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Accessibility Annual Status Report- 2016

Achievements for the 2015/2016 Academic Year-

During the past school year many of our service departments and academic support services continued their efforts to support the elimination of barriers for individuals with disabilities.

Facilities, Planning and Capital Development Department:

The Facilities, Planning and Capital Development department worked within the budget allocations to renovate schools, build new or replacement elementary and secondary schools and modified existing structures while ensuring that all requirements under the *Ontario Building Code* were met. *Ontario Building Code* requirements are in compliance with the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA) statutory obligations to ensure that physical barriers are eliminated for individuals with disabilities.

The following Capital Development projects are underway and are expected to be completed by 2019 or earlier:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Location</th>
<th>Project Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Build/Replacement Schools 2016- 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Trinity Catholic School</td>
<td>Consolidation of two (2) elementary schools on a new site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Simon Catholic School</td>
<td>Replacement elementary school on a new site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Evangelist Catholic School</td>
<td>Replacement elementary school &amp; Child Care Centre on the existing school site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph Morrow Park Catholic Secondary School</td>
<td>Replacement of secondary school on a new school site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dante Alighieri Academy/Villa Columbo</td>
<td>Joint Venture development of secondary school and Community Cultural Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margaret Catholic School</td>
<td>Replacement elementary school on the existing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Fidelis Catholic School</td>
<td>Replacement elementary school on the existing site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bless Cardinal Newman Catholic Secondary School</td>
<td>Replacement of secondary school on an expanded site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Lands Catholic School</td>
<td>Joint Venture development of two (2) elementary school (TCDSB &amp; TDSB), Community Centre and Child Care Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Capital Development and Planning services department continues to ensure all schools that are in the design and construction phase or any additions made to existing schools meet or exceed accessibility standards. Presently, the Board is proceeding with 3 replacement secondary schools, 5 replacement elementary schools and 1 new elementary school. In addition, the Board has completed the construction of 2 elementary school additions with 6 elementary school additions underway. All new schools and additions conform to the accessibility standard obligations, under the AODA, consistent with the requirements of the Ontario Building Code.

**Accessible Schools for Individuals with Physical Disabilities:**

The Board is proud to provide a great number of schools that either have one (1) story or alternatively, at schools which are greater than one (1) story, have a passenger elevator to assist individuals who may have mobility issues and who may experience a physical/architectural barrier if the individual is unable to utilize the stairwells.

**Single Story Schools:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Location</th>
<th>Project Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blessed Kateri Tekakwitha</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Angels</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josyf Cardinal Slipyi</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monsignor John Corrigan</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Grace</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK, Classrooms, Gymnasium &amp; Child Care Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schools with a Passenger Elevator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Location</th>
<th>Project Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Saints</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishop Romero</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Allen</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop Morocco/Thomas Merton</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK, Classrooms &amp; Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed Mother Teresa</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed Pier Giorgio Frassati</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed Trinity</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brebeuf College</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK, Classrooms &amp; Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Wisdom</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Malachy Catholic School</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paschal Baylon Catholic School</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK, Classrooms &amp; Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Victor Catholic School</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ursula Catholic School</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK &amp; Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clement Catholic School</td>
<td>Elementary addition for FDK, Classrooms, Gymnasium &amp; Child Care Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine of Canterbury Catholic School</td>
<td>Elementary addition for Classrooms, Gymnasium &amp; Child Care Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Board is in the process of developing and drafting an Operational Procedure which will apply to accommodation requests for all students or prospective students of the School Board. It applies to all School Board locations.

This proposed Operational Procedure does not apply to accommodations provided as part of special education programs and services for exceptional students under Identification and Placement of Exceptional Pupils, O.Reg. 181/98, made under the Education Act, RSO 1990, c E.2.

The Board encourages students and/or parents to suggest how the student’s disability could be accommodated. In addition, the Board encourages the parents of the student to provide reports, letters, and/or other documents from treating physicians or other health care professionals relating to the disability and the impairments or restrictions which give rise to the need for accommodation.

Following receipt of a request for an accommodation, the school principal will send a letter or email confirming that the request has been received. The request will be considered in as expeditious a manner as possible. The request will be addressed and the appropriate accommodation may be provided in a way that respects the dignity of the student. Amongst the things considered in assessing the request are:

- The student’s disability and the arising impairment or restrictions;
- The medical evidence provided, and/or, depending on the circumstances, additional medical evidence obtained with the permission of the student and/or parents or guardians;
- The accommodations requested;
- Other possible accommodations that may address the student’s impairment or restrictions.
Implementation of the proposed Operational Procedure is scheduled for the commencement of the 2016/2017 academic year.

**Special Services Education:**

The Special Services department is committed to reducing and eliminating barriers for students with special needs for their physical and learning environments. The Toronto Catholic District School Board strives to provide each special needs student with the attitudinal, academic and physical skills to reach their full potential for learning and practical skills development. During the 2015/2016 school year, approximately 1,300 students with special needs were identified and the Board presently has a total of approximately 10,800 special needs students.

Students who have been identified as possessing a special education exceptionality, as defined by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the Toronto Catholic District School Board’s Special Education Plan, have an Individual Education Plan (IEP), an MOE requirement. An IEP is written for students receiving special education support and services in order to meet their individual, academic, emotional, social, behavioural and physical needs. In consultation with parents, classroom teachers and a Special Education Teacher, the IEP is written within 30 school days of a student’s placement in a special education program. Accommodations set out in the IEP are implemented to reduce or remove barriers that hinder the learning of a student with special needs. Presently, the Board has over 18,000 students with an IEP. Access to assistive technology, extra time on tests, varying assessment methods and providing instruction notes are some examples of accommodations made through the support and plan set out in the IEP.

The IEP includes the following elements:

- strengths and needs related to the student’s learning;
- relevant assessment data;
- list of instructional, environmental and assessment accommodations the student requires;
- current level of achievement for each modified subject/course/alternative program area;
- annual program goals, learning expectations and strategies;
- assessment methods;
- documentation of parent consultation;
- transition plan for students 14 years of age and older; and
- a safety plan (if applicable)

During the 2015/2016 academic year, to assist in elimination of barriers in the students’ learning environments, the Ministry of Education approved approximately 400 Special Education Amount (SEA) claims for the purchase of assistive technology for students with higher special needs. The equipment includes devices such as positioning devices and amplification systems. SEA claims also may include computers and software that provide access to curriculum such as word prediction programs, speech-to-text programs, text-to-speech programs and movement-to-text programs through computer generated prompting methods.

On a continual basis, administrators work to identify physical barriers in schools which hinder the learning of students with special needs. Providing ramps, electronic door openers, lifts and hand rails in bathrooms are
examples of some physical changes to buildings that the Planning Department have implemented on an individual needs basis. The removal of physical barriers is facilitated through local level discussions with the Planning Department, the school Principal and the regional Superintendent of Education.

Health & Safety:

**Student & Employee Emergency Evacuation Response Plan(s):**

In accordance with the AODA Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation, the Toronto Catholic District School Board has developed Individual Emergency Evacuation Response Plans for all students and staff members with disabilities or limitations which may hinder their ability to exit the building in the case of an evacuation.

The individual Emergency Evacuation Response Plan is customized by the school administrator, for students, or by the employee’s manager, to incorporate the mobility or capacity limitations into a site based plan to ensure that the individual’s safety, in case of an emergency evacuation, is of the highest consideration. The individual Emergency Evacuation Response Plan also provides information and instructions to those individuals assigned to assist the disabled student and/or employee, if necessary, on the protocol and methods to meet the individual’s special needs for evacuation. The Emergency Evacuation Response Plan template document can be found on the Board’s intranet website portal under the Health & Safety Department’s drop-down menu.

Human Resource Services:

**Workplace Accommodations for Disabled Employees:**

As part of the Human Resources Division, the Benefits Department continues to develop customized individual workplace accommodations for employees with both temporary and permanent physical and cognitive limitations, restrictions and impairments. The workplace accommodation process is described in the Toronto Catholic District School Board’s Workplace Accommodation for Employees with Disabilities Policy- H.M.38. Through the Functional Abilities Form (FAF) and additional medical documentation provided by the employee, from their treating Physician or licensed Medical Practitioner, the Disability Management Team may arrange for workplace site assessments, ergonomic assessments, and accessibility assistive devices to determine the accommodation required for the employee and what equipment or job duty changes may be appropriate for their particular physical and/or cognitive disability. Through the intensive workplace assessments conducted by the Disability Management Team, it may be ultimately determined that modified work is appropriate or that the employee be permanently accommodated in the workplace to address their individual physical or cognitive impairments.

In compliance with the January 1, 2014 deadline under the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation of the AODA, the Benefits Department has developed standardized workplace accommodation documents that detail the employee’s physical and/or cognitive limitations and impairments in relation to the required duties of the employee’s job classification, while ensuring confidentiality of the employee’s medical condition. A detailed description and outline of the employee’s accommodation within the job classification and/or alternative job classification, if found to be completely disabled from the employee’s original job class, is documented by the Disability Management Team on the Workplace Accommodation document. In accordance with the Board’s
Workplace Accommodation for Employees with Disabilities Policy, the workplace accommodation plan is discussed in collaboration with the disabled employee, Board Management and our Union partners for those employees who are a member of a bargaining unit.

**Accessible Recruitment Practices:**

The Recruitment Services Department of the Board’s Human Resources Division aims to promote and provide all job candidates, both internal and external, with an opportunity to self-identify a disability that would require an accommodation during the recruitment process.

As of January 1, 2014, Recruitment Services is proud to offer individualized accommodations for current employees or external job candidates during the interview and/or skills testing processes for vacant positions. The job candidate is required to self-identify their disability before being interviewed and/or tested for the job classification to which they have applied to. The job candidate may also be asked to provide details regarding how to appropriately accommodate their disability during an interview process and in a skills testing environment. In some circumstances, which may be dependent on the nature of the disability identified, the applicant may be required to produce medical documentation to support their request for interview and skills testing accommodations. The medical documentation provided by the job applicant will provide direction and clarity to the Recruitment Department in order to appropriately accommodate the job applicant’s physical and/or cognitive disabilities. Accommodations implemented during the recruitment process are completed centrally, at the Toronto Catholic District School Board’s Catholic Education Centre (Board Office), as well as at schools sites and the Regional Facilities Offices.

**Accessibility Awareness Training for Educators:**

In accordance with the statutory obligations of the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation of the AODA, since the 2012/2013 academic year the Toronto Catholic District School Board has delivered accessibility awareness training to its educators (as defined under the AODA) including: Superintendents of Education, Principals, Vice-Principals, Academic Program Coordinators, Teachers, Educational Assistants, Child and Youth Workers, Early Childhood Educators, Social Workers, Speech and Language Pathologists, Psycho-educational Consultants, Psychologists, Attendance Counselors, Secondary School Student Supervisors, International Language Instructors, Adult English as a Second Language (ESL) Instructors and Adult ESL Nursery Instructors.

The accessibility awareness training reviews the obligations under the AODA which impact the Board’s program and classroom staff. The training specifically focuses and provides reference and resource materials that are designed to assist student based educational staff in developing strategies for educating all students regarding accessibility awareness. In addition, the training provides the educator staff with academic tools to design lesson plans that integrate accessibility awareness into the grade level curriculum.

**Human Rights and Accessibility Training for Support Staff:**

In accordance with the statutory obligations of the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation of the AODA, since January 1, 2014, the Toronto Catholic District School Board has delivered accessibility awareness and human rights training to its support staff, volunteers and co-op students (staff members not defined as “educators”).
The accessibility awareness and human rights training was developed by the Ontario Human Rights Commission and reviews the obligations under the AODA and the *Ontario Human Rights Code* which impact the Board’s staff, volunteers, co-op students. The training specifically focuses on the rights of employees to workplace accommodations and the barriers in the workplace relating to accessibility and all disabilities which have been recognized by the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal.

The TCDSB has also ensured through its community partnership programs, joint ventures, and external contractors that the partner and/or contracted organization is responsible for the deliverance of accessibility awareness and human rights training through amendments to the TCDSB’s community partnership agreements and vendor contracts.

**Accessible Formats:**

**Educational & Training Materials:**

The Board is dedicated to providing staff, students and members of the public with accessible and conversion ready print based materials, upon request. Members of the community are encouraged to contact the TCDSB site Manager, Principal or Superintendent to make the necessary arrangements to receive accessible format print materials. In accordance with the Board’s Workplace Accommodation for Employee with Disabilities Policy, staff who require accessible format work materials and/or educational and training materials are advised to request a workplace accommodation in accordance with the Board’s policy. Students who require training and/or educational material in an accessible format are recommended to go through the Special Education Services department and through the IEP process, materials will be provided by the Board’s school-based educator staff to meeting the student’s unique accommodation requirements.

**Communication Materials:**

Upon request, any communication material produced by the Board, with the exception of video or audio streaming content delivered through the Board’s internet or intranet website, will be converted into an accessible format based upon the accessibility need of the community member, volunteer, staff member or student. The Board may require documentation to support the request in order to tailor the accessibility requirement to the individual’s needs. Individuals requiring communication materials to be converted into an accessible format are recommended to contact the site Manager, Principal, Superintendent or the Board’s Communications Department to arrange for the communication material(s) to be converted.
### Autism (Draft)

**Definition:** A severe learning disorder that is characterized by disturbances in rate of educational development, ability to relate to the environment, mobility, and/or perception, speech and/or language, lack of the representational symbolic behaviour that precedes language (MOE).

In TCDSB, a diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder is required for an identification of Autism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPRC Identification Criteria</th>
<th>IPRC Placement Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autism</strong></td>
<td><strong>ISP:</strong> students require intensive support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) is required</td>
<td>- Cognitive assessment indicating average intellectual functioning(^1). If no formal cognitive assessment has been completed, a referral to psychology will be recommended when appropriate. Placement in ISP considers Autism as well as other exceptionality and/or learning needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other diagnoses are also present, each exceptionality will be identified separately.</td>
<td>- Consultation with SBSLT and Autism Team members: Autism Support Teacher, Psychologist, Social Worker, Speech and Language Pathologist, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate</td>
<td>- Recommendation by Chief of Autism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Chief of Autism will chair IPRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Students with Autism who have a second diagnosis or identification may be eligible for other ISP placements depending on need. Each identification should be listed separately under the Ministry of Education’s definitions.

**Withdrawal:**
- For PAST program, a diagnosis of Asperger’s or high functioning Autism or Autism Level 1\(^2\) indicating average cognitive functioning, is required  
- For students in Grades 3 to 6  
- Referral and recommendation by Autism Team member  
- Recommendation by Chief of Autism  
- Chief of Autism will chair IPRC  
- Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required

---

\(^1\) Based on psychological assessment  
\(^2\) DSM-5 criteria
How are students admitted to the Autism Intensive Support Program?³

STEP 1
After a period of intervention where the need for more intensive support is evident, discussion with the appropriate SBSLT members and Autism Team members is necessary. The recommendation for more intensive support is based on: psychological assessment indicating average cognitive ability. If no formal cognitive assessment has been completed, a referral to Psychology will be recommended when appropriate. Other assessments as available; evidence regarding the student’s response to previous instruction and interventions; parent and student input.

STEP 2
The Autism Support Teacher consults with the Chief of Autism Programs and Services regarding placement recommendation.

STEP 3
If, based on the above communication, placement is recommended, the Chief of Autism communicates with the Principal where the Autism ISP is located to determine if it will meet the student’s needs. When the placement is determined, the Autism Support Teacher arranges a visit for parents and student to the potential ISP (via the receiving school’s Principal).

If there is no space available, the student’s name is placed on the waitlist by the Chief of Autism. No visit is arranged at this time. (IPRC placement is “regular class” as opposed to “special education class – partial integration”).

³ Please note the Autism ISP is currently a pilot project
STEP 4
If there is space available, and the parent agrees with the placement, the Autism Support Teacher informs the Chief of Autism. The Chief of Autism informs the home school Principal to request an IPRC meeting for change of placement. The regional secretary is also informed.

STEP 5
The home school Principal requests an IPRC meeting. There is formal identification (if necessary) and placement in the Autism ISP (“special education class – partial integration”) through the IPRC. The home school Principal arranges transportation for the student.

STEP 6
Transition to the ISP class begins with a Case Conference to exchange information between the sending and the receiving school's appropriate staff (coordinated by sending and receiving School Principals or designates). Assessment findings (as appropriate), indicating programming needs and recommendations are shared with the receiving teachers.

STEP 7
For a formal review of progress/placement, an IPRC review meeting is conducted at least annually or as deemed necessary.
**TCDSB Definitions and IPRC Criteria 2015-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional IC</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition: The Ministry of Education defines “A learning disorder characterized by specific behaviour problems over such a period of time, and to such a marked degree, and of such a nature, as to adversely affect educational performance, and that may be accompanied by one or more of the following: a) an inability to build or to maintain interpersonal relationships; b) excessive fears or anxieties; c) a tendency to compulsive reaction; d) an inability to learn that cannot be traced to intellectual, sensory, or other health factors, or any combination thereof.” (MOE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPRC Identification Criteria</th>
<th>IPRC Placement Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIOUR</strong></td>
<td><strong>ISP (Intensive Support Program):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Behaviour Identification:</td>
<td>Student eligibility criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Psycho-educational assessment indicating social emotional difficulties, average cognitive ability and a recommendation for a Behaviour identification</td>
<td>• Formal identification by Identification, Placement and Review Committee Eligible students present with behavioural needs based on formal assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ For Psychological Reports completed outside of TCDSB, a Psychology File Note with IPRC recommendation by TCDSB Psychology staff is required.</td>
<td>• Full psychological assessment required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Social Worker intervention with student and/or family for at least one term and a report recommending a Behaviour program</td>
<td>o Evidence of average cognitive ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Other assessments as appropriate</td>
<td>o Evidence of Social-Emotional needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Individual Education Plan (IEP) required to address social emotional and academic concerns (in place for at least one term)</td>
<td>• Social Work Assessment based on having worked with student and family for at least one term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An IEP is in place for at least one term addressing behaviour needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o confirm that student cannot function in a regular classroom without extra staff support and numerous accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recommend a behaviour identification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent/guardian consent is required; student consent, as appropriate

For detailed description of placement procedures see separate section below.
When students transfer from another School Board with a Behaviour Identification the schools SBSLT must review assessments to ensure that they meet TCDSB Behaviour Criteria. If the student meets criteria the school may bring the student to IPRC for identification and placement in an ISP Behaviour Programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Withdrawl assistance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student eligibility criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This placement may benefit students who have been demitted from a Behaviour ISP program placement; or, whose parents do not wish their child to attend an ISP class. This placements suits students who are functioning closer to grade level and who present no serious safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Regular Class with Withdrawal Support placement for Behaviour students provides personalized alternate programming, accommodations and modifications to provide access to the Ontario Curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student eligibility criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource assistance within the regular classroom is chosen for Behaviour students who can benefit from being with their peers or who prefer being with their peers and are able to learn without being withdrawn to another classroom setting. This placement is sometimes chosen for students identified exceptional under the category of Behaviour who attend grades seven and eight or high school. It may also benefit students who have been demitted from a Behaviour ISP program placement; or, whose parents do not wish their child to be withdrawn to a special education class or attend an ISP class in another school. This placements suits students who are functioning closer to grade level and who present no serious safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student eligibility criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The placement of Regular Classroom with Indirect Support for Behaviour students is chosen for pupils whose behaviour is no longer interfering with their learning on a daily basis; however, they may require accommodations provided in the regular program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individualized educational programming may be provided indirectly in elementary and secondary school for students with Behaviour identification in their specific areas of need. Formal placement by IPRC is optional for indirect support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/guardian consent; Student consent, as appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behaviour ISP Placement Procedures

Oversight for placement in Behaviour Intensive Support Programs is provided by the Central Behaviour Team:

John Wilhelm Chief Social Worker
Paula Antinucci Assessment and Programming Teacher

How are students admitted to the Behaviour Intensive Support Program?

**STEP 1**
- SBSLT recommendation, based on:
  - Psycho educational assessment indicating social emotional difficulties, average cognitive ability and a recommendation for a Behaviour identification
  - Social Worker intervention with student and/or family for at least one term and a report recommending a Behaviour program
  - Student's response to previous interventions
  - Parent input
  - Other assessments as appropriate
- Individual Education Plan (IEP) including alternative subjects to address social emotional concerns required (in place for at least one term)

**STEP 2**
- Formal identification and placement by Identification, Placement and Review Committee (IPRC) recommending an ISP Behaviour Programme

**STEP 3**
Behaviour APT decides on ISP programme based on:
- Age of student
- Proximity to students home address
- Number of students in programme
- Stability of the ISP programme – are students in crisis
- Is it a good fit with other students in the programme
- Date of last admission to the programme

**STEP 4**
Transition to the placement in ISP Behaviour Programme starts with exchange of information between the sending school’s appropriate SBSLT members (psychology staff, social worker, teacher) and the receiving Behaviour ISP teacher and the receiving schools appropriate SBSLT members (Social Work and Psychology). This meeting is coordinated by the Behaviour APT. Assessment findings (as appropriate), indicating programming needs and recommendations are shared with the receiving school staff.
**STEP 5**
The Behaviour APT arranges a parent and student visit to the ISP class. At this meeting the parent and student can meet the staff and have an opportunity to ask questions.

**STEP 6**
The home school arranges bussing.

**STEP 7**
Formal review of progress/placement is conducted at least annually or as deemed necessary.
**Excellency**

**Learning Disability**

**Definition:** The Ministry of Education defines *learning disability* as one of a number of neurodevelopmental disorders that persistently and significantly has an impact on the ability to learn and use academic and other skills and that:

- affects the ability to perceive or process verbal or non-verbal information in an effective and accurate manner in students who have assessed intellectual abilities that are *at least* in the average range;
- results in (a) academic underachievement that is inconsistent with the intellectual abilities of the student (which are at least in the average range) and/or (b) academic achievement that can be maintained by the student only with extremely high levels of effort and/or with additional support;
- results in difficulties in the development and use of skills in one or more of the following areas: reading, writing, mathematics, and learning skills;
- may typically be associated with difficulties in one or more cognitive processes, such as phonological processing; memory and attention; processing speed; perceptual-motor processing; visual-spatial processing; executive functions (e.g., self-regulation of behaviour and emotions, planning, organizing of thoughts and activities, prioritizing, decision making);
- may be associated with difficulties in social interaction (e.g., difficulty in understanding social norms or the point of view of others); with various other conditions or disorders, diagnosed or undiagnosed; or with other exceptionalities;
- is *not* the result of a lack of acuity in hearing and/or vision that has not been corrected; intellectual disabilities; socio-economic factors; cultural differences; lack of proficiency in the language of instruction; lack of motivation or effort; gaps in school attendance or inadequate opportunity to benefit from instruction.  
  
(From *Policy and Program Memorandum 8, Ontario Ministry of Education, 2014*)

At TCDSB, the *diagnosis of Learning Disability* is used to describe the LD learning profile, which is based on the LD definition by the LDAO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPRC Identification Criteria</th>
<th>IPRC Placement Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For LD identification:</strong></td>
<td><strong>ISP (Intensive Support Program):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Psychological assessment indicating an LD diagnosis (based on LDAO definition)</td>
<td>□ Elementary students diagnosed with moderate/severe LD, as their primary area of need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ For Psychological Reports completed outside of TCDSB, a Psychology File Note with IPRC recommendation by TCDSB Psychology staff is required.</td>
<td>□ Psychological assessment indicating an LD diagnosis; other assessments as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate</td>
<td>□ Have received a period of withdrawal support from a special education teacher in a smaller class setting and have shown insufficient response to intervention (documented in the IEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Experience significant difficulty with the regular classroom curriculum and require intensive support to access several curriculum areas</td>
<td>□ Individual Education Plan (IEP) is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Have a significant need for support in developing organizational/study skills, self-advocacy and social skills</td>
<td>□ Experience significant difficulty with the regular classroom curriculum and require intensive support to access several curriculum areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Have academic skill levels in reading, language, writing and/or mathematics that are deemed well below expectations (i.e. in the Low to Very Low range)

Formal identification by IPRC is required for placement in ISP (based on LD diagnosis)

**Parent/guardian consent is required; student consent, as appropriate**

*For detailed description of placement procedures see separate section below.*

**Withdrawal:**

**Student eligibility criteria:**
- Elementary and secondary students with mild/moderate/severe LD may be referred for withdrawal placement
- Psychological assessment indicating an LD diagnosis; other assessments as appropriate
- Student's response to previous interventions

**Individual Education Plan (IEP) is required**

Formal placement by IPRC is **optional** for withdrawal support

**Parent/guardian consent:** Student consent, as appropriate

**Resource assistance**

**Student eligibility criteria:**
- Elementary and secondary students with mild/moderate/severe LD may be referred for resource support
- Psychological assessment indicating an LD diagnosis; other assessments as appropriate
- Student has academic needs that can be met within the context of the regular class setting
- Need for direct services provided by the special education teacher to the student in the regular class

**Individual Education Plan (IEP) required**

Formal placement by IPRC is **optional** for students to receive school-based support through resource assistance.

**Parent/guardian consent:** Student consent, as appropriate

**Indirect support**

**Student eligibility criteria:**
- Elementary and secondary students with mild/moderate/severe LD may be referred for indirect support
- Psychological assessment indicating an LD diagnosis; other assessments as appropriate
- Student's response to previous interventions

**Individual Education Plan (IEP) required**

Formal placement by IPRC is **optional** for indirect support

**Parent/guardian consent:** Student consent, as appropriate
LD ISP Placement Procedures (Draft 2015/12/09)

Oversight for placement in LD Intensive Support Programs is provided by the Psychology Department:

Dr. Maria Kokai, Chief Psychologist
Marci Buhagiar (Areas 1 & 2)    Lynne Stewart (Areas 3 & 4)
Rosa Villani (Areas 5 & 6)    Danielle Di Giulio (Areas 7 & 8)

How are students admitted to the Learning Disabilities Intensive Support Program?

STEP 1
Where the need for more intensive support is evident, discussion with the appropriate SBSLT members is necessary. The recommendation for more intensive support is based on: psychological assessment indicating an LD diagnosis; other assessments as available; evidence regarding the student’s response to previous instruction and interventions; parent and student input.

STEP 2
Psychology staff who completed the assessment and recommends an ISP placement communicates with the appropriate psychology staff overseeing LD ISP in the region to determine placement availability.

STEP 3
If, based on the above communication, there are spaces for placement available, the psychology staff who completed the assessment communicates with the APTs and LD ISP teachers in question about the placements to determine the most appropriate one for meeting the student’s needs. When the most appropriate placement is determined, the psychology staff, in collaboration with the sending and receiving school’s APT, arranges a visit for parents and student to the potential ISP (via the receiving school’s Principal).

If there is no space available, the student’s name is placed on the waitlist by the psychology staff overseeing LD ISP in the region. No visit is arranged at this time. (IPRC placement is “regular class” as opposed to “special education class – partial integration”.)

STEP 4
If there is appropriate space for placement available, and the parent agrees with the placement, the assessing psychology staff informs the psychology staff overseeing LD ISP in the region to get confirmation. Based on this confirmation, the assessing psychology staff informs the home school Principal to request an IPRC meeting for the placement. The regional secretary is also informed.

STEP 5
The home school Principal requests an IPRC meeting. The receiving school’s Principal and/or ISP Teacher are invited to the IPRC meeting. There is formal identification and placement in LD ISP (“special education class – partial integration”) by IPRC. The home school Principal arranges transportation for the student.

STEP 6
Transition to the placement in ISP starts with a Case Conference to exchange information between the sending and the receiving school’s appropriate staff (coordinated by sending and receiving School Principals or designates). Assessment findings (as appropriate), indicating programming needs and recommendations are shared with the receiving teachers.

STEP 7
For a formal review of progress/placement, an IPRC review meeting is conducted at least annually or as deemed necessary.
## Deaf and Hard of Hearing (D/HH)

**Definition:** An impairment characterized by deficits in language and speech development because of a diminished or non-existent auditory response to sound. (Ministry of Education)

### IPRC Identification Criteria

**Professional Assessment:**
- an audiological assessment indicating a permanent bilateral hearing loss within the mild to profound range
- psychological assessment (when deemed appropriate)
- speech and language assessment (when deemed appropriate)

**Classroom Documentation:**
- collaboration with school personnel, agencies, classroom teacher, parent(s), guardian(s) and student

**Deaf and Hard of Hearing Assessment:**
- academic and functional assessment at student’s school
- students who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing may demonstrate needs in language and speech development and in gaining auditory access to the curriculum

### IPRC Placement Criteria

**ISP:**
The D/HH intensive support program is for students with a significant hearing loss that results in substantial difficulty with communication and language development.
- student requires a specialized setting and a teacher with specialized qualifications in D/HH in order to access the curriculum
- The goal is to help student achieve academic success through the provision of intensive, individualized education programming including appropriate accommodations, modifications, and alternative curriculum, as outlined in their individualized educational plan.
- Instruction is delivered by a teacher of the deaf for a minimum of 50% of the school day. For the balance of the school day, each student receives instruction within the classroom (integration).
- Instructional components in the programming include the Ontario curriculum and the alternative curriculum. The alternative curriculum is individualized to address specific needs such as hearing loss management and technology, self-advocacy skills, speech and language development, auditory learning skills, American Sign Language, social skills, parental support and other areas that are developmentally appropriate.
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate

### Withdrawal

The D/HH withdrawal support program is for students with a bilateral hearing loss that results in difficulty with communication, language development (English and/or sign), and access to the curriculum.
- Instruction is delivered by a Specialist Teacher of the Deaf.
- The frequency of support ranges from bi-weekly to (1x to 4x) sessions per week, based on individual student need.
- Student requires a quiet environment to learn alternative curricula.
- Instructional components of programming include: alternative curriculum to address specific needs such as hearing loss management and technology, self-advocacy skills, speech/language development, auditory learning skills, and other instructional components may include developmentally appropriate areas such as American Sign Language, social skills, parental support and Ontario curriculum.
- In conjunction with the Audiologist, the D/HH teachers monitor equipment use and functionality (e.g., Hearing Aids, Cochlear Implants, FM system/HAT) within the learning environment.
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate

**Resource support:**
The D/HH Resource Support program is for students with hearing loss that may result in some **difficulty with communication, language and access to the curriculum**.
- Support and information are delivered by a Specialist Teacher of the Deaf. The frequency and duration is typically monthly, based on individual student need.
- In conjunction with the Audiologist, the Itinerant D/HH teachers monitor equipment and functionality (e.g., HAT)
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate

**Indirect Support:**
The D/HH Indirect Support program is for students with hearing loss who have refused direct contact
- Information is delivered by a Specialist Teacher of the Deaf (D/HH teachers). The frequency and duration of support is typically twice a year, but may vary based on student need.
- The D/HH teachers may provide information regarding equipment options (e.g., hearing aids, FM system/Hearing Assistance Technology (HAT)) within the learning environment.
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate
D/HH- ISP Placement Procedures

Oversight for placement in D/HH Intensive Support Programs is provided by the Deaf/Hard of Hearing Department:
Andrea Benjamin Coke, Chief Speech-Language Pathologist
Angie Landolfi, Department Secretary
Maureen Burke, Audiologist

Deaf & Hard of Hearing (D/HH) ISP Placement Procedures

STEP 1
Where the need for more intensive support is evident and the student has a moderate hearing loss or greater for BOTH ears; a placement in a Deaf & Hard of Hearing ISP class may be considered. The recommendation for more intensive support is based on: Audiological data. Input from TCDSB Audiologist, current D/HH Teacher, student and parents. Significant language and academic delays should also be indicated.

STEP 2
The D/HH Teacher recommending an ISP placement discusses and documents the possibility of an ISP placement in Deaf & Hard of Hearing with the D/HH SBSLT. This meeting is booked through D/HH Secretary. The D/HH SBSLT consists of Audiologist, SLP, Social Work, and Chief, SLP.

STEP 3
If an ISP placement is deemed most appropriate, the D/HH Teacher will arrange for a visit with student & parents to the D/HH class. The receiving school’s Principal is notified.

STEP 4
If the parent agrees with the placement, the D/HH Teacher informs the D/HH SBSLT of the parent’s decision.

STEP 5
The home school Principal requests an IPRC meeting for Deaf & Hard of Hearing at OLMC through North Office Secretary. The receiving school’s Principal and/or ISP Teacher are invited to the IPRC meeting. There is formal identification and placement in the D/HH ISP (Special Education Class – Partial Integration) by IPRC.

STEP 6
The home school Principal arranges transportation for the student. The start date is communicated by home school Principal to parents and receiving school Principal.

STEP 7
For a formal review of progress/placement, an IPRC review meeting is conducted at least annually or as deemed necessary.
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**Language Impairment**

**Definition:** Language impairment (LI) is a learning disorder characterized by an impairment in comprehension and/or use of verbal communication or the written or other symbol system of communication which may be associated with neurological, psychological, physical or sensory factors, and which may:
- Include one or more of the form, content and function of language in communication;
- Include one or more of the following: language delay, dysfluency, voice and articulation development, which may or may not be organically or functionally based. (Ministry of Education)

**IPRC Identification Criteria**
- Identification of LI is appropriate for students who have moderate to profound oral language difficulties as reported by a Speech-Language Pathologist in an assessment report
- Language difficulties must be seen as the primary area of weakness (i.e., language impairment is not secondary to developmental delay)
- Demonstrates significant academic needs according to classroom teacher(s)
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate

**IPRC Placement Criteria**
- ISP:
  - Assessed by a speech-language pathologist – primary area of need is oral language
  - Presents with moderate to severe expressive and/or receptive language difficulties in the presence of typical development in other areas
  - Demonstrates significant academic needs according to the classroom teacher that require accommodations and modifications (documented in the IEP)
  - School-based interventions (tier 2, such as KLP, 5th Block, other) have been implemented and monitored over a reasonable period of time
  - Requires intensive support in a special education class in order to access the curriculum
  - Difficulties are not due to ongoing hearing loss or second language issues
  - Behaviour/emotional difficulties (if any) do not interfere with programming
  - Individual Education Plan (IEP) is required
  - Evidence of average non-verbal cognitive ability
    - assessed by psychology staff using developmentally appropriate measures, or
    - assessed by a speech-language pathologist or psychology staff using an approved developmental profile for students enrolled in the KLP only
  - Formal identification by IPRC is required for placement in ISP (based on an LI identification)

**Withdrawal:**
- Criteria for placement in Regular Class with Withdrawal Support:
  - At least moderate expressive-receptive oral language difficulties documented within a speech and language assessment report
  - Demonstrates significant academic need
  - Student requires strategic support in order to access the curriculum due to language difficulties
Speech-Language Pathologist conducts an assessment, determines the level of need and nature of the impairment, and shares findings with the SBSLT.

- SBSLT makes a referral for Withdrawal Support based on speech and language assessment, and other assessments as appropriate, need for strategic withdrawal, student’s response to previous interventions if appropriate and parent input.
- Individual Education Plan (IEP) is required
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate
- Formal placement by IPRC is optional for withdrawal support

### Resource Assistance:
Criteria for resource assistance:
- Mild/moderate oral and written language difficulties, documented within a speech and language assessment report
- Student requires strategic support in order to access the curriculum due to language difficulties
- Student has academic needs that can be met within the context of the regular class setting with embedded resource support
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate
- Formal placement by IPRC is optional for resource assistance

### Indirect Support:
Criteria for placement in Regular Class with Indirect Support:
- Expressive and/or receptive oral language difficulties, documented within a speech and language assessment report
- Reading and writing skills may also be impacted
- Student has academic needs that can be met within the context of the regular class setting
- Need for consultative services provided by the special education teacher to the regular class teacher
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate
- Formal placement by IPRC is optional for indirect support
LI- ISP Placement Procedures
Oversight for placement in LI Intensive Support Programs is provided by the Speech and Language Department:
Andrea Benjamin Coke, Chief Speech-Language Pathologist
Charlene O’Neill Christie (Areas 1 & 2)       Liz Traynor-Harding (Areas 3 & 4)
Anna Kaszkowiak (Areas 5 & 6)       Isabelle Giuliani (Areas 7 & 8)
Ivana Logarzo (for current Kindergarten Language Program graduates only)

How are students admitted to the Language Impaired Intensive Support Program?

**STEP 1**
Where the need for more intensive support is evident, discussion with the appropriate SBSLT members is necessary. The recommendation for more intensive support is based on: speech and language assessment indicating moderate to severe expressive and/or receptive language difficulties in the presence of typical development in other areas; psychological assessment indicating average non-verbal cognitive ability; other assessments as available; evidence regarding the student's response to previous instruction and interventions; parent and student input. **For students enrolled in the KLP only, please refer to the KLP to LI Transition Guide.**

**STEP 2**
The speech-language pathologist who completed the assessment and recommends an ISP placement communicates with the appropriate speech-language pathology staff overseeing LI ISP in the region to determine placement availability.

**STEP 3**
If, based on the above communication, there is space for placement available, the speech-language pathologist who completed the assessment communicates with the SLP at the ISP school, SBSLT members as needed and LI ISP teacher in question about the placement, and if the placement is appropriate, arranges a visit for parents and student to the potential ISP placement (via the receiving school’s Principal). If there is no space available, the student’s name is placed on the waitlist by the speech-language pathologist overseeing LI ISP in the region. No visit is arranged at this time.

**STEP 4**
If there is appropriate space for placement available, and the parent agrees with the placement, the assessing speech-language pathologist informs the SLP overseeing LI ISP in the region to get confirmation. Based on this confirmation, the assessing speech-language pathologist informs the home school Principal to request an IPRC meeting for the placement.

**STEP 5**
The home school Principal requests an IPRC meeting for the placement. The receiving school's Principal and/or ISP Teacher are invited to the IPRC meeting. There is formal identification and placement in LI ISP by IPRC.

**STEP 6**
Transition to the ISP placement starts with exchange of information between the sending school’s appropriate SBSLT members (assessor, SET, classroom teacher) and the receiving classroom and LI ISP teacher (coordinated by sending and receiving School Principals or designates). Assessment findings (as appropriate), indicating programming needs and recommendations are shared with the receiving teachers.

**STEP 7**
Formal review of progress/placement is conducted at least annually or as deemed necessary. Students in LI ISP classes are typically demitted by the IPRC after two years of intensive support.
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Speech Impairment Definition: Speech Impairment is a disorder of the articulation of speech sounds, speech fluency and/or voice.

1. An articulation disorder is the atypical production of speech sounds characterized by substitutions, omissions, additions or distortions that may interfere with intelligibility.
2. A fluency disorder is an interruption in the flow of speaking characterized by atypical rate, rhythm, and repetitions in sounds, syllables, words, and phrases. This may be accompanied by excessive tension, struggle and/or secondary behaviours.
3. A voice disorder is characterized by the abnormal production and/or absence of vocal quality, pitch, loudness, resonance, and/or duration, which is inappropriate for an individual's age and/or sex.

Speech Impairment may co-occur with a broad range of exceptionalities, including Language Impairment.

### IPRC Identification Criteria

**Speech Impairment**

- Primary area of need is communication development due to severe speech impairment as documented within a speech and language assessment report
- Presents with severe articulation, fluency or voice disorder difficulties
- Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate

For students with Speech Impairment in the absence of any other learning needs, identification by the IPRC is rare. The principle placement for these students with Speech Impairment is the regular class, with indirect support.

### IPRC Placement Criteria

**Indirect Support:**

- Criteria for placement in Regular Class with Indirect Support:
  - Assessed by a speech-language pathologist - primary area of need is communication development due to severe speech impairment
  - Severe articulation, fluency or voice disorder
  - Participation in social and academic tasks may be impacted
  - Student has academic needs that can be met within the context of the regular class setting
  - Need for consultative services provided by the special education teacher to the regular class teacher
  - Parent/guardian consent; student consent, as appropriate
  - Formal placement by IPRC is optional for indirect support.
  - Most students who are identified with exceptional learning needs in the area of Speech Impairment also have additional developmental or learning needs and exceptionalities (e.g., Language Impairment, Physical Impairment, Developmental Delay, Autism Spectrum Disorder).

For these students, although the speech impairment is a component of the learning profile, it may not be the speech impairment that dictates the placement that is selected for the student. Therefore, the reader is directed to the accountability frameworks for Language Impairment, Physical Impairment, Developmental Delay or Autism, as appropriate.
### Exceptionality

#### Gifted

**Definition:** An unusually advanced degree of general intellectual ability that requires differentiated learning experiences of a depth and breadth beyond those normally provided in the regular school program to satisfy the level of educational potential indicated. (MOE)

In line with provincial practices for identification of Giftedness, the TCDSB accepts a cut off score greater than or equal to two standard deviations above the mean on a standardized test battery accepted by the Board. Results from assessments carried out at the age of 8.0 or older are eligible for consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPRC Identification Criteria</th>
<th>IPRC Placement Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student must meet TCDSB criteria for Giftedness.</td>
<td>ISP - Full-time Special Education and Special Education with Partial Integration (Grade 6-8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Regular screening:**
  - **Grade 4:** based on group screening (OLSAT8) and/or inclusionary measures (if applicable)
  - **Grade 5-12** for students who have not yet participated in a prior OLSAT8 screening and demonstrate characteristics of a Gifted learner; initiated by school or parent/guardian or student (over 16 years of age); based on group screening (OLSAT8) and/or inclusionary measures (if applicable),
  - **Non-Traditional** for students in Grades 9-12 who participated in the elementary Gifted Withdrawal Program who are seeking an identification of Giftedness; initiated by school or parent/guardian or student (over 16 years); based on different level of group screening (OLSAT8) and/or inclusionary measures (if applicable)

- **Withdrawal (Grade 5-8):**
  - Student must be identified as exceptional – Giftedness through an IPRC within TCDSB
  - Parent/guardian and student participation and consent as appropriate

- **Resource support:**
  - Student must be identified as exceptional - Giftedness through an IPRC within TCDSB
  - Parent/guardian and student participation and consents as appropriate
Based on Psychological Assessments (carried out at age 8.0 or older):

- TCDSB assessment based on SBSLT referrals initiated to address different learning needs, indicates that the results meet TCDSB criteria (TCDSB psychology providers do not accept a referral solely for the purpose of screening for the identification of Giftedness).

- Assessment from the community or another school board referral to TCDSB Psychology staff to review assessment; TCDSB Psychology File Note indicates the results meet TCDSB criteria for Giftedness.

Indirect Support:

- Student must be identified as exceptional - Giftedness through an IPRC within TCDSB.
- Parent/guardian and student participation and consents as appropriate.
**Developmental Disability (DD) (Draft)**

**Definition:** A severe learning disorder characterized by a) inability to profit from a special education program because of slow intellectual development; b) ability to profit from a special education program that is designed to accommodate slow intellectual development; c) a limited potential for academic learning, independent social adjustment and economic self-support. (MOE)

**TCDSB Identification Guidelines:** *It is recommended that each exceptionality category be identified separately (consistent with other large school boards).*

The student has been diagnosed with Global Developmental Delay or Developmental Disability or Intellectual Disability which is demonstrated by intellectual functioning at or below the 1st percentile\(^1\), and significant deficits in at least one area of adaptive functioning – conceptual, social, and/or practical\(^2\), and significant academic delays.

If no assessment has been completed, DD identification is not proposed and a referral for appropriate assessment(s) will be recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPRC Identification Criteria</th>
<th>IPRC Placement Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>ISP:</strong> students require intensive support (elementary and secondary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intellectual functioning at or below the 1st percentile(^3)</td>
<td>• Student must be identified as exceptional through an IPRC within TCDSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant deficits in at least one area of adaptive functioning – conceptual, social, and/or practical(^4),</td>
<td>• Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant academic delays</td>
<td><strong>Withdrawal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The student has been diagnosed with</strong></td>
<td>• Student must be identified as exceptional through an IPRC within TCDSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Developmental Delay or Developmental Disability or Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>• Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resource support:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student must be identified as exceptional through an IPRC within TCDSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Based on psychological assessment conducted after the age of 7. If a student is younger than 7 years of age at the time of the assessment, a DD identification will not be used. Instead, an ME identification will be proposed and a review to clarify the identification will be conducted after the child is 7. (This may include a psychological re-assessment if deemed appropriate).

2 DSM-5 criteria

3 Based on psychological assessment conducted after the age of 7. If a student is younger than 7 years of age at the time of the assessment, a DD identification will not be used. Instead, an ME identification will be proposed and a review to clarify the identification will be conducted after the child is 7. (This may include a psychological re-assessment if deemed appropriate).

4 DSM-5 criteria

---
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DD ISP Placement Procedures

How are students admitted to the Multiple Exceptionalities Intensive Support Program?

**STEP 1**
Where the need for more intensive support is evident, discussion with the appropriate SBSLT members is necessary. The recommendation for more intensive support is based on: with Global Developmental Delay or Developmental Disability or Intellectual Disability which is demonstrated by intellectual functioning at or below the 1st percentile\(^5\), and significant deficits in at least one area of adaptive functioning – conceptual, social, and/or practical\(^6\), and significant academic delays; other assessments as available; evidence regarding the student’s response to previous instruction and interventions; parent and student input.

**STEP 2**
The APT/PAT who recommends an ME/DD ISP placement communicates with the Superintendent in the region to determine placement availability.

**STEP 3**
If, based on the above communication, there are spaces for placement available, the APT/PAT communicates with the APT/PAT the placements to determine the most appropriate one for meeting the student's needs. When the most appropriate placement is determined, the APT/PAT arranges a visit for parents and student to the potential ISP (via the receiving school’s Principal). If there is no space available, the student's name is placed on the waitlist by the APT/PAT overseeing ME/DD ISP in the region. No visit is arranged at this time. (IPRC placement is “regular class” as opposed to “special education class – partial integration”.)

**STEP 4**
If there is appropriate space for placement available, and the parent agrees with the placement, the APT/PAT informs the Superintendent. Based on this confirmation, the APT/PAT informs the home school Principal to request an IPRC meeting for the placement. The regional secretary is also informed.

---

\(^5\) Based on psychological assessment conducted after the age of 7. If a student is younger than 7 years of age at the time of the assessment, a DD identification will not be used. Instead, an ME identification will be proposed and a review to clarify the identification will be conducted after the child is 7. (This may include a psychological re-assessment if deemed appropriate).

\(^6\) DSM-5 criteria
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STEP 5
The home school Principal requests an IPRC meeting. The receiving school's Principal and/or ISP Teacher are invited to the IPRC meeting. There is formal identification and placement in the ME/DD ISP (“special education class – partial integration”) by IPRC. The home school Principal arranges transportation for the student.

STEP 6
Transition to the placement in ISP starts with a Case Conference to exchange information between the sending and the receiving school’s appropriate staff (coordinated by sending and receiving School Principals or designates). Assessment findings (as appropriate), indicating programming needs and recommendations are shared with the receiving teachers.

STEP 7
For a formal review of progress/placement, an IPRC review meeting is conducted at least annually or as deemed necessary
## Exceptionality

### Multiple Exceptionalities (ME) (Draft)

**Definition:** A combination of learning or other disorders, impairments, or physical disabilities, that is of such nature as to require, for educational achievement, the services of one or more teachers holding qualifications in special education and the provision of support services appropriate for such disorders, impairments, or disabilities. (MOE)

**TCDSB Identification Guidelines:** It is recommended that each exceptionality category be identified separately (consistent with other large school boards).

The Board adopts 2 pathways to ME identification:
- The student has a medical and/or developmental assessment completed indicating a combination (2 or more) of learning or other disorders, impairments, or physical disabilities; the needs will include cognitive delays and significant academic delays;
- A psychological and/or other assessments have been completed indicating a combination (2 or more) of learning or other disorders, impairments, or physical disabilities; diagnosis(es); the needs will include cognitive delays (Intellectual functioning around the 2\(^{nd}\) percentile\(^1\) based on recent psychological assessment) and academic delays.

If no assessment has been completed, ME identification is not proposed and a referral for appropriate assessment(s) will be recommended.

#### IPRC Identification Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical and/or developmental assessment</th>
<th>Psychological assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination of 2 or more learning disorders, impairments, physical disabilities or diagnosis(es)</td>
<td>Combination of 2 or more learning disorders, impairments, physical disabilities or diagnosis(es)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant cognitive and academic delays</td>
<td>Intellectual functioning around the 2(^{nd}) percentile(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note by TCDSB psychology staff is required</strong> indicating that the student meets TCDSB identification criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the assessment is from a medical or psychology practitioner from the community or other school board, a Psychology File is required indicating that the student meets TCDSB identification criteria.

If ASD or other diagnoses are also present, each exceptionality will be identified separately.

---

**ISP:** students require intensive support (elementary and secondary)

- Student must be identified as exceptional through an IPRC within TCDSB
- Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required

**Withdrawal:**

- Student must be identified as exceptional through an IPRC within TCDSB
- Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required

**Resource support:**

- Student must be identified as exceptional through an IPRC within TCDSB
- Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required

**Indirect Support:**

- Student must be identified as exceptional through an IPRC within TCDSB
- Parent/guardian; student consent, as appropriate, is required

---

\(^1\)Based on psychological assessment
How are students admitted to the Multiple Exceptionalities Intensive Support Program?

**STEP 1**
Where the need for more intensive support is evident, discussion with the appropriate SBSLT members is necessary. The recommendation for more intensive support is based on: a medical and/or developmental assessment completed indicating a combination (2 or more) of learning or other disorders, impairments, or physical disabilities; other diagnosis(es); the needs will include cognitive delays and significant academic delays; or psychological assessment and/or other assessments have been completed indicating a combination (2 or more) of learning or other disorders, impairments, or physical disabilities; diagnosis(es); the needs will include cognitive delays (intellectual functioning around the 2nd percentile² based on recent psychological assessment) and academic delays; other assessments as available; evidence regarding the student’s response to previous instruction and interventions; parent and student input.

**STEP 2**
The APT/PAT who recommends an ME/DD ISP placement communicates with the Superintendent in the region to determine placement availability.

**STEP 3**
If, based on the above communication, there are spaces for placement available, the APT/PAT in consultation with the Superintendent determines the most appropriate one for meeting the student’s needs. When the most appropriate placement is determined, the APT/PAT arranges a visit for parents and student to the potential ISP (via the receiving school’s Principal).

If there is no space available, the student’s name is placed on the waitlist by the APT/PAT overseeing ME/DD ISP in the region. No visit is arranged at this time.

(IPRC placement is “regular class” as opposed to “special education class – partial integration”.)

**STEP 4**
If there is appropriate space for placement available, and the parent agrees with the placement, the APT/PAT informs the Superintendent. Based on this confirmation, the APT/PAT informs the home school Principal to request an IPRC meeting for the placement. The regional secretary is also informed.

**STEP 5**
The home school Principal requests an IPRC meeting. The receiving school’s Principal and/or ISP Teacher are invited to the IPRC meeting. There is formal identification and placement in the ME/DD ISP (“special education class – partial integration”) by IPRC. The home school Principal arranges transportation for the student.

²Based on psychological assessment

Revised February 2015
STEP 6
Transition to the placement in ISP starts with a Case Conference to exchange information between the sending and the receiving schools' appropriate staff (coordinated by sending and receiving school Principals or designates). Assessment findings (as appropriate) indicating programming needs and recommendations are shared with the receiving teachers.

STEP 7
For a formal review of progress/placement, an IPRC review meeting is conducted at least annually or as deemed necessary
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Special Education was identified as one of the engagements for FY2014-15 as part of the Regional Internal Audit Team (RIAT) 2013–2016 multi-year internal audit plan. The overall objectives of this engagement were to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery of special education programs and services in key areas including management roles and responsibilities, administrative controls, monitoring and reporting processes, and the use of information technology.

With the increased demand for special education programs and services across the province, including at the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB) along with limited resources and funding available, it is important that special education is managed effectively and efficiently. In addition, equitable allocation of resources is also an important consideration when evaluating special education to ensure that student needs are being met with available resources.

The scope of this engagement does not include the overall funding approach by the Ministry of Education for special education for the TCDSB.

Scope

There are many components to Special Education. A “top down” approach was used to conduct the engagement with a focus on key areas from an operational and program delivery perspective. Through consideration of potential risks and discussions with TCDSB management and the audit committee, the following areas were identified in scope:

- Oversight and Governance –reporting and control structures, roles and responsibilities, committees, and risk assessments;
- Resource Allocation – budgeting and planning and related allocation of staff resources;
- Service Delivery – individual education plans (IEP’s), measuring student progress, wait lists for assessments, and providing programs and services based on student needs and demand and,
- Information Systems and Management – processes and systems to capture, monitor and report on key information and student performance.

All other areas were excluded from our scope, including for example, the special equipment amount (SEA) claims process, Section 23 programs for high risk students whose educational needs are met outside of the regular school system, curriculum delivery and partnerships with external agencies.
Summary of Key Observations and Recommendations

Overall, based on the results of our audit, it was noted that Special Services at the TCDSB provides support to their students with special education needs. Special Services maintains a strong student focus through a number of processes, both formal and informal, including key activities and through oversight committees. This allows management to minimize potential service delivery risks by placing the emphasis on meeting the needs of students within the resources available to them.

However, in order to better address operational and student service delivery risks, we noted opportunities for improvement as follows:

1. Greater effort to understand and address special education spending in excess of ministry funding allocations.
2. Finance should support greater insight of Special Services needs to inform the Board’s overall budget and planning process.
3. Management should consider a formal risk assessment process to address operational level and financial risks.
4. Improvements to the support staff allocation model including specifically Educational Assistants (EAs) in order to ensure allocations are based on current student needs.
5. The need for enhanced information systems and reporting, especially in the areas of case management and school-level reporting.
6. Processes for monitoring psychological assessment backlogs can be improved to more effectively address waitlist times.

Management Response:

Management agrees with the above observations and has developed action plans to address these observations as detailed further in each section following.

BACKGROUND

School boards in Ontario are regulated by the Education Act to provide special education programming for all students identified with an exceptionality (see Appendix F for exceptionalities and special education placements). Additionally, there are a large portion of students not formally identified as exceptional but who are receiving special education programs and services.

The Ministry of Education provides funding for the delivery of Special Education programs and services. Every school board in Ontario is required to provide an annual report to the Ministry on the utilization of funding and the number of students supported by Special Education programs and services through their Special Education Plan.
Funding

The Special Education Grant (“SEG”) represents approximately 12% of total Ministry of Education funding to the TCDSB and is the second largest grant behind the Pupil Foundation Grant. SEG funding is comprised of six components, largely driven by enrolment or the “special education per pupil amount” (“SEPPA”) and the number of students at the board with very high needs – the high needs amount (“HNA”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>FY2011-12 Actuals</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>FY2012-13 Actuals</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>FY2013-14 Actuals</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>FY2014-15 Projections</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Foundation Grant</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Foundation Grant</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Grant</strong></td>
<td><strong>119.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
<td><strong>118.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
<td><strong>118.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
<td><strong>126.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>12%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Grants and Funding Amounts</td>
<td>345.2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>335.2</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>332.0</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>345.8</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding Excluding Capital Programs</td>
<td>976.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>964.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>949.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1019.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Education School Board Funding Projections for 2014-15 (Spring 2014)

TCDSB Special Services

The TCDSB Special Services group, under leadership of Frank Piddisi (“Superintendent of Special Services”, or “Superintendent”) is responsible for a range of services including special education programs, autism, social work, speech and language, and psychology. (refer to Appendix C for the organizational chart). Many of these areas are connected and together support the needs of students with special education needs. The focus of our engagement was on management and oversight at the Board level for special education programs and services provided by Special Education Teachers (“SET’s”), Intensive Support Program Teachers (“ISP’s”), Educational Assistants (“EA’s”) and other support staff. See Appendix D for budget and staffing information for the Special Services group.
OVERALL OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Oversight and Governance

As mandated by the Education Act (s. 57.1), every school board is required to establish a Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC). The SEAC is one of the key oversight mechanisms in place at the TCDSB, along with establishment of the Accountability Framework for Special Education (AFSE) – discussed in Section C – Service Delivery section below.

The Special Services group at the TCDSB is structured into 4 regions and 8 areas. A Principal-level Program Coordinator is responsible for overseeing the schools in their region. These Program Coordinators meet with the Superintendent twice a month and regularly as required to provide updates for their region on special education matters, including discussing all topics relating to special education programs, best practices, and training initiatives.

Based on our discussions with the Superintendent of Special Services, the Program Coordinators spend approximately half of their time in Identification and Placement Review Committee (IPRC) meetings and are therefore familiar with the identified students in their schools and related placement decisions. A large part of the Program Coordinators role is to manage relationships with the school principals, various support staff, students and parents.

Many of the day to day operational issues (i.e. processing SEA applications, participating in school based support learning teams (SBSLT) for classroom assessments etc.) are carried out by the Assessment and Programming teachers (APT’s) at the elementary level and Programming and Assessment Teachers (PAT’s) at the secondary level. However, from an operational perspective, it is the school principal that has the primary responsibility for ensuring that service delivery and student needs are met (i.e. IPRC meetings and IEP’s are in compliance with provincial requirements, special education staff at the school are allocated appropriately, delivery of programming as per the IEP’s, as well as holding consultations with board staff and parents as required – see Appendix E “Special Education Overview” for more details).

In order to understand overall oversight and governance from an operational perspective, discussions were held with the following individuals:

- Superintendent of Special Services
- 2 Program Coordinators

Based on discussions held with the above individuals, review of roles and responsibilities, and supporting documentation such as meeting agenda notes, it was noted that appropriate reporting structures have been established. In addition, as noted in the
TCDSB Special Education Plan (2013/14), roles and responsibilities have been documented.

However, in order to enhance overall governance and oversight, the following recommendations should be considered:

**A1. The need for identification of operational and financial objectives and formalized risk assessments**

**Background:**

Given the size of the special education budget, it is important that financial and operational objectives are established by management, including the identification of risks to achieving those objectives. “Risk assessments involve a dynamic and iterative process for identifying and analyzing risks to achieving the entity’s objectives, forming a basis for determining how risks should be managed. Management considers possible changes in the external environment and within its own business model that may impede its ability to achieve its objectives.”

**Observation:**

The board has established goals to improve program delivery by exceptionality. There is documentation and monitoring in place in relation to academic goals and objectives. However, operational and financial objectives are not formally established or linked. Based on discussions with the Superintendent of Special Services, there are a number of operational and financial risks faced by the Special Services department. Some of these include:

- Spending over ministry allocations,
- Limited insight into the budget and planning process,
- Contractual and other operational limitations that limit shifts in SET’s and EA’s between schools to meet changes in demand, and
- The need for improved communication and coordination between Special Services and other departments such as Finance and HR,
- Information systems not sufficient to enable management of service delivery.

Without a formal process for identifying and documenting key operational and financial objectives (in addition to academic related objectives), as well as the associated risks to achieving these objectives, management cannot effectively ensure that risks are being monitored, controls and other actions are being implemented to mitigate risks, and that objectives are being met.

---

1 COSO (Integrated Control – Integrated Framework), 2013
Recommendation:

Formally identifying and documenting key operational and financial risks is an important first step in establishing a risk management process. This will also assist with longer term planning and decisions around resource allocation and service delivery (see Observation #B1). As risks are identified, management should continue to monitor them and identify potential strategies to mitigate the identified risks.

Management Response:

The following operational and financial risks have been identified and documented by special education department staff as a result of its plenary meeting held on April 2, 2015:

- Incorrectly identified and placed students resulting in:
  - Unnecessary/Increases in Teacher ISP Staffing
  - Additional Case Conferences with SBSLT Staff and Parents
  - IPRC Appeal Costs, Litigation, Human Rights Tribunal

- Poorly created and documented IEPs result in unnecessary resource commitment and use:
  - Teachers
  - Education Assistants
  - CYWs
  - Contract Support Staff
  - SEA Equipment (Computer and Furniture) Equipment

- Sub-optimal school organization (LSAC and LSSSAC) with respect to students with special education needs resulting in:
  - Supervision gaps requiring additional support staff
  - Instructional gaps as per IEPs requiring additional education assistants and/or teachers

- Contract constraints which prohibit assigning support staff based on individual student need as outlined in the IEP due to seniority surplus rules results in the over assignment of redundant support staff.

- Political process with respect to service level expectations and entitlements

- The use of incompatible and/or different databases and files among HR and Special Services resulting in duplication of effort and inefficiencies.

- Non-comprehensive Crises Prevention and Intervention in-services and tracking exposing the Board to work refusals, litigation, special education appeals.
A2. More formalized reporting from the school level to the board level

Background:

As noted above, from an operational perspective, significant responsibilities are carried by the Program Coordinators, APT’s/PAT’s, and school principals.

Observation:

Although Program Coordinators meet regularly with the Superintendent, formalized reporting processes did not appear to be established from the school level to board level management.

Recommendation:

Given that schools are largely responsible for managing the delivery of special education programs and services, staffing, and other operational matters, more formalized reporting in these areas should be established so that schools are accountable and senior management is able to maintain appropriate oversight. Management should identify ways in which more formalized reporting can be established, without being too onerous for schools to complete. The focus should be on the two key operational areas – resource allocation and service delivery. This could include IEP trend data, year over year comparisons and commentary, special education staffing utilization etc.

Management Response:

Currently teacher staffing is determined by panel and is based on the number of special education identifications and placements.

The Education Act holds school principals responsible for the timely development and delivery of the Individual Education Plans (IEP) for the students in their schools.

Special education staff will deliver annual, mandatory principal in-services around the development and delivery of the IEP and its best practices as they evolve and are communicated by the Ministry of Education, Special Education Branch. As the curriculum leader in the school, principals would be expected to train and retrain teachers with respect to the IEP as needed.

Special education staff will ensure that principals collect and deliver local teacher special education timetables to their field supervisory officer and the TSU/TECT Joint Special Education Committees twice per year by October 31\textsuperscript{st} and March 31\textsuperscript{st} respectively.

The Support Staff for Student Needs (SSSN) database be recreated annually and audited on a spot-check basis throughout the year for currency and accuracy.
B. Resource Allocation

Over 90% of total special education spending is for staff resources (i.e. SET’s, EA’s, paraprofessionals and contract support staff) – see Appendix D for details. The process for staff allocation begins with headcount information received from Finance for the following year. This usually occurs in May, concurrently with the boards annual budgeting cycle. Special Services management will then follow a process for SET (including Individual Support Program (ISP) and Itinerant teachers) and EA allocations to individual elementary and secondary schools based on a variety of factors. For Elementary SET, Empower Reading Teachers, ISP and Itinerant teachers, the allocations are based on IEP placements and caseloads. Typical SET allocations in elementary schools range from 0.50 – 2.50 per school. ISP classes are held in selected schools to accommodate students for larger geographic areas. Based on enrolment data, approximately 14% of identified students attend an ISP class (1,189/8,732 for FY2014/15). See below for a breakdown of ISP classes by exceptionality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of ISP Classes By Region 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TCDSB 2014/15 Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISP Enrolment Statistics for School Year 20142015 - All Elementary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TCDSB 2014/15 Data
Key Findings

B1. Special education spending in excess of ministry funding allocations

Observation:

The funding shortfall in Special Education was estimated at $19.7 million for FY2014-15 (See Appendix D – Special Services Budget and Staffing). The projected funding shortfall has declined from the prior year as a result of full day kindergarten (FDK), estimated at $7.4 million, being fully integrated in the grants for student needs (GSN’s). Historically, and projected by management to continue, special education spending has exceeded ministry funding and represents the largest single deficit program area in the TCDSB. However, no formal plans were noted to address longer term funding shortfalls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education spending</td>
<td>149.8</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>149.3</td>
<td>150.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>127.9</td>
<td>128.3</td>
<td>130.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(Deficit)</td>
<td>(19.90)</td>
<td>(17.10)</td>
<td>(21.00)</td>
<td>(19.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In order to address funding shortfalls as the demand for special services continues to grow the Board has been drawing funds from other program areas – mainly the ESL grant and Learning Opportunities Grant (LOG).

The Special Services department has been managing their resources based on staffing allocations provided to them by Finance and supplemental amounts for contract staff from HR. Based on discussions with the Superintendent of Special Services, most of the additional spending is in relation to support staff (EA’s and CYW’s). For example, additional support staff needed as a result of FDK and the growth in students with autism is estimated at approximately $5 million. Contract support staff to supplement EA shortfalls or changing demand at a school during the year (i.e. for emergencies that impact student safety) is estimated at approximately $3.5 million, with the balance in the number of special education teachers.

Although efforts are made on an overall basis to ensure that a balanced budget is achieved for the Board (which includes reallocating funds where permitted, finding spending efficiencies and savings etc.), additional efforts are required by individual program areas (especially those where spending in excess of ministry funding occurs) to understand their needs and how they can be appropriately addressed. This will allow for open and transparent discussions to facilitate more proactive management of spending in key areas such as special education going forward.
Recommendation:

A comprehensive analysis of the special education needs and budget is recommended in order to form a longer term plan to address funding shortfalls and service delivery impacts. This should be a collaborative effort between senior management from multiple departments, including Finance, Special Services, HR and others as appropriate.

Although special service needs are constantly changing based on student demand and exceptionality, an important first step is to use trend data to form longer term planning decisions. Part of this exercise can include understanding the “ideal state” and the resources required to provide optimal service delivery, the minimum service delivery that can be provided based on Ministry funding, and the “current state”, which currently lies somewhere between those points. Linkages should be made to a formalized risk analysis (see Observation #A1 above), especially in the event that current sources of additional funding become at risk in the future. Accordingly, contingency plans should be in place for alternative service delivery with communication to key stakeholders.

Management Action Plan:

Special education staff will investigate the formal establishment of a system level Special Education Allocation and Planning Staff Committee (SEAP) to oversee the allocation of Special Education Support Staff, i.e. Educational Assistants and Child & Youth Workers, with the following membership:

- Superintendent of Special Education
- Superintendent of Finance
- Superintendent of Human Resources
- Superintendents of Schools (2)
- Elementary School Principals (2)
- Secondary School Principals (2)
- Associate Director of Academic Affairs
B2. Greater insight into the budget and planning process

Observation:

Based on discussions with the Superintendent of Special Services, greater insight into the overall budgeting process and how it impacts their funding allocations would help with decision making.

For example, as noted above, Finance provides Special Services with headcount information and the total budget allocation annually. Although SEAC approves the Special Services budget prior to the Board of Trustees final approval, additional feedback and involvement from Special Services in the process (prior to SEAC and Board of Trustee approval) will allow for more informed decision making around resource allocation decisions and longer term planning (see Observation #B1 above).

Recommendation:

Greater collaboration between Special Services management and Finance is recommended, both on an ongoing basis as well and as part of the annual budgeting process. This will allow for a better understanding of funding formulas, sources of funding and potential savings and will inform longer term planning.

Management Response:

Special Education and Business Services staff will work collaboratively to ensure that budget lines related to special education revenue and expenses be created, monitored and controlled jointly and that each line accurately describes specific operational expenses.

Special Education and Business Services staff will ensure that any in-year line item changes be co-signed by the superintendents of special education and finance.

Business Services staff will investigate the provision of more detailed reporting on a quarterly basis for the functional areas contained within Special Education Programs & Services.
B3. EA Staffing Allocation Model

Background:

EA staff is by far the largest complement of special education support staff (see Appendix D). However, based on dollars spent, salaries (excluding benefits) for elementary SET’s were more than 50% higher than EA’s. See below for a summary of elementary staff:

Cost per SET and EA (excluding benefits) – Elementary – FY2014/15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>Cost/FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET's</td>
<td>$41,314,498</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>85,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA's</td>
<td>$26,370,407</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>36,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EA’s and CYW’s are allocated starting with the Support Staff for Student Needs (“SSSN”) database. Every year, teachers are required to complete a questionnaire in the database. This forms the basis upon which a model is used to adjust EA/Needs ratios for the accumulated 'needs points' generated for three categories of individual needs: low level support, medium level and high. There are over 24,000 individual student records in the raw data base. Although a good starting point, it was noted that many adjustments are made to these ratios. Based on discussions with the Superintendent, there are many reasons for adjustments, including difficulties moving staff to other schools once they have been allocated.

Observation:

Review of the allocation model showed that only approximately 50 schools had EA/CYW allocations less than the model suggested, while the balance (approximately 150 schools) had EA allocations greater than the model suggested because of adjustments made. As per discussion with the Superintendent, this is in order to reflect actual needs as determined by board management and their knowledge of support needs at individual schools. In discussions with Board staff, it was noted that responses to questionnaires in the database are not verified on a regular basis. There is a risk that some schools may report higher needs than required, although this is mitigated by the Superintendent and Program Coordinator review of the EA allocations prior to finalization. It was also noted that the SSSN database records are not reset every year. Therefore, student profiles may not be current or based on current needs.

Recommendation:

Although the SSSN database is a good starting point, Management should explore other ways in which demand can be more accurately measured in order to ensure equitable allocation of EA resources to schools that require the most support. Additionally, it is recommended that the SSSN database records are reset annually in order to reflect current needs.
Management Response:

Special Education staff plan to continue to base September support staff allocations on the Support Staff for Student Needs (SSSN) database and to reset it yearly, audit at mid-year and incorporate into the Form 100/106/107 staffing reporting and control process.

Special Education staff will continue to ensure that principals, special education teachers and special education department heads are in-serviced on the SSSN database’s continuous improvement and completion each year.
B4. Staff Resource Allocation (SET’s and EA’s)

Observation:

While the Board has an established and observable process for allocating SET’s and EA’s to schools based on resources available and need, it was noted that there is not a consistent method for the allocation and scheduling of SET’s and EA’s in a particular school. Discussion with the Program Coordinators revealed that each school principal is responsible for the scheduling of SET’s and EA’s and the method of scheduling and monitoring can vary from school to school.

The RIAT was unable to interview a sample of principals to determine how allocation and scheduling for special education staff is determined. However, it was noted that the Board does not provide schools with a schedule template or guidance for scheduling SET and EA staff. However, due to the daily changing needs of special education students, timetabling for SET’s and EA’s can be particularly challenging and staff must remain flexible to meet these needs.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Special Services department communicate guidance to schools for the format of efficient allocation and scheduling of SET’s and EA’s time and determine whether a consistent scheduling process could be established with the goal of increasing EA utilization and effectiveness.

Management Response:

Special Education staff will develop and deliver in-services for special education teachers and educational assistants around best practices as they relate to school organization, the need for flexible scheduling and the nature of special education placements.

Special Education teacher timetables will be requested from school principals and local staff allocation committees to be delivered to field superintendents for review.

Special Education staff will create and maintain a pool of 201 itinerant educational assistants to be maintained by Area Field Superintendents for use throughout the year.

Special Education staff recommends that CYW allocations are prioritized as follows:

1. Students with Special Incidence Portions (SIP)
2. Autism, Behaviour, Programs to Assist Social Training (PAST) & Secondary Programs
3. APPLE
4. Safe Schools
C. Service Delivery

As noted above, the school principal plays a central role in service delivery. The Special Services department focuses on service delivery through mechanisms designed to enable early identification and assessment of exceptionalities along with the creation and implementation of student IEPs. Additionally, management has developed Program Review Committees and Accountability Frameworks by exceptionality that design programs and services and report on the measurement of student performance.

Identifying and Supporting Students with Special Education Needs

Special Services provides a broad range of services and supports to students with special education needs. Central to the process is the Identification and Review Committee to formally identify and place students. An Individualized Education Plan (IEP) must be developed for every student that has been identified as “exceptional” and may be developed for students that have not been formally identified but have been deemed by the Board to require special education programs or services. Based on recent data, there are approximately 8,800 formally identified students at the Board (including giftedness), and approximately 16,600 active IEP’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students with an IEP (as at Feb. 10, 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified (including gifted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Formally Identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IEP’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: TCDSB Trillium System*

The students on an IEP without formal identification are still receiving special education and support services. Based on the above data, almost half of all students are not formally identified with an exceptionality. When these students are factored in, the number of students receiving some form of special education support is much higher than indicated based on identified students with exceptionalities (i.e. 18% of all TCDSB students have an IEP – 16,642/90,639 – based on FY2014/15 enrolment estimates).

Given that IEP compliance was not considered by management to be a key risk area, the RIAT selected a small sample of 24 student IEPs for the past two years (2013/14 and 2014/15) from 8 elementary and 4 secondary schools and reviewed them to ensure that:

- student needs are being addressed by taking into account assessment data and strengths and weaknesses, and that for modified or alternative programming clearly stated goals, learning expectations, teaching strategies and assessment methods were documented; and
- IEPs are being completed in accordance with Board and Ministry requirements
Based on the testing performed, it was noted that:

- The IEPs reviewed were adequately prepared and tailored to address individual student needs
- IEPs were generally completed in accordance with Board and Ministry guidelines

**The Accountability Framework for Special Education**

An “Accountability Framework for Special Education” (AFSE) was developed by the Board in 2010. The main objectives of the AFSE are as follows:

- To annually review special education programs and services in order that student achievement and well-being is reported and that programs and services are continually renewed and improved.
- To provide SEAC and the Board with timely evidentiary advice to make effective decisions related to program planning and services in special education.
- The establishment of SMART goals that align with the TCDSB Board Learning Improvement Plan.
- To support the Board’s budgetary cycle

A standing Program Review Committee (PRC) has been established for each exceptionality and meets regularly to collect and analyze student achievement and well-being data. It is an important mechanism for reaching student achievement and well-being goals set by the Ministry, including *Learning for All: K-12, Caring and Safe Schools in Ontario, Growing Success and Assessing Achievement in Alternative Areas (A4)* as well as Board goals set by the Committee.

Two Program Review Committees were selected for review (Learning Disabled and Autism) and discussions were held with each of the Program Review Committee leads. The focus of these discussions was to gain an understanding of the functioning of these committees and whether the objectives of the AFSE were being achieved. Based on our review of SMART goal setting, measuring and reporting of set goals for 2014/15 and 2013/14, the 2013 AFSE presentation to SEAC, and PRC meeting agendas and minutes for the prior two fiscal years, the AFSE appears to be working effectively towards achieving its objectives. Management and staff at the Board are commended for their efforts, many who volunteer their time to support the various PRC’s.

Autism and Learning Disabled (LD) exceptionality groups are the two largest exceptionalities in the Board (excluding gifted). LD students decreased by 20%; from 4,180 students in 2013/14 to 3,340 students in 2014/15.

Autistic students are characterized by their complexity of needs. There has been a significant increase in the numbers of students with Autism, doubling in number of students over the last 5 years. The current incidence of Autism at TCDSB is estimated to be 1 in 68\(^2\) in 2014/15 (compared to 1 in 64 in 2013/14). While autistic students at TCDSB have been increasing since 2004, the number hovered at approximately 1,320 students from 2013/14 to 2014/15.
Building Capacity – Professional Development and Training

Building capacity at the school level to work with children with special education needs is important, especially given the limited resources available.

Significant efforts have been made by the board through a variety of initiatives. This includes the 12 Program Review Committees and special teams for Autism, school based support learning teams (SBSLT), staff led training as well as external training. A Professional Development plan is developed at the beginning of the school year for topics that cover many of the many of the exceptionality areas (i.e. autism, speech and language, gifted, development disability etc.) as well as IEP protocols, special services forms etc.

Based on discussions with the Superintendent, all training was delivered in the prior year. In addition, the board is piloting an Intensive Support Program Team model in FY2014/15 which will consist of a team of experts that will train staff at the school level. Board staff is commended for their significant efforts to build capacity at the school level, of which many activities such as training are done on a volunteer basis outside of regular responsibilities.

2 TCDSB Autism Programs and Services Trend Data Presentation
C1. Assessment Times and Waitlists

Background:

Psychologists are assigned to each region (north, south, east and west) and are responsible for providing a range of psychology-related services including counselling and file reviews. In many cases (except for autism and certain physical disabilities), students must receive a psychological assessment prior to receiving placement by the IPRC. Factors such as mental health, age, exceptionality and parental consent impact the timing of a psychological assessment. Based on discussion with the Chief Psychologist, an assessment typically takes thirty hours. Once a psychological assessment is performed, the assessment feedback and written report must be completed within four weeks.

The RIAT obtained the psychology backlog compilations for June 2014 and December 2014. The psychology referrals backlog includes psychology-related services such as file reviews, counselling, small group counselling and psychological assessments.

In June 2014, there were 1,653 backlogged referrals. 85% of these referrals were for elementary students. The west area has slightly more referral backlogs and it contributes to over half of the secondary students referral backlog.

### Backlog - Psychology-Related Services - June 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Psychologists</th>
<th>Total Backlog</th>
<th>Elementary Backlog</th>
<th>Secondary Backlog</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Secondary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1653 100%</td>
<td>1406 100%</td>
<td>247 100%</td>
<td>169 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As at December 2014, there were 1,447 backlogged referrals for psychology-related services; a 12% decrease from June 2014 (1,653 backlogged referrals). 15% (223) of these cases had been referred more than two years ago (prior to December 2012). The backlog of referrals in the west area is higher than the other areas partly due to the higher student population. However, psychology staff was not able to provide a reason for the higher overall number in that region. Please see chart below:

### Total Backlog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Backlog*</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Backlog &lt; 1 year</th>
<th>&gt; 1 year</th>
<th>Backlog &lt; 2 years</th>
<th>Backlog &gt; 2 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of referrals

Source: TCDSB Psychology Department

Special Services and the Chief Psychologist ensure equity and fairness in handling referrals by triaging referrals based on area and psychologist, prioritizing referrals based on consistent criteria and guidelines and management oversight.
Each psychologist is assigned schools in one of the four areas. As per discussion with the Chief Psychologist, the allocation of schools to a particular psychologist is based on the number of secondary schools per staff member, total population per school and per staff member (“elementary caseload”), and the historical number and percent of referrals in the assigned schools. This allocation ensures that each psychologist is responsible for a similar number of schools, student population, caseload, and an even and equitable share of referrals. Psychologists also work collaboratively with Principals and school teams to respond to school needs.

In order to manage and reduce the backlog, the Department of Psychology has established a list of criteria for prioritizing current referrals and a separate set of criteria for prioritizing existing backlogged referrals. Prioritizing existing referrals (backlogged referrals) is based on a high, medium and low assessment. Those referrals that are considered “high” priority are comprised of referrals for students whose behaviour puts themselves or others at risk, students dependent upon their referral for access to ISP or transitioning programs, students whose outside report is to be reviewed for programming or an IPRC meeting, and any referrals that are two years or older.

Referrals that are two years or older are typically the result of initially being considered a low priority referral (i.e. current intervention strategies have been successful). Referrals that are two years or older are considered “high” priority since September 2013. This is due to an increased emphasis on meeting the needs of students that have been waiting for an increased period of time for services and reducing the backlog. In some cases, a referral that is older than two years may result in a cancellation if the student no longer needs the referral.

Certain referrals are also brought to the attention of the Chief Psychologist due to environmental or political pressures. In these cases, the Chief Psychologist will work with staff, parents and other key stakeholders to come to a resolution.

**Observation:**

A sample of 30 students from across all four regions was selected that were two years outstanding or older. As a result of the prioritizing guidelines issued by the Special Services Department, all 30 of the students selected have been reprioritized as “high” on the list of backlogged referrals to receive services from a Board psychologist.

**Sample Profile - Length of Time of Backlogged Psychology Referrals (at March 2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Referral</th>
<th>Years Outstanding</th>
<th>Number of Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was observed that 27 of the 30 students sampled had an active IEP and has been receiving special education services and supports since the time of their referral. 3 out of the 30 students sampled did not have an active IEP for the 2014/15 school year. See below for explanations:

- Student A (#24) was identified as not requiring an IEP as they were performing at grade level and prior year testing met provincial standards (Grade 3 EQAO scores at Level 3). Some informal accommodations were being provided to the student but an IEP for modifications was determined by the school not to be required. It was indicated that the school would communicate with the students’ parents in order to note a psychological assessment was no longer required.

- Student B (#22) was a grade 6 student that was receiving some accommodations in language and math and was in the process of undergoing an assessment to determine whether an IEP was required. Other students were prioritized ahead of Student B were considered higher priority.

- Student C (#18) transferred out of the TCDSB during the FY2014/15 school year, but had active IEP’s in previous years.

Based on the above testing, it was noted that in almost all cases sampled students on the waitlist were receiving special education support, either through a formal IEP (27 out of 30), informally through other accommodations when the level of support required was low (2 out of 30), or in prior years before a transfer (1 out of 30).

The reporting of back log data is performed twice a year in December and June to the Chief Psychologist. It was noted that there is no system in place to manage referrals centrally within the Board. Therefore, each psychologist is responsible for managing their referrals and wait lists, maintaining their caseloads and updating the Chief Psychologist on the status of their case load and referrals twice a year. This is a manual process. Each regional office maintains a list of the referral backlog for their area. However, there is no tracking of completed referrals. Additionally, the back log reporting aggregated by the Chief Psychologist does not provide further data about the type of service requested in the referral.

Without a centrally driven system to manage all referrals, the Chief Psychologist is unable to obtain real-time, accurate data on the status and details of referrals in order to effectively respond to and manage the allocation of staff resources to the demand for psychologyservices. The backlogged data is compiled twice per year for review and remains a manual process.

While there are mechanisms and guidelines in place to ensure assessments are triaged fair and equitably, there is no central system in place at the Board level to manage referrals. A centrally driven system would allow for regular monitoring of case loads and referrals, allowing the Chief of Psychology to directly enforce the guidance for prioritizing referrals and staff members to work collaboratively to manage their caseloads (i.e. transitioning cases when there is a change in staff member). In addition, a centrally driven system would allow for access to current real-time data allowing for resources to be distributed on a needs basis.
Proposed Recommendations

C.1 It is recommended that the Chief of Psychology, in conjunction with key stakeholders in Special Services, review the system for tracking and managing referrals and determine the most efficient and optimal frequency for back log reporting and the key data required to help triage and manage referrals in a fair and equitable manner. This could include exploring case management software tools (see section D below).

C.2 It is our understanding that Psychology staff are required to review their waitlist students with the Principal and SET at the beginning of each school year to prioritize or remove from the list as required. It is recommended that the Chief of Psychology and staff psychologists review their referral lists at least once more during the school year (i.e. midway through the school year) to make a determination as to whether the need for psychological services remain for the student, ensure backlogged referrals are properly prioritized, and an active IEP exists allowing the student access to special education and support services. This would minimize instances where students are no longer in need of an assessment appearing on the list, allow for more accurate backlog reporting which in turn results in better allocation of psychologists during the school year based on caseloads.

Management Response:

Special education staff agrees and support the recommendation and will investigate the purchase and/or development in-house of a case management software system and process to be used by all special education departments:

- Psychology
- Social Work
- Speech and Language
- Autism

Special education staff will prepare a report for Board recommending the need for case-management software. The tool will have both quantitative and qualitative measures and be student focused.

Psychologists will review their referral backlogs with each of their principals in September and January and report student needs to the Chief of Psychology, the Superintendent of Special Education and the Special Education Advisory Committee / Board.
D. Information Systems and Management

The Special Education department has information systems available for tracking data to support decision making that include the Student Support Services Needs Database (SSSN), web-based IEP platform, Trillium, ONSIS, and Data Integration Platform (DIP).

The SSSN is a database of student profiles (based on a questionnaire designed to gauge student needs) that are completed by the schools. As noted in Section C above, the SSSN database is used a starting point to determine EA allocations. It was observed that the number of records in this database (approximately 24,000) far exceed the number of students with identified exceptionalities due to the needs of the schools’ general population of students.

The IEP web based platform is a repository for Special Services forms and all IEP data and forms by student. All IEP platform data is uploaded to the Trillium system daily which in turn is uploaded regularly to the Ministry of Education’s ONSIS system. This system is used mainly by the school staff and Program Coordinators to complete IEP’s, follow-up on individual student cases and to support resource allocations of EA’s and CYW’s at the secondary level.

DIP is a board-wide system that is not specific to Special Services. It comprises records and evaluation data for all students from all existing Board platforms.

Key Findings

D1. The need for enhanced information systems and reporting

Background:

Students receive special education support from a number of staff, including teachers, principals, and special education support staff (SET’s, EA’s, ISP teachers, psychologists, social workers, speech and language pathologists etc.). In addition, when required, Program Coordinators and Assessment and Programming Teachers often correspond with principals and parents regarding students for a variety of reasons. Currently, these interactions (i.e. phone calls, meetings and consultations, student referrals and student case notes) are being managed on an ad-hoc basis.

Observation:

Based on discussions held with board level staff, the following was noted:

- Program Coordinators are notified of escalated issues for resolution through phone calls and emails from schools regarding students with special education needs. These issues and associated correspondence are not logged and past emails regarding the student are relied upon to inform Program Coordinators’ discussions.
with teachers, principals or parents. This makes it difficult to keep track of information regarding the student, both for the school and other support staff;

- Student referrals for (psychology and speech and language) services are manually tracked by the area secretary and staff member but are not centrally logged electronically. This makes it difficult to determine current status and levels of demand, manage case loads, and make timely resource allocation decisions.

- It was noted that in 2014 a quote was obtained by the psychology and speech pathologist groups from a software vendor for a case management tool to maintain and manage case files. It is our understanding that the Social Work department has a separate case management system already in place.

Management Response:

D.1.1 Special Services management staff will investigate methods for collecting data on issues escalated to them for resolution in order to direct attention to persistent areas of concern on a board-wide basis, allow for performance measurement and enable further organization.

D.1.2 Special Services management staff will conduct a thorough analysis of existing information systems to identify information gaps and areas for potential improvement. This includes identifying ways in which current systems can be used to address some of the issues noted above. In addition, depending on the results of the system review, if additional tools are identified as necessary (i.e. case management software), department wide needs should be considered (not just those of individual teams). All requests or needs should be supported by a detailed business case with approval from the Superintendent and others as required.

D2. Records Management and Privacy

Based on discussions held with Board level staff, the following observations were noted:

- Currently, psychology case files are held in paper format by the individual psychologist. Historical case files are maintained in their associated regional office in paper format.

- There is no clear responsibility for file and records management. Regional office secretaries are informally requested to maintain the filing system and record any file activity (i.e. check-out files). It was conveyed to the RIAT, that occasionally files are left out, consequently affecting privacy concerns, due to lack of resources.

- Although there is a central shared drive for psychologists to maintain electronic files, not all files are electronic and often times psychologists work in environments that are not conducive to working from electronic devices.
Recommendation:

D.2.1 It is recommended that the Superintendent of Education, Chief of Psychology and other key stakeholders work collaboratively to investigate options and implement a method for file management and storage that alleviates pressures on resources, space and privacy.

Management Response:

Special education staff will investigate the recommendations in both D.1 and D.2

With respect to file and records management, Special Education staff will investigate and identify an individual to co-ordinate and operationalize the process.
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APPENDIX D – SPECIAL SERVICES BUDGET AND STAFFING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEMENTARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>41,155,682</td>
<td>37,991,710</td>
<td>40,406,755</td>
<td>41,314,496</td>
<td>905,742</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Teachers</td>
<td>1,766,372</td>
<td>1,436,075</td>
<td>1,768,372</td>
<td>1,788,372</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Assistants</td>
<td>26,231,350</td>
<td>26,204,005</td>
<td>25,719,003</td>
<td>20,370,407</td>
<td>651,404</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>7,347,890</td>
<td>7,555,359</td>
<td>7,671,838</td>
<td>7,824,254</td>
<td>152,423</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for staff above</td>
<td>15,307,680</td>
<td>15,275,180</td>
<td>14,203,136</td>
<td>14,524,366</td>
<td>321,232</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>2,406,878</td>
<td>3,143,552</td>
<td>3,135,320</td>
<td>3,153,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Equipment (SEA)</td>
<td>1,756,610</td>
<td>1,122,380</td>
<td>4,597,100</td>
<td>3,055,582</td>
<td>1,541,518</td>
<td>(33.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>1,050,770</td>
<td>997,306</td>
<td>950,770</td>
<td>950,770</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Contractual Services</td>
<td>3,489,806</td>
<td>3,791,000</td>
<td>3,489,806</td>
<td>3,489,806</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ELEMENTARY</strong></td>
<td>100,253,226</td>
<td>94,494,964</td>
<td>99,034,094</td>
<td>99,523,377</td>
<td>489,283</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECONDARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>19,412,404</td>
<td>21,250,516</td>
<td>20,548,336</td>
<td>20,957,210</td>
<td>408,671</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional Teachers</td>
<td>935,122</td>
<td>1,079,187</td>
<td>939,122</td>
<td>939,122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Assistants</td>
<td>14,581,471</td>
<td>14,316,303</td>
<td>13,525,630</td>
<td>13,850,762</td>
<td>326,932</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>3,342,692</td>
<td>3,546,509</td>
<td>3,342,003</td>
<td>3,402,404</td>
<td>60,401</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for staff above</td>
<td>7,444,180</td>
<td>6,900,911</td>
<td>7,366,480</td>
<td>7,541,963</td>
<td>153,903</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>7,371</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>6,612</td>
<td>6,812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Equipment (SEA)</td>
<td>12,566</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>946,643</td>
<td>630,673</td>
<td>316,170</td>
<td>(33.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>220,759</td>
<td>103,313</td>
<td>220,759</td>
<td>220,759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Contractual Services</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>133,733</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SECONDARY</strong></td>
<td>45,983,395</td>
<td>47,301,087</td>
<td>46,944,584</td>
<td>47,576,085</td>
<td>631,421</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators &amp; Consultants</td>
<td>385,233</td>
<td>159,854</td>
<td>386,823</td>
<td>416,432</td>
<td>26,609</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for staff above</td>
<td>97,459</td>
<td>13,851</td>
<td>56,780</td>
<td>60,666</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>39,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROGRAM COORDINATION</strong></td>
<td>482,072</td>
<td>173,455</td>
<td>466,313</td>
<td>516,899</td>
<td>30,486</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 23 PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals &amp; VPs</td>
<td>266,058</td>
<td>455,346</td>
<td>261,944</td>
<td>263,844</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>2,136,919</td>
<td>1,957,444</td>
<td>2,058,162</td>
<td>2,025,302</td>
<td>40,140</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Assistants</td>
<td>182,886</td>
<td>176,137</td>
<td>195,424</td>
<td>199,228</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>46,480</td>
<td>26,412</td>
<td>73,395</td>
<td>73,395</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SECTION 23 PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>2,646,325</td>
<td>2,615,659</td>
<td>2,615,525</td>
<td>2,561,769</td>
<td>45,464</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEHAVIOURAL EXPERTISE PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>432,550</td>
<td>452,937</td>
<td>322,099</td>
<td>336,702</td>
<td>14,603</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BEHAVIOURAL PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>432,550</td>
<td>452,937</td>
<td>322,099</td>
<td>336,702</td>
<td>14,603</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SPECIAL EDUCATION EXPENSE</strong></td>
<td>149,798,736</td>
<td>145,036,682</td>
<td>149,302,515</td>
<td>150,513,951</td>
<td>1,211,436</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>129,871,056</td>
<td>127,854,143</td>
<td>128,263,499</td>
<td>130,913,062</td>
<td>2,546,612</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)</strong></td>
<td>(19,927,681)</td>
<td>(17,173,919)</td>
<td>(21,038,825)</td>
<td>(15,700,945)</td>
<td>1,337,877</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serving: Toronto Catholic District School Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Category</th>
<th># of teachers</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET teachers</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Autism</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEA/Connections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital for Sick Kids</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf &amp; Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Support Staff</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Education</td>
<td>485.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summary of Special Education Allocation 2014/15
APPENDIX E – SPECIAL EDUCATION OVERVIEW

As per the Ministry of Education:

What is an IPRC?
Regulation 181/98 requires that all school boards set up an Identification, Placement and Review Committee (IPRC). An IPRC is composed of at least three persons, one of whom must be a principal or supervisory officer of the board.

What is the role of the IPRC?
The IPRC will:

- decide whether or not the student should be identified as exceptional;
- identify the areas of the student’s exceptionality, according to the categories and definitions of exceptionalities provided by the Ministry of Education;
- decide an appropriate placement for the student; and
- review the identification and placement at least once in each school year.

Who is identified as an exceptional pupil?
The Education Act defines an exceptional pupil as “a pupil who’s behavioural, communicational, intellectual, physical or multiple exceptionalities are such that he or she is considered to need placement in a special education program....” Students are identified according to the categories and definitions of exceptionalities provided by the Ministry of Education.

What is a special education program?
A special education program is defined in the Education Act as an educational program that:

- is based on and modified by the results of continuous assessment and evaluation; and
- includes a plan (called an Individual Education Plan or IEP) containing specific objectives and an outline of special education services that meet the needs of the exceptional pupil.

What are special education services?
Special education services are defined in the Education Act as the facilities and resources, including support personnel and equipment, necessary for developing and implementing a special education program.

What is an IEP?
The IEP must be developed for a student, in consultation with the parent. It must include:

- specific educational expectations;
- an outline of the special education program and services that will be received;
• a statement about the methods by which the student’s progress will be reviewed; and

• for students 14 years and older (except those identified as exceptional solely on the basis of giftedness), a plan for transition to appropriate postsecondary school activities, such as work, further education, and community living.

The IEP must be completed within 30 days after the student has been placed in the program, and the principal must ensure that the parent receives a copy of it.
APPENDIX F – AUTISM INCIDENCE AT THE TORONTO CATHOLIC DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

Autism Prevalence On The Rise
There has been a 600% increase in prevalence over the last two decades.

AUTISM SPEAKS
It's time to listen.
www.AutismSpeaks.org

*Recent research has indicated that changes in diagnostic practices may account for at least 25% of the increase in prevalence over time, however much of the increase is still unaccounted for and may be influenced by environmental factors.
APPENDIX G – EXCEPTIONALITIES AND PLACEMENTS

The Ministry of Education formally recognizes the following 12 exceptionalities:

- Behaviour
- Autism
- Deaf and hard-of-hearing
- Language impairment
- Speech impairment
- Learning disability
- Giftedness
- Mild intellectual disability
- Developmental disability
- Physical disability
- Blind and low vision
- Multiple exceptionalities

Special Education Placement

Once formally identified by the Identification and Placement Review Committee (IPRC), placement is made into one of 5 categories as per Ministry of Education regulations:

- **Regular Class with Indirect Support** - where the student is placed in a regular class for the entire day, and the teacher receives specialized consultative services.

- **Regular Class with Resource Support** - where the student is placed in a regular class for most or all of the day and receives specialized instruction, individually or in a small group, within the regular classroom from a qualified special education teacher.

- **Regular Class with Withdrawal** - where the student is placed in a regular class and receives instruction outside the classroom, for less than 50 per cent of the school day, from a qualified special education teacher.

- **Special Education Class with Partial Integration** - where the student is placed by the IPRC in a special education class in which the student-teacher ratio conforms to Regulation 298, section 31\(^3\), for at least 50 per cent of the school day, but is integrated with a regular class for at least one instructional period daily.

- **Special Education Class Full Time** - where the student-teacher ratio conforms to Regulation 298, section 31, for the entire school day.

---

\(^3\) Teacher/Student ratio of 1:6 for autism classes and 1:16 for other exceptionalities