



Ministry of Education  
Resource Management Division

**2010/11 Special Education Enrolment Audit**

**AUDIT REPORT**  
***REVISED APRIL 11, 2011***

**SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 75 (Mission)**

## **2010/11 SPECIAL EDUCATION ENROLMENT AUDIT REPORT**

### **SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 75 (Mission)**

#### **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**

An entry meeting was held on January 24, 2011 with the Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent, Director of Instruction-Student Services, District Vice Principal (High Incidence), District Vice-Principal (Low Incidence), the District Psychologist and the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer. Daily meetings with the District Psychologist and the Director of Instruction 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 several binders containing District and student information: Student Services Designations, Special Education Audit January 2011 D and F Categories, Student Services Forms and Procedures, an introductory handout entitled *Information for the Special Education Audit Team*, and a summary page provided information on the organization of the files.

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

An exit meeting was held with the Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, Director-Student Services, two Assistant Vice Principals-Student Services, District Psychologist and the Assistant

Secretary-Treasurer on January 28, 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, outlined the appeal process, and expressed appreciation for the assistance provided.

The observations and recommendations were relayed at the exit meeting. The Superintendent was provided with a copy of the recommended changes in the Appendix.

### **Observations**

Of the 110 student files reviewed by the auditors in Code D:

- Six students were recommended for reclassification to Regular.
- Four students were recommended for reclassification to Code C.
- Three students were recommended for reclassification to Code Q.
- Three students were recommended for reclassification to Code R.
- One student was recommended for reclassification to H.

Of the 20 student files reviewed by the auditors in Code F:

- Five students were recommended for reclassification to Regular.

The auditors found that:

- Generally, files were found to be well organized with comprehensive documentation.
- The Special Education binder prepared for the audit, that added information about the students, was very useful.
- Documentation of the level of service given to the students was generally well recorded in the overview binder and helpful to the team.
- District assessments were complete and thorough.
- Audiology reports were frequent, and appropriate.
- IEPs for Codes D and Code F frequently lacked specific dates, with only the school year identified.
- Some files did not contain the required medical diagnosis.
- Goals, in some secondary school student's IEPs, did not correspond to the category in which the student was identified.
- The method for measuring progress in relation to IEP goals varied from highly specific to general.
- In some cases documented evidence of consultation with parents was not easily identified.
- Often the name of the person providing the support service was provided without an indication of the position of that person, making it difficult to determine if the service was part of regular or special education.
- In Category F the IEPs, initially presented by the Teacher of the Deaf, did not address the individual student's needs and abilities. The District had 19 files re-written before the conclusion of the audit. In this single instance the required documentation was accepted by the audit team as evidence provided during the audit timeline.
- Some student files in Category F did not contain assessment information that indicated that the student had substantial educational difficulty due to the hearing loss.

## **Recommendations**

The auditors recommend that:

- The District ensure the writing and the content of the IEPs meet Ministry directives.
- The District ensure the content of the IEP is enhanced to include: the exact date of writing; evidence that a parent has been given the opportunity to participate; documentation of all special education services currently available to students by position rather than by the individual's name only; methods for measuring progress in addition to "observation" where appropriate; and, goals and objectives appropriate for each individual student in the category. Each IEP is also to include evidence that the student continues to require the service.
- Work done by the specialist teachers be well documented and appropriate for the specific and varied needs of individual students.
- All student files must contain documentation to indicate that the student has been appropriately assessed and identified by the school as meeting the criteria for the category in which they have been claimed.

## **Auditors' Comments**

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