

# FFY 2016 Differentiated Monitoring and Support Engagement (DMS) Decisions

## Massachusetts

OSEP's Results Driven Accountability System for differentiated monitoring and support is designed to provide differentiated levels and types of monitoring and support based on each State's unique strengths, progress, challenges, and needs. To implement this system, OSEP developed a multi-tiered model for monitoring and providing support that is based on the principle that supports are first provided at a core or universal level to effectively address the needs of all States and is focused on prevention to minimize the need for more targeted or intensive engagement. Targeted monitoring and support is based on OSEP's identification of common needs among multiple States, and intensive monitoring and support is reserved for those State education agencies and Lead agencies experiencing the most intense or complex challenges to implementation.

To guide our designations for State monitoring and support at the universal, targeted and intensive levels in the areas of results, compliance, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), correctional education, and fiscal management, OSEP developed an organizational assessment of States' progress in meeting performance standards and compliance with the legal requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Education Department General Administrative Regulations and the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards. Using Federal Fiscal Year 2014 data for results, compliance, and the SSIP, and the most current data available for correctional education and fiscal management, along with information about the factors contributing to elevated needs, the support the State has accessed, the State's capacity to improve results and compliance, and additional contextual information about the State, OSEP determined the level of monitoring and support necessary to meet the needs of each State.

As you are aware, we recently completed our first round of DMS for Part B. For the current year's process, we once again examined results, compliance and fiscal data. In addition, we substituted correctional education for dispute resolution as the special focus area, and added in the SSIP. Our analysis of the SSIP is based on our review of the required elements within the Phase II submission, as well as information obtained through follow up conversations with the State. Our analysis of correctional education is based on data from the EDFacts Consolidated State Performance Report<sup>1</sup>, the Civil Rights Data Collection<sup>2</sup>, each State's Annual Performance Report, and each State's data submitted under section 618 of the IDEA<sup>3</sup>. The charts below list your designation and anticipated level of engagement in each area.

---

<sup>1</sup> EDFacts Consolidated State Performance Report 2013-2014: (1) The total number of children with disabilities who were served in a local juvenile corrections or juvenile detention program. (2) The number of students in a local education agency juvenile corrections or detention facility who obtained a high school diploma or GED – In Facility.

<sup>2</sup> Civil Rights Data 2013-2014: The total number of hours per year that educational program is offered during the regular school year in a juvenile justice or detention facility.

<sup>3</sup> 618 Data 2013-2014: (1) The percentage of students with disabilities in a State that dropped out of school. (2) The percentage of students with disabilities who were suspended or expelled from school within a State.

## Results

Designation	Factors <sup>4</sup>	Existing/Current Engagement	New Engagement
Universal		OSEP continues to make information and technical assistance (TA) resources available, and provide universal support to all States. In addition, the State receives technical assistance from the IDEA Data Center (IDC), and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).	OSEP will provide universal support.

## Compliance

Designation	Factors	Existing/Current Engagement	New Engagement
Targeted	State has been identified as meeting criteria specified by GAO audit on dispute resolution.	OSEP continues to make information and TA resources available, and provide universal support to all States.	OSEP will provide targeted monitoring and support on improving dispute resolution.

## SSIP

Designation	Factors	Existing/Current Engagement	New Engagement
Universal		OSEP continues to make information and TA resources available, and provide universal support to all States. In addition, the State receives technical assistance from IDC and DaSy.	OSEP will provide universal support.

## Correctional Education

Designation	Factors	Existing/Current Engagement	New Engagement
Universal		OSEP continues to make information and TA resources available, and provide universal support to all States.	OSEP will provide universal support.

## Fiscal

Designation	Factors	Existing/Current Engagement	New Engagement
Intensive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of award</li> <li>• MFS</li> <li>• Unresolved fiscal monitoring findings</li> </ul>	OSEP continues to make information and TA resources available, and provide universal support to all States. OSEP has provided TA on MFS and unresolved fiscal findings	OSEP will provide intensive monitoring and support using protocols on LEA allocations and fiscal monitoring.

<sup>4</sup> Factors are only listed if a State has been designated as targeted or intensive in a particular area.