



**Ministry of Education  
Resource Management Division**

**2010/11 Special Education Enrolment Audit**

**AUDIT REPORT**  
*Revised June 13, 2011*

**SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 23 (Central Okanagan)**

## **2010/11 SPECIAL EDUCATION ENROLMENT AUDIT REPORT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 23 (Central Okanagan)**

### **Background**

The Ministry of Education funds boards of education based on the boards' reported enrolment as of September 30<sup>th</sup> each year and supplemental Special Needs classifications in September and February. The boards report students with special needs to the Ministry on *Form 1701: Student Data Collection* (Form 1701).

The Resource Management Division annually conducts Special Education enrolment audits, in selected school districts, to verify reported enrolment on Form 1701. School districts are selected for audit based on a variety of factors, including the length of time since their last audit, the district's incidence levels compared to the provincial incidence levels, and changes in enrolment.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the Special Education enrolment audit is to provide assurance to the Ministry of Education and boards of education that school districts are complying with the instructions contained in *Form 1701: Student Data Collection, Completion Instructions for Public Schools* and Ministry policies are being followed. The audit also provides assurance that the students reported have been placed in the appropriate special education category, as per the *Special Education Services: A Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines* (September 2009).

### **Description of the Audit Process**

A Special Education enrolment audit was conducted in School District No. 23 (Central Okanagan) during the week of January 31, 2011. An entry meeting was held on January 31, 2011 with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Secretary Treasurer, Director of Instruction: Student Support Services, Principal: Central Programs and Services, Department Head: Autism Spectrum Disorders, and the Department Head: Behaviour. Daily meetings with the Director of Instruction and representatives from his staff were held to present preliminary findings and to seek clarification related to the contents of files.

Prior to the file reviews, the auditors interviewed District staff to enquire about the District's policies, procedures and programs. The auditors were provided with a copy of District No.23 Manual/Resources and a copy of Behaviour Intervention/Handbook Procedures.

The file review process did not encounter issues requiring school visits.

An exit meeting was held with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Secretary Treasurer, Director of Instruction-Student Support Services, Principal-Central Programs and Services, Department Head-Autism Spectrum Disorders, and the Department Head-Behaviour on February 4, 2011. The auditors reviewed the purpose of the audit and the audit criteria, explained the audit reporting process, reported their findings, clarified any outstanding issues,

discussed reclassifications for the 2011/12 school year, and expressed appreciation for the assistance provided.

### **Observations**

Of the 185 student files reviewed by the auditors in Code G:

- One student was recommended for reclassification to Code D.
- One student was recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

Of the 199 student files reviewed by the auditors in Code H:

- Four students were recommended for reclassification to Code D.
- One student was recommended for reclassification to Code G.
- Twenty-seven students were recommended for reclassification to Code R.
- Thirteen students were recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

The auditors found that:

- The binders that were presented to the audit team were very informative and provided insight into district processes.
- Norm referenced assessment information was well documented.
- The IEPs for Codes G and H were current.
- Autism Spectrum Disorder files were clear, comprehensive and complete.
- Schools frequently made the effort to link the home, school, and community in writing goals for Behaviour Support Plans.
- The scale developed for methods for measurement were usually clearly outlined but, most often, were left blank and not completed on the Behaviour Support Plan.
- The level of special education service provided at the school level was not clearly identified in the IEP. The audit team had to request that information from the Director of Student Services.
- Often the name of the person providing the support service was provided without an indication of the position of that person, thus making it difficult to determine if the service was part of regular or special education.
- The District is in the process of change in the development of IEPs. It is attempting to relate the IEP to the report card. In its effort to create a nexus between the IEP and the report card, in Code G, goals specifically relating to the category were sometimes difficult to determine.
- Information from psycho-educational assessments often were not incorporated into the IEPs.
- Some resource teachers appear not to know how to write IEP goals that correspond to the category in which the student is identified; do not know how to write measurable objectives; and, do not include methods for measuring those objectives in relation to the goals.
- Behaviour Support Plans frequently did not identify the true current behaviour of the students. In an effort to indicate support to the student, the school frequently destroyed the record of behaviour incidents or did not include them in the files.
- In the Alternate Education School program, several student IEPs in Code H were reproduced exactly the same as the previous year with only the date changed.
- Relevant information was often not dated (e.g., notes from behaviour staff, school staff).
- Inter-agency involvement for Code H was not well documented.

- There was no consistent indication that the school had exhausted its resources to warrant referral to Code H.
- Many Code H files did not contain evidence that the student continued to meet criteria for placement in this category for the 2010/11 school year. This evidence was particularly lacking in the secondary schools.
- Evidence indicated Alternate Education School program staff at times did not review files, which resulted in students with physical disabilities or chronic health impairments being placed in Code H rather than the appropriate category.
- There does not appear to be enough staffing time provided, at some secondary schools, for the Behaviour Intervention Support Teachers to complete the appropriate documentation to ensure that Ministry directives and policies are being followed.

### **Recommendations**

The auditors recommend that:

- A District-wide process be developed to ensure students are screened into appropriate Special Education categories as well as a process for delisting students when the student no longer qualifies for that designation.
- The District provide in-service for resource teachers to enable them to write IEP goals, objectives, and strategies that correspond to the category in which the student is identified; and to include methods for measuring progress in relation to the goals.
- The District ensure the amount and type of special education service is included in the IEPs and Behaviour Support plans.
- The schools be required to complete the methods for measuring scale that has been developed for the IEPs and Behaviour Support Plans.
- The District keep refining its plan to meld the goals of the regular academic program with goals for special education on the IEP in Code G in such a manner to ensure the goals correspond to that category within the IEP template.
- IEP goals correspond to the category in which the student is claimed and meet the demonstrated needs of the student.
- The District provide evidence of cross-agency planning in the Behaviour Support Plans.
- Schools record all behaviour incidents in BCeSIS, including the appropriate severity, from grades K to 12.
- Time be provided to Behaviour Intervention Teachers at the middle and secondary schools to ensure that Ministry directives and policies are able to be followed.
- Information from psycho-educational assessments be incorporated into IEPs.
- Documentation of the level of service given to students must be clearly recorded in the IEP.
- The District continue to improve specific methods for measuring progress toward IEP goals and objectives.
- IEPs document all special education services currently available to students by position rather than by the individual's name only.
- School District No. 23 (Central Okanagan) be scheduled for a return audit in the 2011/2012 school year for Code H.

## **Auditors' Comments**

The auditors wish to express their appreciation to the School District, administrators and staff for their cooperation and hospitality during the audit.