

OSEP MONTHLY DMS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CALL

DMS PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS, TIPS AND PREPARATION

SEPTEMBER 2022



MSIP Division Director



Gregg Corr

MSIP Director

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Agenda

- ▶ DMS Updates
- ▶ General Supervision Considerations
 - Integrated Monitoring
 - Sustaining Compliance and Improvement
- ▶ Data
- ▶ Dispute Resolution
- ▶ Fiscal Considerations
- ▶ DMS State Presentation

DMS Updates

- ▶ **Cohort 2** States and Entities will be contacted in October and be notified of their engagement month
- ▶ **Cohort 3** States and Entities will be announced in October
- ▶ OSEP is currently finalizing the first set of monitoring reports
- ▶ Currently engaged in monitoring activities with the next group of Cohort 1 States
- ▶ We have an External SharePoint!

General Supervision Considerations

- ▶ States should be able to clearly articulate to OSEP their:
 - LEA/EIS provider monitoring cycle or schedule
 - Components included in their general supervision system (i.e. data systems, onsite monitoring, virtual monitoring, file reviews, dispute resolution, etc.)

General Supervision Implementation

- ▶ The State should be able to provide actual documentation of their monitoring activities with their LEA/EIS providers, from start to finish, and explain to the Monitoring Team each activity.
- ▶ Provide MSIP with an actual example of how they are using their data system and/or monitoring to identify and verify correction.
- ▶ Providing specific examples and documentation of what the State reviews to verify the correction of noncompliance.

Data Considerations

- ▶ States should be able to clearly articulate to OSEP their data system:
 1. How their data system is utilized for different purposes, including APR data, monitoring, and general system improvements.
 2. How they inform LEA/EIS programs of data collection requirements (including timelines, definitions, calculation methods, data sources) communicated to State and local personnel.

Data Implementation

- ▶ The State should explain how they utilize their data system in terms of their SPP/APR, in addition to related requirements
- ▶ Explain how often the State reviews their data for monitoring or system improvements
- ▶ Clearly articulate their data cycles and how they train LEA/EIS providers
- ▶ Show a sample data set and demonstrate how they utilize the data to identify noncompliance and issuing findings.

Dispute Resolution Considerations

- ▶ States should be able to clearly describe and articulate to OSEP:
 - Any processes the State uses to identify and resolve informal complaints (i.e. IFSP/IEP Facilitation, or any other way parents/stakeholders communicate concerns outside the State Complaint process)
 - How they train and inform LEA/EIS providers and Parents about Dispute Resolution
 - Procedures for tracking and monitoring all State Complaints, Due Process and Mediation requests

Dispute Resolution Implementation

- ▶ The State should be able to demonstrate and describe:
 - Their system for tracking dispute resolution cases, including who and how often the information is tracked
 - Procedures for ensuring compliance and implementation of dispute resolution hearing officers' decisions at the local level
 - Examples, if any, of how dispute resolution has impacted their general supervision system
 - Examples of tracking hearing officers training

Fiscal

- ▶ States should be able to describe and articulate:
 - How they conduct fiscal monitoring of their local programs
 - The components of fiscal monitoring: onsite reviews, desk reviews, grant systems, audits and self-assessments etc.
- ▶ Part B programs should be able to describe and articulate how they use risk assessments and their process for resolving audits
- ▶ Part C programs should be able to describe and articulate how they ensure single line of responsibility requirements and compliance with system of payments, payor of last resort and insurance consent provisions

Fiscal Implementation

- ▶ The State should be able to provide evidence of the implementation of fiscal monitoring.
- ▶ Evidence should include monitoring reports, audit management decision and close out letters.
- ▶ The State should be prepared to walk through examples of fiscal monitoring or audit findings from notification of the monitoring visit through close out of any findings made.

Closeout and Follow-up

- ▶ In the year following the issuance of the monitoring report, the OSEP State Lead will work with the State/Entity:
 - to ensure correction of any remaining outstanding findings,
 - provide technical assistance, and support,
 - and discuss progress in improving identified results areas.
- ▶ All evidence and materials received for close-out will be reviewed by the Monitoring Teams and OGC prior to issuance of a close-out letter of any findings that have been verified as corrected.

DMS State Presentation

Tracy Turner

*Part C Coordinator First Connections
Arkansas IDEA Part C*

Ravyn Hawkins

*Staff Development & Policy Coordinator First Connections
Arkansas IDEA Part C*



OSEP

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Home: www.ed.gov/osers/osep

Blog: <https://sites.ed.gov/osers>

Twitter: https://twitter.com/ED_Sped_Rehab

YouTube: www.youtube.com/c/OSERS

