



**Ministry of Education
Office of the Inspector of Independent Schools**

2014/15 Special Education Evaluation Committee Review

REPORT

**Pacific School of Innovation and Inquiry
(061 96868)**

**2014/15 Special Education Evaluation Committee Review
Pacific School of Innovation and Inquiry
(061 968680)**

Background

The Ministry of Education funds Independent School Authorities based on the Authorities' reported enrolment as of September 30th each year and supplemental special needs classifications in September and February. Independent School Authorities report students with special needs to the Ministry on *Form 1701: Student Data Collection* (Form 1701).

In the 2014/15 school year, the Office of the Inspector of Independent Schools (OIIS) conducted Special Education Evaluation Committee (SEEC) reviews of school and student records to assist OIIS and the independent school system in developing best practices in the area of special education programming and service provision. The Ministry will also use these review processes to develop an independent school special education audit protocol to be used in the future.

Purpose

The purpose of the SEEC review is to provide assurance to the Ministry of Education and Independent School Authorities that schools are complying with the instructions contained in [*Form 1701: Student Data Collection, Completion Instructions for Independent Schools*](#) and Ministry policies are being followed. The review 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 \(March 2013\)*](#).

Description of the Audit Process

An SEEC review was conducted at Pacific School of Innovation and Inquiry on March 2, 2015.

Prior to the file reviews, an entry meeting was held with the School Principal, and the SEEC auditor interviewed the School Administrator to enquire about the Independent School Authority's policies, procedures and programs. The Principal provided a copy of the School's Special Education Policy as well as a sample of a Student Learning Plan developed with each student enrolled in the school.

Pacific School of Innovation and Inquiry reported 16 students in special education categories at the Fall 2014 Form 1701 data submission. For the purposes of this SEEC review, nine student records were reviewed in the following low incidence special needs categories:

Student Claims	Category
4	Category G (Autism Spectrum Disorder)
5	Category H (Intensive Behaviour Intervention or Serious Mental Illness)

The SEEC also reviewed seven student records in the following high incidence special needs categories:

Student Claims	Category
2	Category P (Gifted)
5	Category Q (Learning Disability)

An exit meeting was held with School Principal, Jeff Hopkins, at the end of the review day to present preliminary findings, seek clarification related to the contents of files, and express appreciation for the assistance provided.

Observations:

Of the four student files reviewed by the auditor in Code G:

- one student was recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

Of the five student files reviewed by the auditor in Code H:

- four students were recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

Of the two student files reviewed by the auditor in Code P:

- two students were recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

Of the five student files reviewed by the auditor in Code Q:

- three students were recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

The auditor found that:

- One student reported in Code G did not have any evidence of assessment documentation to support the claim in the category as outlined in the Special Education Manual of Policies, Procedure and Guidelines. There was reference on the IEP of a BCAAN assessment in November 2014 but there was no evidence of the report available in the file.
- Four student claims in Code H did not have evidence to meet the criteria for placement in the Intensive Behaviour Interventions/Serious Mental Illness Category. For one student there was no student file available. For two students, there was no evidence of a Behavior Assessment and/or Mental Health Assessment, no documentation to support the behaviour placed the student or others at serious risk or interfered with academic progress, nor was there evidence of outside agency support for one of these students. For the last student, there was no evidence in the file that indicated any coordinated across agency and community planning.
- Two student claims in Code P did not have evidence that showed assessment and identification that used multiple criteria, and that assessment had collected information from a variety of sources.
- Three student claims in Code Q did not have any assessment documentation evidence to support the criteria for a claim in this category.
- Student files were available with limited or no documentation to support the criteria being met in the various category claims. Even though student data is all online, there was no additional information available to support the requests for evidence of criteria being met.

- There are no support services staff employed by the School to provide assistance to students with special needs. As per the School's philosophy, all teachers support all the students enrolled at the school working on their integrated subjects and personal universal learning goals. The Principal is also the the counsellor and the primary source of support for students with special needs.
- The IEP format used by the School did not contain all the pertinent areas outlined in the Special Education Services Manual of Policies Procedures and Guidelines. There were goals listed in various goal domains and a page of Strategies as well as a page of Adaptations and Accommodations. There were no specific measurable objectives or methods of measurement or evaluation. There was an indication of which teacher would be providing specific support to each student. The Report Card did not report on any IEP goals, objectives or strategies.
- The IEPs were dated and parents were consistently involved in IEP planning.

Recommendations:

The auditor recommends that:

- The School report student claims in Code G only if they meet the criteria listed in the Special Education Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for that category. There must be evidence of documentation showing the student's diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder made by appropriately qualified professionals.
- The School ensure any student claims in Code H meet the criteria listed in the Special Education Manual of Policies Procedure and Guidelines for that category. There must be documentation of a behaviour assessment and/or mental health assessment. There must also be documented evidence of behaviour placing the student or others at serious risk or interfering with academic progress. There also must be evidence that indicates there is interagency coordination and planning.
- The School only claim students in Code P that meet the requisite assessment criteria in accordance with the Special Education Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines.
- The School report only those student in Code Q for whom they have assessment documentation to support the criteria in accordance with the Special Education Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines.
- The School ensure all student files have appropriate detailed assessments that support the recommendation of the student for the reported category in accordance with the criteria outlined in the Special Education Manual of Policy, Procedures and Guidelines.
- The School review their current IEP format to ensure all pertinent areas outlined in the Special Education Manual of Policies Procedures and Guidelines are included and evident on the form they are using.

Auditor's Comments

The auditor extends appreciation to the school staff for their cooperation and hospitality during the SEEC review.