## Assessing the Evidence of a System of General Supervision: Part B

| State | Date |  |
|-------|------|--|
|       |      |  |

| Component 1: State Performance Plan  |                           |                       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Evidences                            | Description/Documentation | Extent of evidence    |
| There is broad stakeholder           |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| involvement in establishing and      |                           | Partially evidenced   |
| revising targets.                    |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 2. There is broad stakeholder input, |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| including the State Advisory Panel,  |                           | Partially evidenced   |
| on improvement activities and        |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
| monitoring progress and slippage.    |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 3. The SPP has measurable and        |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| rigorous targets.                    |                           | Partially evidenced   |
|                                      |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 4. Data used to establish baselines, |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| set targets, measure progress and    |                           | Partially evidenced   |
| slippage, are current, valid, and    |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
| reliable.                            |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 5. A complete SPP is submitted in a  |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| timely manner.                       |                           | Partially evidenced   |
|                                      |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 6. The state evaluates each LEA's    |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| performance against state targets.   |                           | Partially evidenced   |
|                                      |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |

| Component 1: State Performance Plan  |                           |                       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Evidences                            | Description/Documentation | Extent of evidence    |
| 7. The state allocates resources and | •                         | Clearly evidenced     |
| technical assistance to facilitate   |                           | Partially evidenced   |
| improved performance.                |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 8. The most current dated SPP is     |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| posted on the state's website.       |                           | Partially evidenced   |
|                                      |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 9. The state publicly reports each   |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| _EA's performance against state      |                           | Partially evidenced   |
| SPP targets.                         |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 14. The state reports to the         |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| Secretary, in an annual performance  |                           | Partially evidenced   |
| eport, the performance of the state  |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
| under the SPP.                       |                           | Not evidenced         |
| 15. The SPP is integrated within the |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
| state's accountability systems.      |                           | Partially evidenced   |
|                                      |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
|                                      |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
|                                      |                           | Partially evidenced   |
|                                      |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |
|                                      |                           | Clearly evidenced     |
|                                      |                           | Partially evidenced   |
|                                      |                           | Not clearly evidenced |
|                                      |                           | Not evidenced         |

## **Component 2: Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation Evidences Description Extent of evidence** 1. State policies and procedures are Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced aligned with IDEA. Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced 2. State policies and procedures Clearly evidenced include descriptions of the range of Partially evidenced sanctions to enforce correction Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced 3. LEAs have policies and procedures Clearly evidenced aligned with state policies and Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced procedures. Not evidenced 4. LEAs have policies and procedures Clearly evidenced in place to ensure that all personnel Partially evidenced necessary to carry out the Not clearly evidenced requirements of IDEA are Not evidenced appropriately and adequately prepared. 5. The state establishes and Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced maintains qualifications for highly qualified personnel. Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced 6. The state and LEAs have written Clearly evidenced policies and procedures in place, Partially evidenced including assurances, that these are Not clearly evidenced implemented to ensure FAPE in the Not evidenced

LRE.

| Component 2: Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation   |             |   |
|---|-------------|---|
| Evidences   | Description | Extent of evidence  |
| 7. Required MOUs, interagency agreements or other mechanisms to ensure the provision of early intervention services and fiscal responsibility for those services are in place, current and being implemented effectively. |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
|   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
|   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |

|  | Component 3: Effective Dispute | e Resolution          |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Evidences                                | Description                    | Extent of evidence    |
| I. Resolution of all disputes must be    |                                | Clearly evidenced     |
| n accordance with required timelines.    |                                | Partially evidenced   |
| •  |                                | Not clearly evidenced |
|  |                                | Not evidenced         |
| 2. Dispute resolution processes          |                                | Clearly evidenced     |
| nclude mechanisms for ensuring that      |                                | Partially evidenced   |
| Ill related corrective actions have      |                                | Not clearly evidenced |
| een implemented and                      |                                | Not evidenced         |
| noncompliance has been corrected.        |                                |                       |
| B. All personnel, including hearing      |                                | Clearly evidenced     |
| officers and mediators, are trained      |                                | Partially evidenced   |
| appropriately on dispute resolution      |                                | Not clearly evidenced |
| processes and IDEA requirements.         |                                | Not evidenced         |
| I. Tracking of issues identified is used |                                | Clearly evidenced     |
| o determine patterns or trends.          |                                | Partially evidenced   |
|  |                                | Not clearly evidenced |
|  |                                | Not evidenced         |
| 5. Results of dispute resolution         |                                | Clearly evidenced     |
| processes are analyzed to determine      |                                | Partially evidenced   |
| he effectiveness of the dispute          |                                | Not clearly evidenced |
| resolution system.                       |                                | Not evidenced         |
|  |                                | Clearly evidenced     |
|  |                                | Partially evidenced   |
|  |                                | Not clearly evidenced |
|  |                                | Not evidenced         |
|  |                                | Clearly evidenced     |
|  |                                | Partially evidenced   |
|  |                                | Not clearly evidenced |
|  |                                | Not evidenced         |

| Component 4: Data on Processes and Results                           |             |                                       |
|--|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| Evidences  | Description | Extent of implementation              |
| Data are collected as required                                       |             | Clearly evidenced                     |
| under section 618 of IDEA and by the                                 |             | Partially evidenced                   |
| secretary.   |             | Not clearly evidenced                 |
| N. I. T. A. a. a. b. mait. data in a time also and                   |             | Not evidenced                         |
| 2. LEAs submit data in a timely and                                  |             | Clearly evidenced                     |
| accurate manner.   |             | Partially evidenced                   |
|  |             | Not clearly evidenced                 |
| 2 Varification is achieved through                                   |             | Not evidenced                         |
| 3. Verification is achieved through multiple methods and activities, |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced |
| ncluding electronic, comparative and                                 |             | Not clearly evidenced                 |
|  |             | Not evidenced                         |
| on-site monitoring to determine data accuracy.                       |             | Not evidenced                         |
| accuracy.  |             |                                       |
| 1. LEA reports, dispute resolution                                   |             | Clearly evidenced                     |
| data, and other sources of data are                                  |             | Partially evidenced                   |
| used by teams conducting on-site                                     |             | Not clearly evidenced                 |
| monitoring visits.   |             | Not evidenced                         |
| _  |             |                                       |
| 5. The state distributes to LEAs and                                 |             | Clearly evidenced                     |
| oublicly reports on the LEA's  |             | Partially evidenced                   |
| performance in comparison to state                                   |             | Not clearly evidenced                 |
| argets.  |             | Not evidenced                         |
| 6. State makes determinations on the                                 |             | Clearly evidenced                     |
| status of LEAs consistent with the                                   |             | Partially evidenced                   |
| minimum requirements as specified                                    |             | Not clearly evidenced                 |
| by OSEP.   |             | Not evidenced                         |
| 7. States include multiple measures of                               |             | Clearly evidenced                     |
| status in their determination  |             | Partially evidenced                   |
| decisions.   |             | Not clearly evidenced                 |

| Evidences                            | Description | Extent of implementation |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
|                                      |             | Not evidenced            |
| 8. Data are used to target and       |             | Clearly evidenced        |
| maximize technical assistance,       |             | Partially evidenced      |
| professional development, as well as |             | Not clearly evidenced    |
| state resources.                     |             | Not evidenced            |
|                                      |             | Clearly evidenced        |
|                                      |             | Partially evidenced      |
|                                      |             | Not clearly evidenced    |
|                                      |             | Not evidenced            |
|                                      |             | Clearly evidenced        |
|                                      |             | Partially evidenced      |
|                                      |             | Not clearly evidenced    |
|                                      |             | Not evidenced            |

| Component 5: Integrated Monitoring Activities   |             |   |
|---|-------------|---|
| Evidences   | Description | Extent of evidence  |
| 1. There is stakeholder involvement in the development of measurable and rigorous targets.  |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced                             |
| 2. There is stakeholder involvement in the design, implementation, and evaluation of integrated monitoring activities (e.g., State Advisory Panel, family members, LEA staff).                            |             | Not evidenced Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
| 3. Training is provided at all levels (state and local) for those involved in monitoring to provide consistency in the implementation of monitoring procedures and to ensure transparency of the process. |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced               |
| 4. State and LEA data are systematically reviewed to determine focused monitoring activities.   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced               |
| 5. Monitoring results trigger effective corrective actions, technical assistance, improvement strategies, fiscal decisions and other investments, sanctions, and incentive that ensure timely correction. |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced               |

| Component 5: Integrated Monitoring Activities   |             |   |
|---|-------------|---|
| Evidences   | Description | Extent of evidence  |
| 6. State identified noncompliance triggers effective corrective actions, technical assistance, improvement strategies, fiscal decisions and other investments, sanctions, and     |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
| incentives. 7. Focused monitoring activities should be geared toward identifying solutions and activities to enhance and improve performance as well as correcting noncompliance. |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
| 8. Multiple data sources and methodologies (e.g., desk audits, surveys, on-site reviews, local agency self-assessments) are used.   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
| 9. Monitoring activities identify status of compliance and performance.   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
| 10. Monitoring activities lead to the identification of underlying causes of noncompliance to assist in the development of improvement strategies.                                |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |
| onatogioo.  |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |

| Evidences                                  | Description | Extent of evidence    |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Technical assistance or professional    |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| development activities are directly        |             | Partially evidenced   |
| linked to specific indicators in the SPP,  |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| ncluding the identification and            |             | Not evidenced         |
| correction of noncompliance and            |             |                       |
| mprovement of performance.                 |             |                       |
| 2. The state systematically                |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| disseminates information to LEAs           |             | Partially evidenced   |
| about promising and evidence based         |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| practices.                                 |             | Not evidenced         |
| 3. Standards for professional              |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| development are designed to evaluate       |             | Partially evidenced   |
| technical assistance and professional      |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| development activities.                    |             | Not evidenced         |
| 4. Evaluations of technical assistance     |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| and professional development involve       |             | Partially evidenced   |
| evidence of a change of practice           |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| resulting in improved outcomes and         |             | Not evidenced         |
| compliance as well as building             |             |                       |
| sustainability and capacity.               |             |                       |
| 5. Follow-up activities are built into the |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| echnical assistance design to              |             | Partially evidenced   |
| determine whether improvement              |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| activities are carried out consistent with |             | Not evidenced         |
| he technical assistance provided.          |             |                       |
|  |             | Clearly evidenced     |
|  |             | Partially evidenced   |
|  |             | Not clearly evidenced |
|  |             | Not evidenced         |

## Component 7: Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions **Evidences Description Extent of evidence** 1. State rules clearly define the state's Clearly evidenced authority for enforcement. Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced 2. Targeted training, technical Clearly evidenced assistance, and support are provided Partially evidenced to LEAs when developing and Not clearly evidenced implementing corrective action. Not evidenced 3. State rules authorize a range of Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced sanctions. Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced 4. Model practices reflecting Clearly evidenced improvement activities of high Partially evidenced performing LEAs are identified in order Not clearly evidenced to be replicated by other LEAs. Not evidenced 5. Rewards are provided to reinforce Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced high performing LEAs. Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced 6. Incentives are provided for Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced improvement at the LEA level. Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced 7. Targeted technical assistance is Clearly evidenced provided by other agencies through Partially evidenced interagency agreements. Not clearly evidenced

Not evidenced

| Evidences                               | Description | Extent of evidence    |
|---|-------------|-----------------------|
| 8. States have procedures to track      |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| effectiveness of corrective actions and |             | Partially evidenced   |
| improvement strategies.                 |             | Not clearly evidenced |
|   |             | Not evidenced         |
| 9. The state uses any monitoring and    |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| enforcement authority available.        |             | Partially evidenced   |
|   |             | Not clearly evidenced |
|   |             | Not evidenced         |
|   |             | Clearly evidenced     |
|   |             | Partially evidenced   |
|   |             | Not clearly evidenced |
|   |             | Not evidenced         |

## **Component 8: Fiscal Accountability**

| Evidences                               | Description | Extent of evidence    |
|---|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1. States implement the correct funding |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| formula in the distribution of IDEA     |             | Partially evidenced   |
| funds.                                  |             | Not clearly evidenced |
|   |             | Not evidenced         |
| 2. The funding formula for distribution |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| of state funds does not violate LRE     |             | Partially evidenced   |
| requirements.                           |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| •                                       |             | Not evidenced         |
| 3. States ensure that Charter LEAs      |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| receive their equitable share of funds  |             | Partially evidenced   |
| in a timely manner, including           |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| significantly expanding Charter LEAs.   |             | Not evidenced         |
| 4. LEAs provide a proportionate share   |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| of IDEA funds to private schools.       |             | Partially evidenced   |
| ·                                       |             | Not clearly evidenced |
|   |             | Not evidenced         |
| 5. States submit a correctly completed  |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| Use of Funds form designating how the   |             | Partially evidenced   |
| state's set-aside will be expended.     |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| ·                                       |             | Not evidenced         |
| 6. The state has a procedure for        |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| securing timely reimbursements of       |             | Partially evidenced   |
| funds used under this part in           |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| accordance with section 640(a) of       |             | Not evidenced         |
| IDEA.                                   |             |                       |
| 7. States' interagency agreements       |             | Clearly evidenced     |
| establish fiscal responsibility for the |             | Partially evidenced   |
| provision of special education and      |             | Not clearly evidenced |
| related services and procedures for     |             | Not evidenced         |
| dispute resolution.                     |             |                       |

| Component 8: Fiscal Accountability       |             |                       |  |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|--|
| Evidences                                | Description | Extent of evidence    |  |
| 8. States and LEAs use applicable        | -           | Clearly evidenced     |  |
| procedures related to high risk pools if |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
| the state reserves funds for this        |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
| purpose.                                 |             | Not evidenced         |  |
| 9. States maintain effort at the state   |             | Clearly evidenced     |  |
| level.                                   |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
|  |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
|  |             | Not evidenced         |  |
| 10. States and LEAs use applicable       |             | Clearly evidenced     |  |
| procedures related to exceptions to      |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
| maintenance of effort.                   |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
|  |             | Not evidenced         |  |
| 11. State directs the use of 15% of an   |             | Clearly evidenced     |  |
| LEA's IDEA allocation for early          |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
| intervening services when significant    |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
| disproportionality is identified.        |             | Not evidenced         |  |
| 12. States ensure that LEAs use IDEA     |             | Clearly evidenced     |  |
| funds to pay the excess costs of         |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
| providing special education and related  |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
| services.                                |             | Not evidenced         |  |
| 13. States direct the use of state funds |             | Clearly evidenced     |  |
| (where permitted by state law) or        |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
| withhold LEA funds based on              |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
| longstanding noncompliance.              |             | Not evidenced         |  |
| 14. States ensure LEAs maintain effort.  |             | Clearly evidenced     |  |
|  |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
|  |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
|  |             | Not evidenced         |  |

| Component 8: Fiscal Accountability  |             |   |  |
|---|-------------|---|--|
| Evidences   | Description | Extent of evidence  |  |
| 15. States ensure that audits are conducted annually in accordance with the Single Audit Act.   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |  |
| 16. States ensure that LEAs adjust local fiscal efforts in accordance with 34 CFR 300.205.  |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |  |
| 17. States ensure that LEAs do not commingle IDEA funds with state funds.   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |  |
| 18. States ensure that IDEA funds supplement and not supplant the level of other federal, state and local funds.  |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |  |
| 19. States ensure that LEAs report on early intervening services.   |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |  |
| 20. States have procedures for prohibiting an LEA from reducing maintenance of effort if an LEA is not meeting Part B requirements.                                     |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |  |
| 21. States have procedures for ensuring that funds are expended appropriately and are not commingled with state funds and do no supplant Federal, state or local funds. |             | Clearly evidenced Partially evidenced Not clearly evidenced Not evidenced |  |

| Component 8: Fiscal Accountability    |             |                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--|
| Evidences                             | Description | Extent of evidence    |  |
| 22. States have procedures for        |             | Clearly evidenced     |  |
| ensuring that funds are used only for |             | Partially evidenced   |  |
| the excess cost of providing special  |             | Not clearly evidenced |  |
| education and related services.       |             | Not evidenced         |  |