# Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)

MEETING NOTICE – Monday, October 2, 2017 at 7:00 pm – **Board Room**

**Minutes**

The following committee representatives and (alternates) were present:

Association for Bright Children (ABC) Diana Avon (Melissa Rosen)

Autism Society of Ontario – Toronto Lisa Kness

Brain Injury Society of Toronto (BIST) Cynthia Sprigings

Community Living Toronto vacancy

Down Syndrome Association of Toronto Richard Carter

Easter Seals Ontario Deborah Fletcher

Epilepsy Toronto Steven Lynette

Integrated Action for Inclusion (IAI) vacancy

Learning Disabilities Association Toronto *regrets*

VIEWS for the Visually Impaired David Lepofsky

VOICE for Hearing Impaired Children (Rosary Kwak)

TDSB North East Community Aline Chan Jean Paul Ngana

TDSB North West Community Jordan Glass

TDSB South East Community Diane Montgomery (Dick Winters)

TDSB South West Community Nora Green Paula Boutis

TDSB Trustees Alexander Brown Pamela Gough Alexandra Lulka

Regrets: Olga Ingrahm (SE Community), Mark Kovats, (Learning Disabilities Association –Toronto District), Phillip Sargent (NW Community), Valerie Gonzales-Chavez (NW Community Alternate)

TDSB Staff Present: Uton Robinson, Executive Superintendent, Special Education and Section Programs

Angela Nardi-Addesa, Superintendent of Education, Learning Centre 1, Learning Network 06

Lori Moore, Centrally Assigned Principal

Marcela Mayo, Communications Officer

Margo Ratsep, SEAC Liaison

Minutes by: Margo Ratsep

**MINUTES**

*(All notes included in these minutes are paraphrased by the recorder*.)

## Call to Order

SEAC Chair David Lepofsky called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. He welcomed visitors in the gallery and invited SEAC members and staff in attendance to introduce themselves.

## 2. Declaration of Possible Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were declared.

The Chair spoke briefly on three topics:

* The Ministry’s Accessibility Standards Development Committee is currently awaiting Ministry direction. The consultation period with boards of education for input about accessibility barriers in schools closes in two weeks today. He repeated his recommendation from Item 8 at the September meeting that students become involved in identifying barriers. He congratulated TDSB in the step it took to hire an Accessibility Coordinator, as recommended by SEAC.
* Requests from TDSB staff for SEAC feedback and/or representation at additional meetings are increasing. While it is good that the board seeks SEAC advice and feedback, the flow of requests is significant and requests do not always contain the information needed. When asking volunteers to come to a meeting or consulting about documents, it is important to provide information about what is wanted and in an accessible written format (not a pdf). Since volunteer time is limited, he recommended judgement is needed about how often volunteers are asked and what is asked of them when inviting them to a meeting.
* Regarding the Enhanced Equity Task Force, he suggested it may not be realistic to expect the task force to provide major guidance about students with special education needs. While it is important to develop a good equity plan and that students with disability needs be recognized as students with special education needs, SEAC is the committee that addresses special education needs. The guidance from the Equity Task Force is not a filter that should stand between SEAC and board staff/trustees.

## 3. Approval of the Minutes

On motion of Dick Winters, the Minutes of September 11, 2017 were approved with the clarification that the Chair would like an answer from the appropriate staff to his question about the requirement of s. 75 o of the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation for individual transportation plans for students (found under Item 6.1, final bullet).

**4. Applications for New SEAC members**

\*\*\*Motion – Moved by Paula Boutis, seconded by Jordan Glass

***Whereas there are two vacancies for North East Community Alternate Representative on the Toronto District School Board Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC), and***

***Whereas SEAC has received an application from Nelson Lui to become Alternate Representative for the North East Community and he meets the Ministry of Education and board criteria for eligibility, therefore,***

***Be it resolved that the board appoint Nelson Lui as an Alternate Representative for the North East Community, for the remainder of the 2014 to 2018 term.***

The motion carried.

Given that SEAC renewal takes place in 2018, the Chair suggested that SEAC may wish to create a subcommittee that develops recommendations to the board about how these applications are reviewed and managed.

**5. Staff Report including updates on issues raised at SEAC's September 11, 2017 meeting,** *and*

**6. Open Opportunity for SEAC members to ask staff about issues regarding students with special education needs.**

The Chair confirmed that given the complexity of the questions SEAC members were asking, he was not expecting a full answer to all the questions sent in. He invited Executive Superintendent Uton Robinson to speak to his Department Update and to respond to questions raised. He requested that additional questions raised during the discussion be recorded in the minutes and included in the list of possible SEAC priorities, to be appended to the minutes. The following information resulted from both Items 5 and 6 and is organized by topic. Below each topic heading, information provided by Uton Robinson and Centrally Assigned Principal Lori Moore is provided and follow-up SEAC input during the Q & A discussion is included.

**5.1 Organization Changes**

The focus on central staff changes provided in the department update is to ensure staff is able to be more responsive to the needs at the local school, with sufficient staff available to address and resolve the issues.

**5.2 Communication**

Recognizing that SEAC has put forward a number of recommendations to improve communication, TDSB Communication Officer Marcela Mayo has been tasked with improving communications, including updating the special education website with simplified content and videos; ensuring parent friendly and jargon free language; and ensuring an Integrated, proactive approach that places kids in the centre. The goal is for parents and staff to have a consistent understanding of special education programs and services. Marcela Mayo is in attendance and is interested in working with SEAC to improve communications.

SEAC Input

1. Communication in the Special Education Plan using visuals (i.e. the process Flow chart) is good but buried in the Plan. Recommend the use of more visuals and links directly from the website.
2. Re: Parent Survey feedback – Hold a small round-table session about the results of the SEAC Parent Survey with special education and communication staff to give direct input on what needs to be changed.

**5.3 SEAC Motions**

The Department Update addressed questions about how staff has responded to SEAC motions to date. There was an acknowledgement that this is a work in progress.

Regarding Motion 2, TDSB continues to follow the Ministry standard as it pertains to the IEP process. This includes opportunities for parents to raise concerns. In response to a recent comment about the TDSB Guide to Special Education for Parents/Guardians, staff shared that the Guide is modelled on the example provided to boards by the Ministry of Education. We are happy to review the Guide with SEAC.

In response to Motion 3, many of TDSB facilities were built a long time ago. The recent hot weather has been uncomfortable for some students and staff. The Facilities Department continues to look after 584 schools to ensure they are in good repair. We know that not all of our schools are accessible, however, a long term phase-in model is planned.

Regarding Motion 4, we are not where we want to be but moving in the direction that students have the technological access and equipment they need. This is an on-going effort.

Motion 5 contained several recommendations on inclusion. There continues to be a lot of discussion and activity to move towards inclusion. A phase-in approach is being taken in support of a successful implementation. A staff response to each recommendation within the motion was provided to SEAC at a previous meeting.

SEAC Input:

1. Re SEAC Motion 2 – A new appeal process is a priority item of SEAC. A question was raised about what is being done at TDSB in response to SEAC's recommendation that a new internal appeal process be created for students with special education needs and their families, if they are not happy with the proposed Individual Education Plan or with its implementation. The appeal process is inadequate and the board is not constrained to only follow what the Ministry outlines.*(Response: Uton Robinson indicated that the existing process which the Ministry of Education sets out is what is in place, and that there have been no changes.* *If SEAC wants to offer more details on what it proposes, TDSB would be open to considering that.)*

**5.4 Enhancing Equity Task Force**

Uton deemed it premature to comment since he has not been briefed on the Enhancing Equity Task Force report in its entirety. Regarding the question about programs for students in Government Approved Care and/or Treatment, Custody and Correctional Facilities (“Section 23”), we are taking steps to rebrand the program to address any negative stereotypes associated with students who are served through these programs. With the support of a superintendent and centrally assigned principal for that program, we welcome SEACs voice to this rebranding opportunity.

SEAC Input:

1. Re: Section Programs – We would like an opportunity to hear from staff about the programs.

*(Response: The Centrally Assigned Principal can provide statistics about the agencies and what transfers back into the system look like.) The chair suggested a written summary be provided.*

1. Re: Staff mindset and mental barriers against inclusion –These continue to work against the Director’s narrative to change that and do what is required for students with special education needs. People need to know kids are owned by their schools and that the SST is for problem-solving.

*(Response: The examples shared by SEAC do not align with inclusion as intended and described in the Integrated Equity Framework. We have a challenge when faced with galvanized minds, but we have the focus and commitment to make it happen. We deal with specific incidents, have conversations with the superintendent and trustee and we look at what we can do with that staff to better prepare them.)*

1. Re: Enhancing Equity Taskforce – Students with special education needs should be attached to the task force report, due to the intersection of special education with aspects of race, socio-economic status, etc., framed in the context of “anti-oppressive practice”. Paraprofessional staff must also be trained.

**5.5 Standards for Individual Education Plans (IEPs)**

There is on-going professional learning for staff. For example, at a meeting today, staff looked at expectations and other areas included within Motion 2 (such as PPM 140, PPM 156) to ensure professional learning is made available around that too.

**5.6 Staff Allocation**

There have been several questions from SEAC members about staff allocation, which is a complex process. Staff is allocated to meet the needs of students with special education needs, as is professional support staff assignment. There are standards and targets around additional supports for all special education programs. Additional needs are reviewed on a case by case basis, in conjunction with how all staff allocated in a school is being used. In many situations there is additional staff allocated to support the needs of students in ISPs and in regular classes. The information provided in the October Department Update is for this school year.

SEAC Input:

1. SEAC would find it helpful to hear from the author of the document Financial Facts.

*(Response: Craig Snider would be able to come to SEAC to speak about the information.)*

1. Allocation of a psychiatrist could help to address some of the mental health needs in the board. Medication could be one of the supports and we need professionals to talk about that. Referrals to CAMH take a long time. Would like to hear about pathways for entering and exiting.

*(Response: In the amalgamated board, there has never been a psychiatrist on staff. Uton would be pleased to address SEAC about PR 699 on Management of Risk of Injury Behaviors.)*

**5.7 ASD Pilot Project**

We are currently identifying schools with high numbers of students with ASD and those which may be centrally located for transportation implications. The Ministry is receptive to an itinerant model where there is support from the school principal and dedicated space, and where a project coordinator can go to school and meet with a therapist. We are looking at multiple sites. In terms of the training, between 30-50 Educational Assistants who currently work with the student population are being identified for training. While the pilot is for K-12, the majority of students will be elementary. There is no requirement that students be in an Intensive Support Program (ISP). The focus is on the Community Based Resource Model (CBRM) and Resource support in the local school, on the psychological assessment and teaching strategies going into the Individual Education Plan (IEP) and on accountability, managed through the School Support Team (SST).

**5.8 Occupational Therapy (OT)**

Occupational Therapists report to the Manager of Occupational Therapy/Physiotherapy (OT/PT). (OT/PT). Staff is distributed throughout the board. They are accessed by phone to attend School Support Team (SST) meetings to consult on matters that may relate to students with Physical Disabilities and special needs that fall within the TDSB Low Incidence category.

The Local Health Integrated Networks (LHIN – formerly known as CCAC) provide therapy services to students in the schools through information sharing that is permitted by the Ministry. This includes assessment and consultation about what can be included in an Individual Education Plan (IEP) and how students can be supported in schools and at home. We are discussing more effective/efficient ways to take professional recommendations and convert them into more teacher friendly language and teaching strategies for use in the classroom. When Professional Support Services reports are completed, the information is provided to the School Support Team (SST). We are exploring use of a strategic feedback loop for more effective tracking of progress through a designated period of time.

SEAC Input:

1. York Region has created a document/tool that assists teachers in recoding report recommendations for strategies.

**5.9 On-going Training for Teachers and Principals around ASD and Other Exceptionalities.**

We have developed a professional learning plan for administrators including sessions around processes and relevant PPMs. There are also sessions for support staff and teachers around profiles of special needs learners and on technology and software. Professional Services Staff (PSS) also provide in-service to targeted staff and to regular staff who are interested in moving into special education positions as they become available. Administrators are also invited. Within the Integrated Equity Action Framework, deep professional learning by all staff is considered critical for capacity building, where staff work together understanding the issues and working with students to ensure they are successful. This is a shift, moving away from the mindset that “the cavalry is coming”. There are also sessions to address the knowledge gap about Universal Design for Learning (UDL). The year-long plan involves special education consultants and co-ordinators working with other staff in the Learning Centre so that all understand what UDL is, and working closely with Teaching and Learning staff to embed special education pieces in their work with frontline teachers. This includes what accommodations and modifications look like, what Differentiated Instruction looks like, and building UDL into the teaching/learning process. We are seeing progress even though we have a long way to go.

SEAC Input:

1. Concerned about the time needed for training and the fact that the training is not mandatory.

*(Response: Going forward there will be greater emphasis that refusal to accept a student with special needs doesn’t happen.)*

1. Around HSP, concerned about how these kids will be supported if not in HSP and the degree of teacher training required versus union restrictions.

*(Response: Re: HSP – Uton would like to have more time to share what is happening. A number of schools are involved. There is embedded learning with side by side collaboration and students experiencing a sense of belonging.* *Resource teachers and their EAs also work in the regular class with these students. Re: Training – any teacher in special education program delivery needs to have special education qualifications. All teachers must develop an annual learning plan, share it with the principal and determine their learning path. Performance review is on a 3-5 year cycle. Teachers use professional judgment to determine individual needs. They may also attend professional conferences and participate in professional learning groups.)*

1. Important that teachers’ skill development include how to structure the class (physically alter the classroom) to meet needs and concerned about how much time teachers have to learn about entering students.

*(Response: A good example is the TDSB Deaf/Hard of Hearing team, which is a resource support for classroom teachers on an on-going basis.)*

1. Teachers need to accept that they will all become special education teachers, with students with special needs in every classroom. Teachers must learn how to accommodate the needs of the children and there is little advance training or prep time to strategize. There are no checks and balances on how well teachers are implementing the Individual Education Plan (IEP). We need a longer year or smaller classrooms.

*(Response: The Ministry reviews IEPs across Ontario on an annual audit basis. We have voiced concern about teacher training with the Ministry when there has been the opportunity. Many teachers take courses and prepare during July and August and their work is not always recognized.)*

**5.10 Staff Response to SEAC Questions**

Uton Robinson expressed the need for much more meeting time to respond to the kinds of complex questions being asked by SEAC members. The Integrated Equity Framework does address the department’s on-going work, including the following:

* Communication
* HSP remodel
* Focus on professional learning and accountability, as expectations versus options
* Developing on-going training for staff (i.e. IPRC Chair sessions)
* Management of Risk of Injury (PR 699) with reference to ASD
* IEP
* Reviewing IST meeting and SST meeting manual/guidelines
* SEA training
* Universal Design for Learning
* Technology enhancement
* Section 23 – rebranding, welcoming attitudes and seamless transitions

The Chair drew discussion to a close with three requests:

1. That Uton provide a breakdown of exceptionalities with student numbers, and numbers of students that have moved from ISP to regular classroom. *(Response: The October report is available in February/March) Uton could currently provide last year’s numbers to SEAC.)*
2. In March 2016, facilities staff did a presentation to SEAC and mentioned 550 schools with 85 accessible.) How many are now?
3. In reference to Uton Robinson’s earlier response re: SEAC's proposal of a new appeal process for students with special education needs and their families regarding the IEP, SEAC had provided clear details in its June 13, 2016 motion #2, Paragraph 4, (a) through (h). He noted that the feedback from parents, given in SEAC's current online survey, demonstrates a clear need for this reform. He also said that from the contents of the TDSB Integrated Equity Framework, he had been given to understand that TDSB was open to taking more action on this general issue.

**7. Brainstorming SEAC Priorities for the upcoming year**

Through Item 5 and 6 discussion and questions, a number of topics were identified. The Chair went around the table to give each member the opportunity to identify their priority topic. Responses included:

* Communication – simplify so parents can know readily about resources
* Programming – eliminate formula driven IEPs and provide more effective programming to meet needs
* Collaboration among skillsets of EAs, SNAs and teachers – how many, how distributed, how they can collaborate effectively to better meet needs
* Teacher training
* Bus driver training
* Employment skills certification
* Training of Special Incidence Portion (SIP) CYWs
* Increase support for executive functioning concerns – how to facilitate high schools/senior schools making assignments available on line
* Consult Ontario Disabilities Employment Network on best practices
* Teacher training and cultural shift
* Teacher screening and accountability in performance appraisals, annually and with customer input
* Needs identification
* Effective communication
* Accountability
* Section 23 presentation
* Early intervention with ABA in the classroom and (implementation of PPM 140)
* Compulsory Teacher training for HSP
* Funding for special needs routes in transportation

Members were asked to forward to the Chair any additional ideas by the end of the week.

**8. Association Reports**

The Association for Bright Children reported the September 17th conference as successful, with about 50 parents in attendance. Presentation topics included Advocacy for your Child, Anxiety for students with LD and an Integra presentation on Executive Functioning for Kids with LD.

**9. Other Business**

The Chair drew the meeting to a close, mentioning that the AODA Alliance is working on a pledge for trustee candidates running for office to sign.

**10. Adjournment**

On motion of Richard Carter, the meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m. The next meeting is Monday, Nov 6th.

**Appendix A**

**SEAC Questions by Topic – September and October 2017**

Topics are arranged in alphabetical order for ease of reference. Beneath headings are topics raised at the October meeting and where applicable, questions previously emailed to Uton.

**1. Accessibility**

Report on the increase in numbers of accessible sites over time

**2. Accountability**

1. What is the accountability mechanism that will be implemented to ensure that the responsibilities delegated are effectively and efficiently carried out (e.g., what is the accountability relationship between the Executive Superintendent (Uton) and the director of Education re the Spec Ed Action Plan and how it is monitored and/or evaluated)?
2. How is the above-mentioned accountability relationship between the Director of Education and Uton cascaded down to the other staff members reporting to Uton (e.g., Centrally Assigned Principals) as well as to Superintendents of Education who are school principals’ direct boss?
3. What is the working relationship between the Superintendents in the Learning Centres with Spec Ed 'responsibility' (as presented by the director when he presented the LC model at SEAC) and the Centrally Assigned Principals? How would they be contributing to achieving the goal and the objectives of the 2017/2018 school year Spec Ed department Action Plan?
4. Improving how recommendations from Professional Services Staff are understood by staff and implemented in the classroom
5. Accountability for principals
6. Teacher screening and accountability in performance appraisals, annually and with customer input

**3. Autism Spectrum Disorder**

1. Learn about the 2017-2018 ASD Pilot Project and dedicated space for therapy
2. Early intervention with ABA in the classroom
3. Application of PPM 140

**4. Budget**

1. I would like to know how much money is spent on academic staff (teachers & EAs) in ISP classes and how much is spent in regular classes. I would also like to know how much is spent on PSSP staff.
2. Regarding the document Financial Facts, there are several bits of information that are not broken down in this guide book that would be helpful to SEAC when it participates in spec ed budget discussions - I'd have to re-read it again to try and remember what I thought was "missing", but who can go through this with us? It was overall probably the most helpful information I have ever seen about budgeting and financial expenditures at the TDSB.
3. For us to have effective input, we need first to have a full, clear understanding of how money is spent on meeting the needs of students with special education needs, whether in the regular classroom or in a special education classroom. It would also be very helpful for us to get a good understanding of who, on the TDSB hierarchy, is making the key decisions.
4. Can we set up a working group to work with a group at TDSB on budget as well? The finance meeting times are at 5 p.m. and impossible for people like me to attend even to observe. Is there another way? As a note, it is not enough for us to comment on the special education budget as though it exists in isolation of the rest of the budget. It doesn't. The *Moore* decision from the Supreme Court of Canada would indicate the entire budget needs to be reviewed to determine if proper budget decisions are being made in respect of spec ed.

**5. Co-Operative Learning and Post School Employment**

1. Suggested consultation with Ontario Disabilities Employment Network on best practices. I would like to propose we invite Joe Dale of the Ontario Disability Employment Network to give a 15 minute presentation for employment of persons with disabilities and how we can better align what employers are looking for with our "co-op" programs for students with disabilities. I saw him speak at Chris Glover's last special education forum and thought he was spot on. I think TDSB is very far from doing what is needed to improve the odds that our students with disabilities will be employable.
2. Employment Skills Certification for special education students

**6. Communication**

1. Improving communication with parents about available resources and how to access them.
2. Use of visuals to communicate information in the Special Education Plan and on the website

**7. Equity**

Special Education and Equity Task Force – the importance of the intersection of Special Education with Equity issues such as race, socio-economic, language etc.) and anti-oppression practices

**8. Home School Program (HSP)**

1. Can we get some information about the various HSP pilots that TDSB is doing?
2. How will elementary children no longer placed in HSP be supported
3. Compulsory teacher training for meeting needs in the regular classroom

**9. Inclusion**

1. It would be helpful to know what the high school graduation rate at TDSB for its students with disabilities (and does this data exist by exceptionality or other categorization of disability?). I think what I am asking about specifically is graduation with a diploma rather than a certificate of completion (sorry if I have the lingo not quite right).This article is what prompted the question for me. Here's some data out of the US re: outcomes between boards that are highly segregated and those that are fully inclusive in their teaching of students with disabilities.

<http://www.rgj.com/story/news/education/2016/07/25/districts-prioritize-inclusion-cited-high-graduation-rates-children-disabilities/87414016/?cookies=&from=global>

1. Present the October report – that will help us track what percentage of students for each exceptionality is in an ISP class so we can follow the inclusion strategy
2. Provide a breakdown of numbers by exceptionality and tracking of numbers of students moving from ISP to regular

**10. Individual Education Plan (IEP)**

1. Effective identification of student needs
2. More effective programming – too much jargon and formulaic IEP development
3. Board oversight of teacher accountability in IEP implementation
4. Improved appeal process for families about IEP issues

**11. Professional Support Services (PSS) Staffing**

1. I would like to know the ratio of psych services, social worker and SLP to schools.
2. Are students in regular class able to access OT and SLP to the same degree?
3. Need for a psychiatrist position to address mental health needs

**12. Section 23**

1. In my efforts to figure out what section 23 programs were, I learned that section 23 of the Education Act was repealed in 2000. I have been unable to find any legal basis for these programs. On what basis does TDSB run these programs?
2. Staff presentation on Section 23

**13. Special Education Action Plan**

What is the 2017/2018 school year Special Education Department action plan, including the overall goal in relation to the needs of the Spec Ed students, related objectives and the major milestones as well as the system-level performances indicators (e.g., system indicator for equity for students with special needs, system indicator for Spec Ed student achievement and system indicator for Spec Ed student well-being)?

**14. Special Education Plan**

I actually think the Spec Ed plan is rather valuable. I tell every parent I know to read it. It has helped me when I needed resources / supports that I should have been getting for my daughter, but wasn't. I would like to see a small sub group be tasked again to review and provide feedback in a more formalized way than we have done in the last two years

**15. Special Education Program Recommendation Committee (SEPRC)**

In response to Paula's June meeting SEPRC concerns, questions I have about the supports in the regular class -- do we fully understand how supports are allocated.  Is it associated with a diagnosis?  For example, in some Boards a child with a MID exceptionality does not qualify for EA supports in a regular class, but would access one if they went to a program.  Do we fully understand who EAs are allocated?

**16. Special Needs Strategy**

1. I would like a presentation on Professional Support Services under the new Special Needs Strategy.  I still don't get that and it’s supposed to help our kids. I understand that they have not posed a question for us, but I would like a service presentation.
2. I would also like to know where the extra money comes from.  How much money is from the Spec Ed envelope and how much do we take from other envelopes and which ones?  For example, the Learning Opportunity Grant.

**17. Staff Allocation**

1. How many front line staff is there at TDSB to provide added supports to students with special education needs, beyond the frontline teacher in the regular classroom? Broken down as special education teachers, special needs assistants, education assistants or others?
2. How are this additional staff assigned out among the 550 school at TDSB each school year? Who divides them up and assigns them? Put another way, if a family has a student with  special education needs, and they are going to a particular school, how is it decided how many special education teachers, SNA's, EA's etc. are to be located at that school?
3. We have informally heard that it is the school principal who decides how to divvy up the time of the added special education staff such as SNAs in that school, among the  students with special education needs at that school. Is this so? If so, what instructions or guidelines are assigned to the principal when making these decisions? To whom does the principal account? How does the TDSB senior staff track whether this is being done optimally? It would be important to know what is done to ensure that there are not different practices from school to school.
4. If a principal has more demand for additional special education staff support than has been allocated, what can they do about it? To whom do they make their request? What flexibility is in the staffing allocation to allow for this? How is this tracked? How is the accountability on this addressed?
5. As I understand it (and please correct me if I am wrong), TDSB does not specifically assign a specific special education staff support person to a specific student. If during the school year, or between school years, that student moves to another TDSB school, they don't carry that assignment of staff support with them. The student and their family must make their case for the same support again. It would be helpful to know if this is so, and if so, what can be done to change this to avoid each school and each family having to re-invent the wheel.
6. If a principal has told a family that there is not enough special education staff support to meet the needs of a student with special education needs, to whom can they address their request to get more special education staff supports allocated to that school?

**18. Technology**

Supporting students with executive functioning needs with online posting of assignments

**19. Training**

1. Training for cultural shift in attitudes and mandatory professional development for all staff
2. EA, SNA and Teacher collaborative use of skillsets in meeting student needs
3. Training for all staff (including teachers, educational assistants and administrators) on the needs of students in different exceptionalities
4. The knowledge gap about Universal Design for Learning
5. Advance preparation by staff for students with special education needs
6. IST-SST Guideline
7. Please provide data for the last year, and for the previous five years, on number of hours of training that TDSB teachers have participated in, on topics relevant to special education, such as and including:   
   (a)  "inclusive education";   
   (b) "UDL - and how to teach in a UDL environment";   
   (c) "how to teach students who are (designated or not):   
           - autistic;   
           - blind;   
           - deaf and hard of hearing;   
           - 'MID';   
           - 'DD';   
           - 'gifted';   
           - have learning disabilities (preferably list education by category);   
           - have physical disabilities (preferably list education by category);   
           - have speech impairment;   
           - have language impairment;   
           - etc.   
   (d)  "how to teach students who have more than one 'exceptionality' ";   
   (e)  "features and use of assistive technology";  
   (f)   "how to work effectively with other special education support staff" - i.e. EA's, etc.;   
   (g)  "understanding the role and benefits of physiotherapy / occupational therapy / psychologists / behavioural therapists / speech language therapists" etc.   
   (h)  "addressing and remediating pre-conceived attitudes to all special education students" etc.   
     
   For all of the above categories:   
    (I)  Please indicate if training is REQUIRED (i.e. all teachers at a particular school / level / etc. must complete this education) OR whether the training is OPTIONAL (i.e. teachers choose whether to participate in this training or in other topics).   
   (II)   Also, please provide other relevant subcategories where available. For example: "offered at the elementary / middle / secondary school level"; "offered during PA / PD days or on the teacher's "own" time"; etc.

**20. Transportation**

1. I would like some clarification on the busing expenditures. The draft document I was given by a colleague (dated Feb 2017, called "Financial Facts: Revenue Expenditure Trends”) refers to various categories for expenditures, including Gifted, Magnet (what is this), hazard (?), courtesy (?), wheelchair accessible, general transportation, French immersion and special transportation needs. Is this latter one for children placed in spec ed programs (other than gifted)? And does it cover busing for kids to both ISPs and congregated sites?
2. What does TDSB have in place to ensure that all students with disabilities who need transportation have an individual transportation plan, as required under s. 75 o of the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation, enacted under the AODA in 2011, and how does TDSB monitor to ensure that these are in place and properly implemented.
3. Bus Driver training in understanding and meeting special needs
4. Funding for special needs routes in transportation

**21. Universal Screener**

1. In the description provided I see that it mentions that the screener can inform program for all students, and it can, but how was that practice shared with staff?  I still feel that it is solely used to identify a single population which is costly if so.
2. Please provide data for the last year on both the CCAT and GRS, broken down by the following categories:  
   (a)  Number of students, by grade, and by district, who received the  CCAT;    
   (b)  Number of students, by grade, and by district, who received the  GRS;   
   (c)  Number of students, by grade, and by district, whom as a result of the (i) CCAT; and (ii) GRS, were subsequently identified as having a special education need, and report results broken down by specific special education need (i.e. 'learning disability (identify which one(s)); 'gifted'; 'MID'; 'DD'; etc.