken by the state to penalize local districts or programs for failure to correct identified noncompliance. These may range from meetings with state regulatory personnel to withholding of funding.