Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) Meeting
MINUTES
October 7th, 2013 at 7:00 p.m.
5050 Yonge Street, Boardroom

Members Present:  Yama Arianfar, Diana Avon, Michelle Brick, Richard Carter, Aline Chan, Paul Cross, Clovis Grant, Trustee John Hastings, Olga Ingrahm, Trustee Howard Kaplan, Gal Koren, Steven Lynette, Jean-Paul Ngana, Ginny Pearce, Phillip Sargent, Trustee Sam Sotiropoulos, Nancy Turner Wright

Alternates Present:  Najia Shafi, Nora Green

Regrets:  Dr. Robert Gates, Judy Moir, Christina Buczek, Heather Breckenridge, Deborah Fletcher, Debra Hayden

Staff Present:  Sandy Spyropoulos, Cindy Burley, David Johnston, Margo Ratsep, John Manalo

Guests:  Tim Myrden, Rachel Breau, Nancy Dye,

Recorders:  John Manalo and Margo Ratsep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order&lt;br&gt;A meeting of the Special Education Advisory Committee was convened at 7:01 p.m. on Monday, October 7, 2013 in the Boardroom, 5050 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario with Chair Steven Lynette presiding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approval of the Agenda&lt;br&gt;***Motion: Yama Arianfar moved that the Agenda be approved as amended. The motion carried unanimously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Declarations of Possible Conflicts of Interest&lt;br&gt;No conflicts of interest were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes of September 27, 2013&lt;br&gt;***Motion: Jean Paul Ngana moved that the Minutes of September 16, 2013 be approved. The motion carried unanimously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Delegations and/or Presentations&lt;br&gt;● Tim Myrden, Central Coordinator for Deaf/Hard of Hearing (D/HH) programs introduced D/HH teacher Nancy Dye, an itinerant teacher on TDSB staff and the lead teacher for the Early Years (preschool) program, who won the OTIP Teaching Award for Excellence in Teaching in the Elementary Teacher category. Nancy Dye said a few words of appreciation to those who have supported her and described her program, which uses ASL, amplification technology and visual language with differentiated learning strategies. SEAC members supported Paul Cross’ suggestion that SEAC invite Tim Myrden to provide a more detailed presentation to SEAC about the Deaf/Hard of Hearing programs and Tim indicated his willingness to do so at a future meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Rachel Breau, Librarian, Partners Program Lead, CNIB Library presented information about the material resources available to those who have reading-print challenges due to vision loss (partial sight), physical disability or perceptual disability (e.g. Dyslexia, processing disabilities). They specialize in fiction audiobooks, electronic braille and scribed-videos. Users must register to use the library services with an active public library card. <a href="http://www.CNIB.ca/selfregistration">www.CNIB.ca/selfregistration</a>. Contact: <a href="mailto:PartnersProgram@cnib.ca">PartnersProgram@cnib.ca</a>, 1800-563-2642x7055, Rachel Breau (Program Lead), Faline Bobier (Program Coordinator), Alana Green (Marketing). Rachel undertook to forward information brochures to the SEAC Liaison, for use with TDSB staff. Her colleague Alana Green will be participating in the Marketplace of the PIAC-SEAC Parent Conference on October 19th.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Business Arising from the Minutes

- Clovis Grant provided an update about the PIAC/SEAC Parent Conference. 125 have registered currently with 36 children requiring child-minding services. Clovis took names of SEAC volunteers to be workshop facilitators.
- Steven Lynette reviewed with SEAC the letter he sent on behalf of SEAC to Erin Moroz, Executive Officer, Communications and Public Affairs, regarding SEAC member concerns about the new design of the TDSB public website. The letter outlines suggestions for making the website more detailed and accessible for parents.

### Trustees’ Report

- Trustee Hastings distributed a newspaper article regarding the Special Needs Golf Tournament mentioned at the September meeting. He also recommended the program series called “Quirks and Quarks” on the topic of mental illness and children’s behaviour.
- Trustee Howard Kaplan spoke regarding recommended changes to the TDSB website.

### Executive Superintendent’s Report

Sandy Spyropoulos submitted a report for inclusion in the minutes. (*See pages 3 to 15*)

### System Superintendent’s Report

Cindy Burley gave a visual presentation on the Special Education Board Improvement Plan for Student Achievement and submitted a report for inclusion in the minutes. (*See pages 16 to 33*)

Cindy extended an invitation for SEAC representation at an upcoming Ministry of Education Consultation session. Interested members are to email Cindy. Gal Koren volunteered at the meeting.

### Professional Support Services Report

David Johnston submitted a report for inclusion in the minutes. (*See pages 34 to 36*)

### Reports/Updates from SEAC Subcommittees

- Communications Subcommittee – Clovis Grant suggested that this subcommittee work with the Special Education Department on suggesting improvements to the TDSB website. Members interested in working on this task are to email Clovis.

### SEAC Member Association Reports

- Community Living – Clovis Grant reported that Community Living is developing a survey for parents around post-secondary education opportunities for students with intellectual disabilities.
- Epilepsy Toronto – Steven Lynette reported that Epilepsy Toronto is holding its Annual Marathon on Sunday, October 20th
- Easter Seals – Attention was drawn to the Easter Seals information on Transitions, distributed at the last meeting

### Correspondence Received by the Chair

The following correspondence was received:

- Letter dated September 16, 2013 to SEAC from Diane Johnstone, Principal of Trillium Demonstration School re: the Visiting Teacher Program
- Email dated October 7, 2013 from Michelle Munroe, Central Coordinator, Parent and Community Engagement re: Invitation for SEAC member participation in the EQAO Parent Forum on Saturday, October 26th in Toronto

### New Business

There was no new business.

### Adjournment

Trustee Kaplan moved that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.
1. Director’s Update

Student Achievement – EQAO – TDSB Achievement Results 2012-2013

Primary Division (Grades 1-3)
Over the past five years (2008-09 to 2012-13), the percentage of all Grade 3 students who performed at or above the provincial standard (Levels 3 and 4), increased 10% in Reading (58% to 68%) and 11% in Writing (66% to 77%), and remained the same in Mathematics (69% to 69%).

In 2012-13, the percentage of Grade 3 students who performed at or above the provincial standard increased 3% in Reading (65% to 68%), remained the same in Writing (77% to 77%), and decreased 1% in Mathematics (70% to 69%) compared to last year.

Junior Division (Grades 4-6)
Over the past five years (2008-09 to 2012-13), the percentage of all Grade 6 students who performed at or above the provincial standard (Levels 3 and 4), increased 10% in Reading (67% to 77%) and 12% in Writing (67% to 79%), and decreased 1% in Mathematics (63% to 62%).

In 2012-13, the percentage of Grade 6 students who performed at or above the provincial standard increased 3% in Reading (74% to 77%) and 4% in Writing (75% to 79%), and remained the same in Mathematics (62% to 62%) compared to last year.

Grade 9 Mathematics and OSSLT Results
In 2012-13, the percentage of Grade 9 students who performed at or above the provincial standard (Levels 3 and 4) remained the same in Academic Mathematics (83%) as the previous year.

In 2012-13, the percentage of Grade 9 students who performed at or above the provincial standard (Levels 3 and 4) decreased 2% in Applied Mathematics (34% to 32%), compared to 2011-12.

In 2012-13, 81% of TDSB students who took the OSSLT were successful. This result showed no change (0%) in successful first-time eligible Grade 10 students, compared to 2011-12.

Over the past five years (2008-09 to 2012-2013) the TDSB has sustained a high level of achievement in literacy at the Grade 10 level with 81-82% of students achieving successful results.

Over the past five years (2008-09 to 2012-13), the percentage of all Grade 9 students who performed at or above the provincial standard (Levels 3 and 4), increased 8% in Academic Mathematics (75% to 83%).
Over the past five years (2008-09 to 2012-13), the percentage of all Grade 9 students who performed at or above the provincial standard, increased 9% in Applied Mathematics (23% to 32%).

2. IEP Development Update

At the conclusion of the fifth week of IEP development, there were 40,835 IEPs in progress across the TDSB. Our web-based application provides the opportunity for us to generate reports to monitor the status of IEP development both at the school level and centrally. As of October 3, 2013, there were 1,106 more IEPs completed than on the same date last year.

As a sampling of some of the other data that our reports can provide, of the 40,835 IEPs currently in progress:

- 26,097 are for male students and 14,738 are for female students. This is consistent with percentages reported at this time last year – 64% male and 36% female.
- Approximately 48% (19,480) of students with IEPs are exceptional and 52% (21,355) do not have an exceptionality.
- Approximately 60% of students are supported in the Resource program and 40% in HSP and ISP classes.
- Of those students who are exceptional, 39% are supported in the Resource program and 61% are supported in HSP or ISP classes.
- Of those students who are not exceptional, 81% are supported in the Resource program and 19% are supported in HSP or ISP classes.
- Of those students who are not exceptional, 15% are underachieving in literacy, 5% are underachieving in numeracy and 42% are underachieving in both literacy and numeracy.

Grade level distribution shows that the greatest numbers of IEPs are for students in grade 12 (5,132), grade 8 (4,087), grade 7 (3,959), grade 5 (3,934) and grade 6 (3,869). These same grade levels were in the top five last year as well, although with a slightly different distribution. The lowest numbers are for students in kindergarten (644) and grade 1 (721) which are relatively consistent with last year.

IEPs by Exceptionality* (as of October 3rd, 2013)

*PLEASE NOTE: The data in the chart below does not reflect students who may have more than one exceptionality. It illustrates the “first” exceptionality only and as such does not reflect an accurate representation of the number of all students “by exceptionality”. Currently, SAP CRM reports “by exceptionality” can only be generated in this format. We will be exploring possible enhancements that will increase the capability of the system to generate reports with more specific information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Exceptionality</th>
<th>Special Education Class ISP/HSP</th>
<th>**Regular Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>9.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td>4506</td>
<td>7670</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Impairment</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giftedness</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>5261</td>
<td>26.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild Intellectual Disability</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>10.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disability</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind and Low Vision</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Exceptionalities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impairment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/Hard of Hearing/Preschool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12189</strong></td>
<td><strong>7306</strong></td>
<td><strong>19495</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regular class with indirect support**
Regular class with resource assistance
Regular class with withdrawal assistance

3. **Special Education, Section Programs and Student Support Services 2013 – 2014 Organizational Structure**

A handout was provided illustrating the 2013-2014 organizational structure.

4. **TDSB Website and Special Education/SEAC**

   Erin Moroz and Kelly Hagan from Communications will be responding to the feedback provided by SEAC and have indicated that they will work with the SEAC Communications subcommittee to address the issues that have been raised.

5. **Ontario Council for Exceptional Children President’s Award**

   Congratulations to Anne Ricci our Chief of Occupational Therapy/Physiotherapy who has been selected to receive the 2013 President’s Award from the Ontario Council for Exceptional Children at the 57th Annual Special Education Conference for her commitment and excellence in the education and leadership of students with special needs.

6. **“Individual Education Plan (IEP) Provincial Trends Report 2012: Student Achievement and Narrowing Gaps”**

   The attached report was provided to SEAC.
Individual Education Plan (IEP) Provincial Trends Report 2012:
Student Achievement and Narrowing Gaps

Introduction

Since 2003 the Ministry of Education’s improvements have focused on three priorities:

- Increasing student achievement and reaching targets of
  - 75% of grade 6 students at the provincial standard (level 3) in reading, writing and mathematics
  - 85% secondary school graduation rate
- Narrowing gaps in student achievement, and
- Increasing public confidence in publicly funded education.

For students with special education needs the number of students reaching the provincial standard has continued to increase year over year from 2002-03, the number of exemptions have decreased, and, the number of students moving through the levels has also continued to increase year over year.

These achievements can be linked to work of the ministry and school boards to transform how students with special education needs receive programs and/or services. The vision for this transformation was set out in Special Education Transformation: The report of the Co-Chairs with the Recommendations of the Working Table on Special Education (2006). The Report identified the following four directions for changes that would be required to achieve transformation in special education:

- a focus on student learning and assessing progress;
- a focus on accountability for results;
- a proactive model; and,
- a focus on access to education.

With respect to these changes, the Ministry of Education recognized that the Individual Education Plan (IEP) is a critical tool in driving student achievement and well-being for students with special education needs. In 2006, the ministry began a collaborative review of Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and corresponding Provincial Report Cards. The intent of the review was to address the series of relevant recommendations related to the IEP made by the Working Table and to move toward the special education goals of developing and implementing effective IEPs for students with special education needs, and enhancing the collaborative relationships between educators and parents. The results of the review in 2006 indicated that areas requiring further focus included annual program goals, learning expectations, parent consultation, and transition planning.
These areas of focus were reinforced in the 2008 Report on Special Education by the Auditor General of Ontario. The Auditor’s recommendations focused on a number of areas including Individual Education Plans (IEPs) – reporting progress, collaboration with parents in the development of the IEP, monitoring student progress and transition planning.

The follow up from the 2006-07 IEP Review and the Auditor’s recommendations also led to the ministry’s development of an electronic IEP template and IEP samples to support school boards, as well as a parent IEP website to encourage and support greater parental involvement. Furthermore school boards used their individual school board results to inform professional learning for staff and Special Education Advisory Committees (SEACs). During the fall of 2009, the ministry held regional conversations with school boards and gathered further information on school board practices and the use of assessment data in the planning and development of IEPs.

The release of Growing Success: Assessment, Evaluation and Reporting in Ontario Schools (2010), further articulated the focus on accountability and results for students with special education needs. In addition, the Board Improvement Planning for Student Achievement (BIPSA) and the School Effectiveness Framework (SEF): A support for school improvement and student success K – 12 (2010) articulate a cycle of school board program planning processes supporting student achievement including students with special education needs.

It is within this context of ongoing work to improve the achievement and well-being of students with special education needs that the ministry undertook a further Provincial IEP Review in spring 2012. The following is a description of the 2011-12 IEP Review and a summary of provincial trends.

Methodology

In spring 2012 the ministry undertook a Provincial Individual Education Plan (IEP) Review. The purpose of this review was to measure progress since the 2006-07 Provincial IEP Review. The methodology used in this review included the establishment of internal school board review teams.

The teams were asked to review a minimum of 10 IEPs (5 elementary and 5 secondary) in relation to key elements of the IEP Standards for Development, Program Planning, and Implementation, 2000. School boards rated their progress using the following rubric in their self-assessment of both their 2006 and 2012 results:

- **Emergent:** The IEP complies with few of the IEP Standards. Some of the required information is missing or incorrectly noted. Few of the content is personalized and precise.
- **Developing:** The IEP complies with some of IEP Standards. Some of the required information is noted. Some of the content is personalized.

---

1 Boards refer to school boards, school authorities and provincial schools
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and precise.

**Satisfactory:** The IEP complies with most of the required IEP Standards. Most the content is personalized and precise.

**Proficient:** The IEP complies with all of the IEP Standards. All the information is personalized and precise.

The IEP Standards key elements that were reviewed according to the rubric included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Template</th>
<th>Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Strength and Areas of Need</td>
<td>Accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level of Achievement</td>
<td>Annual Program Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Expectations</td>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods</td>
<td>Transition Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Consultation</td>
<td>Link to the Provincial Report Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary (clear linkages to other components of the IEP).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School board results were submitted electronically to the ministry where they were collated and analyzed. The following sections were included:

- Self-rating of 2006-07 IEP Collaborative Review results;
- Self-rating of 2011-12 of 10 sample IEPs (5 elementary, 5 secondary);
- Self-reporting of capacity building opportunities since 2006;
- Self-reporting of internal planning for moving forward;
- Suggestions for supports from the ministry; and
- Additional comments on the 2011-12 IEP review process.

**Key Learnings**

The following section highlights the key learnings from the review.

A key purpose for the ministry releasing *IEP Standards for Development, Program Planning, and Implementation, 2000* was to describe province-wide standards that school boards use when developing, implementing and monitoring IEPs. The top two levels in the scoring rubric are *Satisfactory and Proficient* and are considered to be acceptable results for school boards.

*Figure 1* illustrates that there has been an increase in the percentage of school boards who are reporting that they are at the satisfactory and/or proficient level in terms of compliance with the key elements of the standards. All school boards indicated a satisfactory and/or proficient level in meeting all of the standards. Areas requiring continued focus include annual program goals, transition planning and parent consultation.
Figure 1: Change in School Boards at Satisfactory or Proficient Level by Key Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Template</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Data</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>+34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Strength &amp; Areas of Need</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>+47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>+56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Level of Achievement</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>+31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Program Goals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>+37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Expectations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>+55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>+43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Methods</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Plan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Consultation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>+36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the Provincial Report Card</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>+49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary-clear interdependence among the key elements of the standards above</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>+59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Building Opportunities between 2006 and 2012 for the Continuous Improvement of IEPs

School boards shared information about the professional learning they undertook at the system and school levels to build capacity to improve the planning, implementation and monitoring of IEPs. They reported ongoing professional learning in four major areas: awareness development; professional development; resource development; and internal IEP reviews.
**Awareness Development**

IEP review teams reported awareness development opportunities most frequently for students, parents, Early Childhood Educators (ECE), Educational Assistants (EAs), SEACs and community agencies.

"Our internal annual IEP audits have assisted us with improving our IEPs."

"The checklist is very helpful. We have used the checklist from 2006-2007 for conducting our own internal reviews for the past few years and for use in PD sessions with principals and teachers."

"We have had very good feedback from stakeholders with respect to the provincial template."

**Professional Development** (e.g., workshops, professional learning communities)

School boards reported the highest frequency of professional development for teachers, principals/vice principals and central professional services staff. Participants also reported that learning opportunities were offered to: other school boards; staff in Section 23 and Section 68 programs; New Teacher Induction Programs (NTIP); Federations; Additional Qualification Courses; and, IEP Steering Committees.

Methods used to deliver professional development included: presentations; IEP video training; IEP software manual development; job embedded coaching opportunities; special education carousel evenings; IEP Identification Placement Review Committee (IPRC) web based applications; the establishment of an IEP Help Desk; student focused groups; and, local special education courses.

"The professional development being provided for Special Education Resource Teachers at both levels is resulting in improvement in the development of the IEPs. For example, the focused work on IEPs for students on alternative programs through the A4 project has resulted in well-written, well-developed IEPs."

**Resource Development**

School boards indicated that they had developed resources for specific audiences. The resources targeted parents, teachers, principals/vice-principals and central administration staff. Many school boards indicated a willingness to share the resources they have developed or were in the process of developing for 2012-13. The ministry has established an IEP e-Community to assist in this process.
Internal IEP Review

School boards reported that existing internal annual IEP reviews provide rich opportunities for professional learning and for including parents, students and community partners. They also indicated that they will continue with their existing internal IEP review processes and/or adapt to the model presented in the 2012 Review.

School boards acknowledged that the IEP review process modelled by the ministry helped to facilitate their own internal IEP review process. They identified that the review was an excellent opportunity to assess their own progress and to identify a targeted area for future professional development.

“Our committee felt that the audit process was an extremely beneficial one and an excellent tool for professional development. Dedicating time to review, reflect and plan on next steps for improving our IEP’s was truly appreciated. Because of this process we are committed to beginning each school year with a baseline training session with an internal audit planned following the first IEP of each school year. We felt that our process can be much more streamlined with expertise being shared more effectively to maximize the quality of the IEP’s. We are also committed to engaging our parents in a more dynamic way to empower them to be more involved...and to help them understand more effectively the purposefulness of an IEP as it relates to their child is our priority. Parents need to feel the IEP process is a tool for success not a barrier to success.”

School boards reported a variety of membership in their internal IEP Review Teams as follows:

- 60% had a Principal;
- 30% had a Vice Principal;
- 70% had a Special Education Coordinator and/or Consultant;
- 50% had a Superintendent;
- 43% had a Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) Member;
- 63% had a Teacher; and
- 10% had a Student.

Other members included: parents; members of community agencies; educational assistants; and other professionals (e.g., Applied Behaviour Analysis Specialist, Speech and Language Pathologist, Psychologist).

For an overview of the 2011-12 and 2006-07 reviews please see:

Appendix 1 for the Summary of 2011-12 Board Results$^2$ with IEP Standards; and Appendix II for the Summary of 2006 – 07 Board Results$^3$ with IEP Standards.

$^2$ Note: Some percentages have been rounded up
$^3$ Note: Some percentages have been rounded up
Note: Some percentages have been rounded up.

Moving Forward with IEPs

School boards made the following suggestions for areas where they or the ministry could focus on the future to support the continuous improvement in the development, implementation and monitoring of IEPs:

- An internal IEP review process to facilitate capacity building and further enhance board accountability for achievement;
- A focus on parent consultation, measurable annual program goals, learning expectations, and transition planning;
- A focus on elements of the IEP that describe the student’s program, the accommodations to be provided and how learning is to be demonstrated;
- A focus on IEP awareness development activities for students, parents, SEACs, community agencies, early childhood educators and teacher assistants;
- A focus on IEP professional development in the form of workshops and professional learning communities for teachers, early childhood educators, teacher assistants, principals/vice-principals and central administrative staff; and
- Updating current resources, creating new ones, and providing a platform for resources to be easily accessed.
Appendix 1: Summary of 2011-12 Board Results with IEP Standards

Key Elements

- Proficient
- Satisfactory
- Developing
- Emergent
Appendix II: 2006-07 Summary of Board Results with IEP Standards

Key Elements
- Proficient
- Satisfactory
- Developing
- Emergent
System Superintendent
SEAC Report

Submitted by Cindy Burley
October 7, 2013

Professional Learning for Special Education Teachers

On September 19, MARTs, CLs and ACLs who are new to Special Education participated in professional learning sessions about special education policies, procedures and practices, as well as Shared Solutions. Many of these sessions took place in computer labs where staff were able to access and navigate the Special Education Website, Ministry websites and the IEP/IPRC SAP program. Part 2 will take place on November 28. The content of this session will be differentiated based upon the input from the teachers themselves in order to tailor it to their needs.

On September 25, teachers from our ISP classes for students with a learning disability participated in a professional learning session focused on the profile of the learner and strategies to support them.

On September 26, MARTs and CLs/ACLs participated in a variety of small group interactive sessions on a variety of topics, including: Positive Behaviour Supports, Supporting Kindergarten Students, the School Support Team process and more.

As well, on September 26, teachers who are new to our classes for students with a developmental disability participated in a session about the programming and the IEP.

Professional Learning for Special Education Department Staff

On October 3, Special Education Department staff participated in a professional learning session around the disaggregation EQAO results for students with special education needs. Each Family of Schools consultant and coordinator pair, used the data combined with local needs to determine 2-3 key areas of focus for professional learning and support in their Family of Schools.

Tri-Ministry Transition Planning for Students with a Developmental Disability

The draft document has been reviewed based upon the June 2013 consultation, which included SEAC members, as well as TDSB staff. TDSB and TCDSB are waiting for the distribution of the revised protocol.

IEP Samples by Exceptionality

This year, we are beginning the process of developing sample IEPs for each exceptionality using the profile of students in Intensive Support Programs. These samples will include the transition plan, in preparation for PPM 156: Transition Planning for Students with Special Education Needs.
PPM 156: Transition Planning for Students with Special Education Needs

We are continuing our work towards the implementation of the new transition policy, which comes into effect in September 2014. As mentioned, samples are being developed and as well, we are preparing messaging for the system and professional learning sessions for administrators and teachers.

Board Improvement Plan and EQAO Results 2012-2013

A brief overview of the results for students with special education needs was provided.
Board Improvement Plan

✓ Maintain Exemption Rate in grades 3 and 6
✓ Mitigating anxiety
✓ Improve literacy and numeracy
✓ Target Ten Strategies
✓ Secondary Focus – personalized and precise accommodations
✓ Assistive Technology
Board Improvement Plan

✓ Targeted intentionality
✓ Tiered approach – What we do for All, for Some, for a Few
✓ Differentiated professional learning based on data and local needs
✓ Build on last 3 years’ findings, available data and local needs
✓ Develop IEP exemplars, including transition plans
✓ Transitions – implement PPM 156: Supporting Transitions for Students with Special Education Needs (September 2014)
✓ Continue to develop standards and essential components – focus on Developmental Disabilities, Gifted, Behaviour and Autism
Board Improvement Plan
Exemption Rates - Grade 3 Students with Special Education Needs

*By June 2014 the exemption rate will be maintained*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3 Exemption Rate</th>
<th>2009 - 2010</th>
<th>2010 - 2011</th>
<th>2011 - 2012</th>
<th>2012 - 2013</th>
<th>Decrease since 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Improvement Plan
Exemption Rates - Grade 6 Students with Special Education Needs

By June 2014 the exemption rate will be maintained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6 Exemption Rate</th>
<th>2009 - 2010</th>
<th>2010 - 2011</th>
<th>2011 - 2012</th>
<th>2012 - 2013</th>
<th>Decrease since 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elementary Exemptions

• Exemption message in effect for 3 years
• Exemption rates have decreased 6-9% in grade 3/6
• Many schools already had few or no exemptions
• Some schools had a history of exempting all students on an IEP or in an ISP
Elementary Exemptions

• Now, schools are making individual decisions about students on a case by case basis

• Three main issues remain:
  1. Need more clarity about students who are English Language Learners
  2. Parental requests
  3. Anxiety Issues

There is a workshop that was co-developed by Special Education and Professional Support Staff to address anxiety during test-taking situations.

Talk to your Family of Schools Consultant, your school psychologist or your school social worker for more information!
Elementary Exemptions

From the 2013 Draft Board Improvement Plan:

“An inclusionary approach to participation in EQAO assessments, with exemptions only in accordance with EQAO Exemption Criteria and guided by TDSB Exemption Targets.”
## EQAO - Grade 3 and 6 Overall Board Results

(including students with special education needs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>Change Since 2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>Change Since 2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EQAO - Grade 3 and 6**  
Results for Students with Special Education Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>Change Since 2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
<th>Change Since 2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applied Math - EQAO - Grade 9  
Level 3 & 4  
Students with Special Education Needs  

Goal – To improve by 10%  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Change SPED</th>
<th>Change All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change since 08-09</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Math – EQAO – Grade 9
#### Level 3 & 4
Students with Special Education Needs

Goal – To improve by 3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SPED</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Change SPED</th>
<th>Change All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change since 2008-09 | 10% | 8%
## OSSLT – EQAO – First Time Eligible

**Students with Special Education Needs**

**Goal** – To improve by 10%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with an IEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding gifted)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary Students

- How are students with IEPs being supported consistently and persistently by all teachers?
- What are their accommodations during instruction?
- What are their accommodations during assessment?
- How are the accommodations personalized and targeted?
Secondary Students
(the same slide with an uncluttered format in Arial)

- How are students with IEPs being supported consistently and persistently by all teachers?
- What are their accommodations during instruction?
- What are their accommodations during assessment?
- How are the accommodations personalized and targeted?
Marker Students

Definition

- "Marker students can be defined as students requiring an extra "lens" (i.e., social-emotional, academic, special education, equity) to ensure their on-going success depending on the focus area or need..."
- Target Ten is a subset of Marker Students, which means that all Target Ten students can be Marker Students.

Demographic Characteristics of Marker Students – General Trend (does not include this year’s data)

- "Students with Special Education Needs (excluding Gifted) who participated in the Marker Students program were significantly more likely to achieve the provincial standard on EQAO Reading, Writing, and Mathematics than other students with Special Education Needs (excluding Gifted) in Grade 3 and Grade 6 in the TDSB."
Speech-Language Pathology Services
Professional Development Sessions 2013/14

Oral Language and Literacy Connection Summer Institute (3-day series)
TDSB Speech-Language Pathologists provide three-days of professional development focusing on oral language and literacy.
Day 1: Phonological Awareness and Phonics – Building fundamental literacy skills
Day 2: Vocabulary – Critical Skill to Academic Success
Day 3: Reading Comprehension – Using Oral Language to Bridge Inferential Thinking
Offered in one location (east) in August 2013.

Kindergarten Red Flags (2-part series)
This in-service provides instruction on developmental norms and observation strategies so that participants will be better equipped to identify “at risk” kindergarten students (including those who are English language learners) and discuss student needs at school support team meetings.
Offered in four locations (east, west and central) in September-October 2013 and in two locations (east and west) in January 2014.

iPads in the Low Incidence Classroom (2-part series)
This interactive workshop will support the successful implementation of iPads in the Low Incidence classroom from a speech and language perspective. Participants can expect to: develop an understanding how iPad apps can address underlying students’ speech and language learning needs and tailor the use of a specific iPad app with a specific student profile.
Offered in three locations (east, west and central) in September-October 2013.

APPlying Yourself - iPad use in the Classroom (2-part series)
This interactive workshop will support the successful implementation of iPads in the classroom to support various language skills. Participants can expect to: develop an understanding how iPad apps can address underlying students’ speech and language learning needs and tailor the use of a specific iPad app with a specific student profile.
Offered in one central location in November-December 2013.

ABC and Beyond™: The Hanen Program® Building Emergent Literacy in Early Childhood Settings (4-part series)
TDSB Speech-Language Pathologists provide four half-day in-services and two individual coaching and feedback sessions to help teachers and ECE partners promote emergent literacy skills throughout the kindergarten curriculum. Participants can expect to learn practical strategies to develop their students’ oral language, vocabulary, story comprehension and language for thinking and learning.
To be offered in one central location in November 2013-March 2014
Oral Language in the Classroom: Asking and Answering Questions

This in-service reviews question development in young children and teaches how to support students in answering and asking questions. Participants will learn specific strategies for supporting students in the classroom through the use of practical hands on activities and demonstration videos.

To be offered in two locations (east and west) in November 2013.

Building Vocabulary, Closing the Gaps (2-part series)

This workshop will increase the knowledge base of why vocabulary is important, and why it matters for reading and writing. Participants will learn strategies to support students in their learning of new words in everyday classroom subjects and activities. What you do will have a huge impact on academic success!

To be offered in two locations (east and west) in January 2014.

“I Tawt I Taw a Puddy Tat”

This workshop will assist participants in understanding the difference between “speech” and “language” and whether a student is having an articulation problem, a stuttering problem or a language problem. Participants will learn about the causes and implications of articulation difficulties and be provided with ready-to-use strategies to help students in the classroom.

To be offered in two locations (east and west) in February 2014.

Visuals are Worth a Thousand Words (2-part series)

Visuals can be used to support students' understanding, independence and ability to follow rules and routines in the classroom as well as express their needs, wants, feelings, and respond to questions and comments more effectively. This workshop will assist participants in the effective use of visuals to support students in a variety of activities that foster language and literacy development as well as increase independence in the classroom.

To be offered in two locations (east and west) in November 2013 and March 2014.

Ministry of Education Documents Supporting Mental Health

Two recent publications will support the implementation of the Mental Health Strategy at the Toronto District School Board. School Mental Health ASSIST has released a document entitled, “Leading Mentally Healthy Schools: A Resource for School Administrators”. In addition, the Ministry of Education has issued a draft document for school staff entitled, “Supporting Minds – An Educator’s Guide to Promoting Students’ Mental Health and Well-Being.” Input is being invited on this latter document over the course of the next year. The links to these documents are as follows:

- “Leading Mentally Healthy Schools: A Resource for School Administrators”
  https://www.dropbox.com/s/1ch2ge3f6a6vf57/LeadingMentallyHealthSchoolsFinal.pdf
- “Supporting Minds – An Educator’s Guide”
# Service Statistics
## September 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Psych.</th>
<th>Social Work</th>
<th>Attend.</th>
<th>SLP</th>
<th>OT/PT</th>
<th>Child &amp; Youth Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2338</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait List</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEAC Service Statistics Year to Date (September 2013)

- **Psych.**
- **Social Work**
- **Attend.**
- **SLP**
- **OT/PT**
- **Child & Youth Services**

- **Referrals**
- **Completed**
- **Wait List**
- **In Progress**