DMS 2.0 Framework w/Evidence and Intended Outcomes

This Framework outlines a State system that is:

- 100% focused on improved outcomes and results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families,

- Comprised of defined components,

- Integrated across components, and

- Nimble enough to address emerging issues.

The Framework outlines how all programs will be monitored on their general supervision systems during Phase 1 of DMS.

General supervision encompasses the States' responsibility to ensure that it and its subgrantees and contractors meet the requirements of IDEA which includes:

1. Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities; and

2. Ensuring that public agencies meet the program requirements under Part B and C of IDEA, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities.

- For each of the 8 components of a general supervisions system, OSEP provides:

- A definition;

- A series of "if/then" statements which outlines the elements OSEP thinks is necessary to achieve the intended results; and

- A list of examples of the types of evidence that we have found helpful in understanding a State's system within the specific component. This list is neither exhaustive nor does it mean that a State is out of compliance if it does not have a specific item.

Phases

PHASE 1: OCTOBER–NOVEMBER

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
An effective fiscal management system	**The State has a thorough understanding of the IDEA and cross-cutting Federal fiscal requirements.**	**The State will have internal controls in place to ensure compliance with IDEA and cross-cutting Federal fiscal requirements.**	**The State will be able to document oversight of the use of IDEA funds.**	**The State and LEA/EIS programs will use IDEA funds for their intended purposes in a manner that is reasonable, necessary, and allocable to the IDEA.**	**An effective fiscal management system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.**
DEFINITION	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	
A system designed to ensure that IDEA funds are distributed and expended in accordance with Federal fiscal requirements. A State's fiscal management system will include documentation of required budgetary information, policies and procedures reflecting IDEA, EDGAR, and Uniform Guidance requirements and evidence of implementation of those procedures all of which assist States in using Federal funds for improving performance and outcomes for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities.	• Policies and procedures • (manuals, user guides for applicable requirements and key Part B and Part C fiscal processes), as well as description the State's general supervision system. • Information on State structure (e.g., budget office and program office; interagency agreements; examples of contracts; organizational charts) • Description of Educational Service Agencies/regional Part C structures roles/responsibilities for fiscal requirements	• Organizational charts • Documentation related to the SEA/LA's allocation of funding, including IDEA Part B/C funds, to its LEA/EIS programs and providers • Risk assessment policies and procedures, calculations of risk, rubrics related to the assignment of risk categories, including LEA/EIS programs that do not meet audit thresholds, related to monitoring processes, as appropriate. • Budget and expenditure data for a particular year for the purpose of calculating MOE/MFS.	• Example of reports from data system for accuracy of billing, payments etc. • Fiscal monitoring reports • Part B interactive spreadsheets • Part C budgets • PART C: System of payments implementation – payor source, ability to pay, access to insurance, interim payments etc. • Notifications to LEA/EIS programs of upcoming fiscal monitoring activities • Description of **procedures for resolving** IDEA-related single audit and monitoring	• Documentation supporting State's implementation of its procedures for the timely disbursement/ reimbursement of IDEA funds • Documentation related to compliance with cost principles of subpart E of the Uniform Guidance • Fiscal monitoring reports that include findings, documentation supporting corrective action, and closeout reporting • Documentation demonstrating the implementation of the Method if applicable (e.g.,	

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
	- Data systems used by the State, with specific reference to data sources relevant to fiscal processes and oversight - Description of fiscal TA accessed by the State - Yearly timeline for reviewing data sources, calculating, and issuing IDEA allocations, release of funds, and reallocation considerations	- PART C: Example(s) of agreement(s) with EIS programs/providers/vendors/agencies providing Part C EIS - List of SEA's single audit findings for the past 3 years, with status report on any unresolved findings - Oversight Agency Reports (ex: Legislative review, OIG, policy groups, State task force) of SEA/LA internal processes	- findings for LEA/EIS programs - List and documentation of IDEA-related single audit findings/corrective actions and fiscal monitoring findings/corrective actions for LEA/EIS programs - Fiscal monitoring protocols - PART B: List of charter school LEAs that opened/ - closed/significantly expanded/changed status - Policies and procedures reflecting the SEA/LA's standards for correcting fiscal noncompliance - PART C: The State's Method to ensure the provision of, and financial responsibility, Part C Services (Draft or Final), if applicable - Policies and procedures related to parental notification/consent provisions for (Public/Private) Insurance - Sample State consent forms related to access to (Public/Private) Insurance	documentation/State forms related to the use of funds to support staff/activities described in the State's Method and SOP procedures) Information memos, guidance documents, and training/professional development agendas to LEA/EIS programs on topics related to IDEA, EDGAR, and Uniform Guidance fiscal requirements, annual applications/plans, budgets, fiscal monitoring and enforcement, reallocation of funds and other topics as identified	

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
			• Fiscal data system procedures/screenshots, demonstrating the system's capacity for oversight of funds for the Part B/Part C programs • PART B: Sample calculations and budget documents for determining the maximum amount of funds available for voluntary CEIS		

Phase 1: January–February

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
An effective Integrated monitoring system	**The State continuously examines and analyzes data across multiple sources to evaluate its performance, and that of its LEA/EIS programs for improved results and compliance.**	**The State identifies noncompliance with procedural and programmatic requirements and makes recommendations for performance improvements.**	**The State requires the LEA/EIS programs to correct identified noncompliance.**	**An effective integrated monitoring system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.**
Definition	**Examples of Evidence**	**Examples of Evidence**	**Examples of Evidence**	
A multifaceted process or system which is designed to examine and evaluate States with a particular emphasis on educational results, functional outcomes and compliance with IDEA procedural and programmatic requirements.	- Monitoring policies/procedures - Self-assessments (State-level or LEA/EIS programs) - Timeline for monitoring - Criteria for identifying LEA/EIS programs for monitoring - Description of how the State analyzes data for CWD and all students - Additional data sources they are using (IDEA/ESEA) - Documentation of Stakeholder engagement activities and work - Evidence of State cross analysis of different factors and data points that contribute to identified issues	- Monitoring reports with findings - Description of processes in manual - Tools to conduct monitoring - Training of LEA/EIS programs - Examples of improvement plans - Description of Stakeholder engagement and activities related to compliance and performance improvement	- Root cause analysis to identify what is behind the performance data - Evidence of TA provided and outcomes as a result of the TA provided - Documentation of what corrective actions were required and/or improvement plans	

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
A system designed to Sustain Compliance and Improvement	**The State uses a system of incentives and sanctions to ensure continued improvement and IDEA compliance.**	**LEA/EIS programs develop and implement improvement activities and corrective actions to address areas in need of improvement and noncompliance.**	**The State verifies that LEA/EIS programs have implemented improvement activities and corrected noncompliance.**	**A system designed to sustain compliance and improvement will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.**
DEFINITION:	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	
A system for recognizing, and improving compliance and performance including use of improvement activities, incentives, and sanctions.	• Evidence of a general supervision system which includes a defined system of incentives and sanctions for compliance with IDEA • Documentation of enforcement policies that explain the consequences of violating regulations, policies, and procedures. • Policies related to Incentives for improved performance and compliance • Written State monitoring procedures • Sample of corrective action (reports and timelines) • Valid and reliable data on State monitoring of LEA/EIS programs	• LEA and EIS procedural manuals including at a minimum; methods for determining non-compliance, steps-to-correct, timelines, sanctions and incentives • Evidence of the implementation and evaluation of improvement activities, and how stakeholders are involved • Verification of correction of systemic and individual noncompliance • Evidence State collects and reviews LEA/EIS program tracking mechanisms for noncompliance • Audit reports • Sample of Corrective Actions (reports and timelines)	• Verification of the correction of systemic and individual noncompliance • Records of enforcement actions taken against LEA/EIS programs • Records of technical assistance provided to LEA/EIS programs related to noncompliance and program improvement • Tracking noncompliance (statistics, frequency, areas of need) • Samples of LEA/EIS program documents or compliance reports • Close out reports, evidence of correction • Revised policies and procedures, if applicable • Evidence of the Implementation of the revised policies and procedures	

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
			• Evidence of change in practices from attendees of trainings • Updated data showing improvement	

PHASE 1: MAY–JUNE

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
An effective dispute resolution system	**Parents and other stakeholders will be informed of their rights under the law.**	**The State timely resolves disputes about IDEA procedures and the provision of FAPE in the LRE or EIS.**	**LEA/EIS programs provide FAPE in the LRE/EIS to eligible infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities.**	**An effective dispute resolution system will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.**
DEFINITION:	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	
A system designed as part of a State's general supervisory responsibility to ensure implementation of IDEA's dispute resolution procedures consistent with IDEA requirements.	• Procedural safeguards notice (dispute resolution components) • Evidence of receipt of Procedural Safeguards (signature page, file review during monitoring) • Model forms for State complaints and due process • Review of communication to MSIP Customer service • News articles or pending lawsuits • State websites for access to forms and safeguards • LEA/EIS program examples of model forms • Policies and procedures regarding timing of safeguards, use of model forms, and information required in State complaints and hearing notices	• Section 618 data • Evidence of hearing officer's decisions, state complaint actions, mediation agreements • Evidence of training provided to hearing officers and mediators • Description of how the Due Process System is established in the State • Part C programs – policies and procedures for Part C due process hearing procedures or adoption of Part B hearing procedures • Documentation that appeal rights are included in hearing decisions • Tracking documents for Dispute resolution systems (State Complaint, Due Process and mediation) • Policies around timelines	• Timely Correction of noncompliance (individual and systemic) • Evidence of implementation of remedies ordered by hearing officer or State (compensatory services, monetary reimbursement, IEP/IFSP Team meetings) • Evidence of technical assistance • Review any Memorandums of agreements or contracts with the entity responsible for conducting the hearings • Any supplemental guides or Q & A Documents the States have developed to provide guidance to their Stakeholders related to Dispute Resolution activities	

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
	• Information on requesting mediation (info in notice, website, etc.) • Evidence of availability of hearing decisions to SAP/ICC and/or public			
An effective system for targeted technical assistance and professional development	**The States uses all available data/information to prioritize which areas need improvement.**	**The State identifies TA/PD offerings that are aligned to those areas in need of improvement.**	**The State prioritizes the delivery of TA/PD in those areas in need of improvement.**	**An effective system for targeted technical assistance and professional development will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.**
DEFINITION: A system of technical assistance and professional development that uses data-informed root cause analysis areas to address State priorities and areas in need of improvement.	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE** • Tools/ mechanisms to collect data that would inform targeted TA or identified area(s) for improvement • Evidence of how the State is triangulating or analyzing their data. • Monitoring reports • 616/618 Data Reports • Description of State TA/PD activities within the State • Description of how the State identifies the types of TA/PD activities they provide	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE** • Evidence of dissemination and communication of available TA/PD • Description of State's analysis of data to inform TA/PD activities	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE** • State level or LEA/EIS program best practices for implementing IDEA. • Description of the delivery method of the TA/PD activities the State are developing and implementing • Review the State's description of TA/PD in the SPP/APR introduction • Evidence of alignment with other programs/initiatives (e.g. SPDG) (e.g., meeting notes, agendas, etc.) • Evidence of stakeholder involvement in identifying needs on TA/PD activities	

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
	• Outline of stakeholder's involvement in development of TA/PD activities			

PHASE 1: JULY–AUGUST

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
An effective system to collect and report timely and accurate data	The State collects and reports valid and reliable data that are timely submitted to the Secretary and the public.	The State analyzes data for strategic planning and equitable allocation of resources.	The State uses data to support implementation of strategies that are most closely aligned to improved outcomes.	An effective system to collect and report timely and accurate data will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.
DEFINITION:	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	
A data system designed to ensure that the data collected and reported are valid and reliable and that information is reported to the Department and the public in a timely manner. The data system will inform and focus a State's improvement activities as well as verifying that that the data collected and reported reflect actual practice and performance.	• Description of data collection system(s) • Reports/Screen Shots of data systems • Walk through demonstration of data system • Documentation of Data governance requirements • Manuals or evidence reflecting the Edit Checks/Business Rules within their data system • Data manuals • Description of data process/oversight • Organizational Chart related to data and roles and responsibilities • TA/PD trainings for data users • EDFacts Data Quality Reports • APR Data Matrix	• Schedule/Timeline for examining LEA/EIS program data • Guidelines for using data to inform monitoring/TA • Evidence that the State uses its data systems to plan for new initiatives • Evidence that the State compiles and integrates data across systems and uses the data to inform and focus its improvement activities • Models for root cause analysis • Evidence of how root cause analysis is used • Process for making data informed decisions at the State level • Guidance and/or training to LEA/EIS programs to use data to inform decision making	• Timeline of data pulls for implementation of strategies • Documentation of analysis of data trends • Evidence that the State supports a data driven culture at the LEA/EIS program level to ensure LEA/EIS programs carry out evidence-based practices with fidelity (e.g. trainings, user manuals, guidance etc.) • Identification of high and low performing LEA/EIS programs based on data • Evidence of identification of best practices through the use of data • Additional sources of data beyond 616 and 618 data at both State and LEA/EIS program level	

IF A STATE HAS	THEN	THEN	THEN	INTENDED OUTCOME
	• Data sharing agreements • Public Reporting • Evidence of meaningful stakeholder involvement • Evidence that the State has a system to ensure protection of personally identifiable data	• Training and guidance for LEA/EIS programs on how to analyze data. • Evidence such as a data sharing agreement, MOU, or information attained during OSEP interviews that State level Part C and Part B 619 staff regularly communicate about outcomes data issues	• Evidence that the State uses its data systems (e.g., monitoring, self-assessment, database, due process, and State complaints) to improve program and systems operations • Evidence that outcomes data within longitudinal data systems are analyzed and used for improving the programs	
A State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)	**The State executes an approvable plan that evaluates the State's efforts to implement IDEA requirements and purposes and the plan describes how the State will improve IDEA implementation.**	**The State reports annually to the Secretary on the performance of the State under the SPP/APR. The SPP/APR demonstrates the State's progress towards meeting the measurable and rigorous targets for each indicator that have been developed with stakeholder input. The State has a plan in place to address needed improvement.**	**The State will work with LEA/EIS programs to address needed improvement, in those areas that are most closely related to improved outcomes.**	**An SPP/APR that demonstrates progress on compliance and results indicators will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.**
DEFINITION:	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	
A multifaceted plan that evaluates the State's efforts to implement the requirements and purpose of the IDEA and describes how the State will improve its implementation.	• An approved SPP/APR • Policies and procedures around the SPP/APR • Evidence of stakeholder input in the development and the implementation of the SPP/APR	• SPP/APR • Improvement activities • Cross indicator analysis • Reasons for slippage • Plans in place to address slippage • Policies and procedures around data submission • Valid and reliable data	• Public Reporting • Training to LEA/EIS programs on Indicator Analysis and Evaluation • Policies and procedures around data submission • Valid and reliable data	

Phase 2

If a State Has	Then	Then	Then	Then	Intended Outcome
Effective implementation of policies and procedures	**The State develops policies and procedures that are aligned with IDEA and other Federal requirements.**	**The State effectively implements its policies and procedures.**	**The State ensures that LEA/EIS programs are knowledgeable about the policies and procedures.**	**LEA/EIS programs effectively implement policies and procedures that ensure the provision of FAPE in the LRE and EIS.**	**Effective implementation of policies and procedures will contribute to improved outcomes for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities and their families.**
DEFINITION:	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	**EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE**	
Policies and procedures outline the goals, objectives, processes and statutory requirements of a Part B and Part C Program, that are implemented with fidelity.	• Annual IDEA Grant Application • Evidence of systematic and periodic review of implementation of specific policies and procedures • Evidence of policies and procedures being publicly available • Evidence of accessible policies and procedures on State's Website • Review of communication to MSIP Customer service	• Evidence of LEA/EIS program implementation of the State's policies and procedures • LEA/EIS program websites demonstrating consistency with State policies and procedures related to IDEA • The State monitoring reports of LEA/EIS programs on implementation of State policies and procedures • Evidence of periodic review of LEA/EIS program policies and procedures	• Evidence of dissemination of State policies and procedures • Evidence of State TA/PD related to implementation of policies and procedures to its LEA/EIS programs • Documentation of the State process for identifying barriers to LEA/EIS program implementation through root cause analysis • Documentation of what LEA/EIS program corrective actions were required and/or improvement plans, if applicable • Evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement	• Samples of LEA/EIS program policies and procedures • Sample documents (largest LEA/EIS programs, Redacted documents such as IEP/IFSPs, to verify implementation/compliance) • Evidence of LEA/EIS program methods for identifying noncompliance • Examples of LEA/EIS program improvement plans	

			during implementation, and evaluation of LEA/EIS program policies and procedures		