



**Ministry of Education
Resource Management and Corporate Services Division
School District Financial Reporting Unit**

2016/17 Special Education Enrolment Audit

AUDIT REPORT

**WEST POINT GREY ACADEMY
(039 96645)**

2016/17 SPECIAL EDUCATION ENROLMENT AUDIT REPORT WEST POINT GREY ACADEMY (039 96645)

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 2016/17 school year, the Ministry of Education conducted Special Education enrolment audits, in selected schools recommended by the Office of the Inspector of Independent Schools (OIIS), to verify reported enrolment on Form 1701.

Purpose

The purpose of the Special Education enrolment audit 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 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 \(April 2016\)*](#).

Description of the Compliance Audit Process

A compliance audit was conducted at West Point Grey Academy on February 14 and 15, 2017.

Prior to the file reviews, an entry meeting was held with school assigned staff and the audit team interviewed school administrators and staff to enquire about the Independent School Authority's policies, procedures and programs.

West Point Grey Academy reported 89 students in special education categories at the Fall 2016 Form 1701 data collection period. For the purposes of this audit, nine student records were reviewed in the following low incidence special needs categories:

Headcount	Category
4	Physical Disability or Chronic Health Impairment (Code D)
4	Deaf or Hard of Hearing (Code F)
1	Autism Spectrum Disorder (Code G)

36 student records were also reviewed in the following high incidence special needs categories:

Headcount	Category
1	Mild Intellectual Disability (Code K)
13	Gifted (Code P)
22	Learning Disability (Code Q)

The auditors held an entry meeting with the Head of School, Senior Support Coordinator, Junior School Skills Department Head and the Head of Learning Support–Senior School on February 14, 2017. The School staff shared information with the auditors regarding the structure of the school and the service delivery model. Although the School is divided into the Junior School and the Senior School, and housed in separate buildings, the service delivery model is similar in both schools. There is a Skills Coordinator in both schools who works with teachers and students to provide support services. The staff described a pre-referral intervention model which involved team meetings and collaboration with parents and staff. Student IEP development was also described as a collaborative process. The School shared with the auditors that they were in the process of developing a new IEP template that will be used consistently in both schools.

An exit meeting was held with the Head of the School, Senior Support Coordinator, Senior School Skills Coordinator, Junior School Skills Coordinator and Grade 8/9 Skills Coordinator on February 15, 2017. 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 2016/17 school year, and expressed appreciation for the assistance provided.

Observations

Of the four student files reviewed by the auditors in Code D one student was recommended for reclassification to Code Q.

Of the four student files reviewed by the auditors in Code F one student was recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

The one student file reviewed by the auditors in Code G was recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

The one student file reviewed by the auditors in Code K was recommended for reclassification to Code Q.

Of the 13 student files reviewed by the auditors in Code P:

- 9 students were recommended for reclassification to Code Q;
- one student was recommended for reclassification to Regular Education.

Of the 22 student files reviewed by the auditors in Code Q:

- one student was recommended for reclassification to Regular Education

The auditors found that:

- All clarification requests were responded to in a timely manner and contained the information the auditors required to verify the criteria and conclude the audit.
- Diagnostic information was readily available in the student file but did not always support the category in which the student was claimed.
- There was evidence of meeting notes in the student files indicating the collaborative planning done by the staff to determine the appropriate supports and services for the student.

- There was evidence of regular communication and collaboration with parents.
- All the student files reviewed in Code Q contained evidence of well-defined services and programs as well as up to date assessments.
- There was a clear indication of who the service providers were and their role to support the student.
- The support program developed for the students often reflected recommendations from various reports and assessments.
- There were a number of issues relating to the IEPs developed by the school:
 - It was difficult to determine the date for most of the IEPs reviewed.
 - There was no indication on the IEP that the parent was offered the opportunity to be consulted about the preparation of the IEP.
 - Very few of the IEPs contained measureable objectives.
 - Very few of the IEPs contained defined goals or what the objectives were, nor were there outlined methods for measuring progress in relation to the IEP goals.
- Several student files did contain a SMART Goal Worksheet and that was reflected on the student's IEP
- For student claims recommended for reclassification, the evidence in these files lacked evidence to support the student had been appropriately claimed in that category.
 - One student reported in Code D had evidence to verify that diabetes was not seriously impacting their education. The student's Medical IEP indicates his independence in managing his diabetes. This student has also been diagnosed with a Learning Disability and evidence in the student file verified that medical condition did not have an impact on the student's education. The evidence supports the criteria for Code Q.
 - One student reported in Code F did not have evidence of a current Audiology Assessment nor was there evidence to support that this student's unilateral hearing loss was having an impact on the student's education. There was no evidence of a current IEP or support from a qualified teacher of the Deaf or Hard of Hearing. Without evidence of any service provision aligned with the Special Education Services Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines, student claim is aligned with Regular Education.
 - One student claim in Code G did have assessment evidence in the student file to support a diagnosis of ASD. There was no evidence of an IEP developed or of any additional support services being provided by the School. There was evidence in the student file of invoices from 2014 being sent by the parent to the school for services provided by a private SLP and private ABA services. Without evidence of any service provision by the School aligned with the Special Education Services Manual of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines, student claim is aligned with Regular Education.
 - One student reported in Code K did not have any evidence in the student file to support a claim in that category. All the evidence in the student file supported a claim in Code Q. The School verified this should have been a Code Q claim.
 - There were nine students reported in Code P with no evidence to support a claim in that category. The Psychoeducational assessment supported a claim in Code Q and consideration for a claim in Code P. There was no IEP goal to reflect Code P criteria nor were there learning activities specific to this category. The evidence in the student file did support a claim in Code Q and was verified by the School staff.

- One student reported in Code P did have assessment evidence to support the claim but there was no evidence of an IEP, support services, or learning activities in the student file from that of the general school population.
- One student reported in Code Q did not have the assessment evidence to support the claim. The Psych Educational report stated the student did not have a learning disability. The School staff verified the ineligible claim.

Recommendations:

The auditors recommend that:

- The School report only those student claims who meet the criteria for the category in which they are reported and ensure students are receiving special education support services to address the needs identified in the assessment information that are beyond those offered to the general population.
- The School ensure that Form 1701 reporting is verified prior to submission and that student files are updated and reviewed regularly to ensure the student claims meet the criteria in the category in which they are claimed for the reported school year.
- The School ensure that any new IEP template being developed adhere to Ministry requirements and guidelines, and contain all the components necessary to verify the criteria is being met.
- The School ensure the new IEP template is used consistently in the School.
- The School ensure the date of the IEP is clearly indicated.
- There is evidence that parents have been given the opportunity to be consulted about the preparation of the IEP.
- The School ensure goals and objectives are clear, measurable and in alignment with the category in which the student is identified.
- The School engage in an IEP workshop to ensure staff who are developing IEPs understand and recognise the requirement for goals, measurable objectives and methods of measuring progress in relation to the goals and objectives.
- The School ensure any student claims in Code D meet the criteria listed in the Special Education Services Manual of Policies Procedure and Guidelines for that category. There must be documentation that the chronic health impairment seriously impacts student's education and achievement.
- The School ensure any student claims in Code F contain the required audiology assessment. For a student with a unilateral hearing loss, there must be an annual assessment, as well as documentation to support the impact the hearing loss has on the student's education. There must be a current IEP, a goal that reflects the category in which the student is claimed, and support must be provided by a qualified teacher of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.
- The School be considered for a return audit to ensure all related staff are adhering to and working in accordance with the Special Education Services Manual of Policy, Procedures and Guidelines requirements.

Auditors' Comments

The auditors express their appreciation to the school staff for their cooperation and hospitality during the audit.