# Report to the Toronto District School Board's Special Education Advisory Committee

# from SEAC Chair David Lepofsky for the May 1, 2017 TDSB SEAC Meeting

Date: April 25, 2017

By: David Lepofsky, CM., O.Ont,

Chair, Toronto District School Board Special Education Advisory Committee

# 1. Introduction

We have a great deal to address at our May 1, 2017 meeting. Whatever we cannot get through at this meeting will spill over to our June 5, 2017 meeting. I aim for this Chair's Report to support both upcoming SEAC meetings.

# 2. Voting on the Wording of Recommendation 3(a) of Motion #5

At our April 3, 2017 meeting, SEAC achieved an historic milestone by passing almost the entirety of our Motion #5, dealing with the issue of Inclusion for students with special education needs. One small but important item of unfinished business remains regarding that motion.

At our April 3, 2017 SEAC meeting, we deferred a vote on the wording of Recommendation 3(a). That part of the motion addressed the actual test that TDSB should use when deciding on the placement of individual students with disabilities, on a case by case basis, in a regular class or in a special education class. At our April 3, 2017 SEAC meeting, Paula Boutis proposed an alternate wording for Recommendation 3(a). Because we did not have her actual proposed new wording before us for everyone to read, I deferred this issue for a vote at our May 1, 2017 meeting.

In the meantime, at our April 3, 2017 meeting, SEAC passed the rest of Recommendation 3, with some wording refinements raised at the meeting. At the end of this report, I set out the rest of Recommendation 3, as SEAC passed it.

I am pleased to report that since our last meeting, Paula Boutis and I have had a helpful discussion about the wording of Recommendation 3(a). Paula has refined the wording of her proposal. I entirely support the wording she puts forward for SEAC to vote on at our May 1, 2017 meeting. It is as follows:

*"3(a) Placement of a student with a disability in a special education class should be a last resort. Consistent with the Education Act, prior to placing a student in a special education classroom, TDSB, except where there is voluntary informed parental consent, should seek to ensure that a child, as a first option, is placed in a regular classroom with appropriate special education services and supports being implemented."*

The wording for Recommendation 3(a) that I had earlier proposed in the 4th draft of Motion #5, which was before SEAC at our April 3, 2017 meeting, was as follows:

*"a) Consistent with voluntary parental choice, students with disabilities should be educated in the least restrictive environment with needed educational accommodations promptly put in place. Segregation of a student with a disability should be the last resort. It should only occur with parental consent, and after all less restrictive alternatives have been considered and rejected."*

At our May 1, 2017 meeting, I will first invite a vote on Paula's wording of Recommendation 3(a). If any SEAC members request it, I am also happy to offer for SEAC members to have the option of voting on the older wording of Recommendation 3(a), that I had earlier included in the fourth draft of Motion #5. Let's call that David's older wording. I emphasize that I myself am supporting Paula's wording. If any SEAC members want the option of voting on my older wording of Recommendation 3(a), our SEAC minutes can reflect how many, if any, prefer my older wording, and how many prefer Paula's wording.

This will not re-open any of the rest of Motion #5. That has all already been voted on. To help us address this in an efficient way at our May 1, 2017 meeting, I encourage SEAC members to use our email exchanges to express their preferences on Recommendation 3(a) over the days leading up to our May 1, 2017 meeting. Do you like Paula's version, set out above? Do you prefer David's older version? I repeat that I myself now favour Paula's older version.

# 3. Results to Date of the SEAC Online Survey of Parents of TDSB Students with Special Education Needs

SEAC's online survey of parents of TDSB students with special education needs has been running for several months. We are very fortunate that two Osgoode Hall Law School law students volunteered to do a placement with me, to fulfil their Osgoode Public Interest Requirement. They have reviewed the 800 or so survey responses that we had received as of a few weeks ago. Their report, summarizing these responses, will be circulated to you in advance of our May 1, 2017 meeting and posted on the SEAC website.

We are also fortunate that these two students, Adam Giancola and Nadir Khan, bill be coming to give a brief summary at our May 1, 2017 meeting. SEAC members will have the opportunity to meet them and ask them questions about their review. We are all indebted to them for volunteering their time for this project.

At our meeting, you can also offer TDSB staff recommendations on how TDSB could better publicize this survey. Our survey is still running online. I believe that TDSB could do much more to let parents know about it. I myself have tweeted about it many times, but I believe that too few parents know about this survey.

# 4. Motion #6 Exclusion of Students from TDSB Schools

We have before us our draft Motion # 6 to address this topic. I have asked TDSB to provide us with a written response on this topic in advance of our May 1, 2017 meeting. TDSB staff will have the opportunity to summarize that written response at our meeting and on which SEAC members can have a discussion.

This topic was first discussed at our February 6, 2017 meeting, during a presentation by Robert Lattanzio, executive director of the ARCH Disability Law Centre. As reported in my Chair's report to you for our March 20, 2017 meeting, I have asked for a written staff response to address these questions:

"a) Any information it has on how often exclusions occur;

b) any written policies, procedures or directions to principals, teacher or other TDSB staff on when a student may be excluded from school, and on what terms, apart from the process for suspension or expulsion, and

c) The written policies or directions on procedures that TDSB expects its principals or teachers to follow when excluding a student from school."

I have just asked Uton Robinson to include in his staff response on this topic the text of the Ontario regulation that deals with this issue.

# 5. Staff Update on Its Actions on SEAC's Motions #1, 2, 3 and 4, Passed at Our June 13, 2016 Meeting

Just before our April 3, 2017 meeting, SEAC member Richard Carter asked for a staff update on what TDSB has done so far on the four reform motions we passed back on June 1, 13, 2017. I have asked staff to provide us this update in writing in advance of our May 1, 2017 meeting. If that is not possible, then I have asked for us to receive it before our June 5, 2017 meeting. I understand that we should expect this for our June meeting.

When I first presented these four Motions to the TDSB Trustees' Program and School Services Committee last fall, I understand that the trustees asked for a staff report on them. I understand that no formal staff report has been given to PSSC.

# 7. TDSB's Equity Task Force, and Its Review of Its Equity Policy

TDSB is now conducting two simultaneous reviews of its equity policy and practices. I myself don’t understand what the difference is between the two reviews, if any, or why TDSB has two such reviews going on at the same time.

We have SEAC representation, including, among others, myself, serving on the Equity Task Force. I have given Liz Rykert, the Task Force's lead, a full briefing on our five reform motions. She has invited me to brief the Task Force's Learning Centre 2 members on our 5 reform motions at its April 25, 2017 meeting. This is an important way for us to get buy-in to the major reforms that SEAC has presented to TDSB.

# 8. SEPRC Special Education Review Committees at TDSB

At several SEAC meetings, SEAC members have questioned the propriety and the legal basis (if any) for TDSB using its SEPRC (Special Education Review Committee) process for deciding on placements, services and supports for students with special education needs who are first starting at TDSB. I have therefore asked TDSB staff to provide us with a written response/update on the basis for this SEPRC practice, rather than using the process of Identification and Placement Review Committee IPRC that is required under Ontario special education law.

I understand that staff will need some time to prepare a pre-meeting written update on this. I will therefore defer this to our June SEAC meeting. If time permits, I will allot time at our May meeting for SEAC members to share comments and questions on this topic, for staff to take back and endeavor to address before our June meeting.

For this, and for the earlier topic of Exclusions at TDSB, we have asked TDSB staff to report to us on its policies in these areas, and its legal basis for these policies. In so far as the legal basis is concerned, it would be appropriate and helpful for us to hear directly from TDSB's lawyers on this.

The specific questions I have asked Uton Robinson to have staff address are these:

a. What is the policy on whether there should be an IPRC in the first year, on arrival at TDSB

b. Why does TDSB conduct SEPRCs and what does TDSB say is the legal basis for it (We'd like to hear directly from TDSB legal counsel on that.)

c. What is the TDSB written policy or practice on how and when the SEPRC is conducted. This should include any TDSB policy on what families are told in advance about the SEPRC process, and what they can do if they are not happy with the process or the results.

After we hear from staff and hold a discussion on this, it may be a topic on which we wish to formulate a recommendation to TDSB. I encourage you to keep that in mind as we hear back from TDSB staff.

# 9. Further SEAC Input into the Upcoming TDSB Special Education Plan

At our April meeting, SEAC members offered a range of thoughtful comments to TDSB staff as part of our input into the upcoming year's TDSB Special Education Plan. Please be ready to take the opportunity at our May meeting to provide any further ideas you wish to share. Of course, you are also welcome to provide your feedback to TDSB in advance of our May meeting via email to TDSB. Feel free to copy your feedback to SEAC members. I will ask that any feedback offered via email also be listed in the minutes of our May SEAC meeting.

TDSB staff should also take any discussion we have on the SEPRC issue or on any other topic at our May meeting as part of SEAC's input into the Special Education Plan.

# 10. Ontario Government's Special Needs Strategy

I have asked Special Education Executive Superintendent Uton Robinson to arrange a conference call for any interested SEAC members, with Ms. Rae Roebuck, who is a private consultant who is working with several Toronto agencies on this issue. I aim for this call to take place sometime after May 23, 2017.

As a short explanation, the Ontario Government has an initiative underway, called the Special Needs Strategy. In it, it appears that the Ontario Government is trying to make it easier for families and students with special education needs to get easier access to a range of services that they need.

Ms. Roebuck has approached TDSB to ask it to sign an agreement regarding the provision of these services. SEAC's input was sought on this contract proposal. I remain unclear on what exactly SEAC is being asked to advise on. I am trying to get this clarified.

You will recall that at my request, Ms. Roebuck sent a short report to us, which I had earlier circulated to SEAC members via email for feedback. It was not clear from that report what we were being asked to comment on, or what was in the contract that TDSB was being asked to sign, or what this contract would actually mean for students with special education needs at TDSB.

We have received feedback from some SEAC members that they would like to get more information on this. I have let Ms. Roebuck and Uton Robinson know that we cannot give input into whether TDSB should sign a contract until we know what is in the contract, and how it would change things for students with special education needs. We also need to know if we are simply being asked to say yes or no, take it or leave it, to the contract, or whether we are also being asked to identify anything that is not in that contract, but which TDSB should insist on being added, if TDSB is to sign.

I don't want to take up SEAC meeting time having a wide-ranging discussion on what TDSB should ask to have added to a contract, if SEAC is being given a simple "take it or leave it" choice.

For its part, I believe TDSB has the same questions about these issues. I don't fault TDSB staff for the unclear nature of this situation.

I have therefore asked Uton Robinson to help us with two important steps.

First, we would benefit from receiving a fuller explanation from Ms. Roebuck on key questions like:

a) What exactly is in the contract that TDSB is being asked to sign? Can we see it (in an accessible format, of course)?

b) What would this contract provide for students with special education needs and their families that is now not available to them? How would it change things? How, if at all, would it improve things? What might be made worse for them under this contract?

c) What other options are open to TDSB for meeting these needs, if it does not sign this contract?

d) What exactly is SEAC being asked to advise on? Is it simply a "yes or no" question, i.e. should TDSB sign the contract? Instead, are we being asked to give input on what else should be added to the contract, as a precondition of TDSB signing it?

I have emphasized that SEAC cannot reasonably be expected to comment on a contract without seeing the contract, and knowing all this other information.

Second, as noted above, I have asked Uton Robinson to arrange a conference call with Ms. Roebuck and any interested SEAC members, at a time that is convenient for SEAC members, after we have gotten a written report from Ms. Roebuck on the foregoing, during which we can ask her questions. Given the confusion that has been presented to us, which is not the fault of TDSB; I did not want to take up scarce SEAC meeting time trying to get this all clarified.

After this has been completed, we can discuss at SEAC what advice, if any, we wish to give TDSB.

# 11. TDSB Staffing to Meet the Needs of Students with Special Education Needs

Once we have our Motions #5 and #6 wrapped up, we can turn our attention to an issue that many SEAC members have raised, and that has come up in various ways at our meetings. I aim for our exploration of this to commence, if possible, at our June 5, 2017 meeting. I want to give you and TDSB staff the heads up on this now. If time permits, we may canvass SEAC members at our May 1, 2017 meeting for questions you'd like the staff update to include, for the June meeting.

I aim for us to explore the way TDSB deploys its staff to meet the educational needs of students with special education needs, whether in special education classes or in general education classes. In order for us to be able to give meaningful input into the TDSB budget for students with special education needs, we need to first understand the numbers of staff and the way they are deployed. Who decides where special education teachers are deployed? Who decides and how do they decide where Special Needs Assistants SNAs are deployed? Who decides, and how do they decide, what staff supports students with special education needs get in a special education class, as opposed to a general education class?

It would also be helpful to know things like:

1. How many special needs assistants (SNA's) are there at TDSB? How are they distributed among schools and classes? Who decides whether a particular student gets the help of an SNA and for how many hours per day?

2. How have the levels and deployment of special education staff resources changed since the move to the Learning Centres structure at TDSB? Has the case load of each special education consultant increased, decreased or stayed the same?

This will, for example, help us consider whether more staff is needed. It will also help us explore whether there are better ways to deploy this staff, as TDSB moves towards greater inclusion in the regular class setting.

We have all heard reports of parents being told that a child with special education needs will get more support in a special education class than in a general education class. This will give us chance to look into whether this is true at TDSB, and what can be done about this issue.

I invite SEAC members to email Uton Robinson with any questions on this topic that you may have. I am asking TDSB staff, through Uton, to provide us with a written and oral briefing on the levels and deployment of TDSB special education staffing resources, both in the special education class setting and in the regular class setting.

I anticipate that we should be able to receive the written update before our June 5, 2017 meeting. This discussion may spread over several meetings.

In my view, we cannot meaningfully comment on TDSB special education budget until we have a much better understanding on where that budget now goes, and who decides on how it is shared among all students with special education needs.

# 12. HSP Home School Program

At our April 3, 2017 SEAC meeting, Uton Robinson gave us a report on the Home School Program. Time was not available for a discussion. I will put this on our agenda, to be addressed either at our May or June meeting, depending on available time.

# 13. The SEAC Website Now Has a Page Listing All our Recent Recommendations

Please share with your networks the new part of the SEAC web site. It lists all our recommendations to TDSB. You can find it at

<http://www.tdsb.on.ca/Community/HowtoGetInvolved/CommunityAdvisoryCommittees/SpecialEducationAdvisoryCommittee/Recommendations.aspx>

# 14. Building a Relationship with the Special Education Advisory Committee of the Toronto Catholic District School Board

I had the good fortune of speaking to Ms. Marilyn Taylor, the chair of the SEAC for the Toronto Catholic District School Board, as well as to the Director of Education for that Board. I aim to build a relationship with them, so we can learn from their experience and share ours with them.

For example, I learned that their SEAC receives written and oral briefings on their annual budget some time before the budget is voted on. They get the written information well before the SEAC meeting where they are to discuss it. Their SEAC then formulates feedback and advice to their board. That information goes to the board before it makes final decisions on their budget.

This sounds far superior to TDSB simply telling us about the budget after the fact, as has been its practice for some time. I have asked Executive Superintendent Uton Robinson to reach out to the TCDSB to get more information on their special education budget consultation process, and to let us know about it.

# 15. Correspondence I Have Received as SEAC Chair

I set out below two items of correspondence addressed to me, or copied to me, as TDSB SEAC chair. First, I attach a letter, addressed to me, addressed to the Ontario Education Minister, from the Association of Bright Children (ABC). From its contents it seems in substance to be addressed to TDSB and not to me. I have emailed ABC to suggest that they address their questions directly to TDSB staff or trustees.

The second is from the Toronto Family Network, on the subject of our Motion #5. It was received just before our April 3, 2017 meeting. At our April 3, 2017 meeting, I stated that I would include it in my next chair's report, as having been received. Some had voiced concerns about it being included in minutes of the SEAC meeting. It had previously been circulated to all SEAC members via email.

## April 3 Letter to the SEAC Chair from the Association of Bright Children

April 3, 2017

Mr. David Lepofsky

Chair

Special Education Advisory Committee

Toronto District School Board

5050 Yonge Street

Toronto, Ontario, M2N 5N8

Dear Mr. Lepofsky:

The Association for Bright Children – Toronto Chapter (ABC Toronto), wishes to obtain information on a matter of great concern to our members.

ABC Toronto wishes to request two items of information on report number 56:

1. Agenda Item 16.2 (4) Agenda, Page 16 of the Program and School Services Committee regarding a response to a delegation regarding congregated High School Gifted program (2992).

2) Agenda Item 16.7 (9), Agenda Page 18. "The Board decided: Whereas, the boundaries for secondary gifted programming changed in 2016 with the re-opening of new programs: Therefore be it resolved that the Director present a report providing an update on the results of the change to secondary gifted enrollment."

As the official representatives of gifted students on SEAC, ABC Toronto wishes to be made aware of issues concerning the students we represent. We kindly request that if issues concerning gifted students or Gifted ISPs are brought to the board that we be consulted. We have many educated parents in our Association who are happy to provide important research and experience from our Association​.

To that end, we herewith wish to inform you of a motion sent to us from Northern Secondary School (NSS) Council, regarding maintaining the size of their Gifted ISP. There is great concern amongst parents of this program that the current and incoming cohort size remains where it is. The program used to have about 750 gifted students in a school of about 1900 students. The program has almost been cut in half in the last 3 years.

Should there be any significant plans or changes to this Gifted ISP, again, we believe consultation with NSS Council and our organization is necessary. We hope that the Board in its efforts to support inclusion doesn't "throw the baby out with the bathwater". The NSS Gifted ISP has a 30​ plus year history of meeting the needs of gifted students, with research-based strategies for meeting the needs of gifted students, a depth and breadth of shared teacher knowledge, a well-integrated student body within the school, and course selection sufficient to truly meet the diverse needs of the student population.

​In your 2016 – 17 Special Education Plan, you state that the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) "will continue to focus on providing exemplary special education programs…and that any changes to the special education delivery model will be implemented thoughtfully, based on extensive research, an understanding of best practices and with a consistent focus on student achievement in well-being". The NSS Gifted ISP is one such exemplary program and we wish to advocate for its continued strengthening at this time.

More broadly, if there are any changes in policy or procedure for placement of students into any Gifted ISPs, or any other foreseeable variations to the programs as they stand now, we ask that we be consulted on these matters so that we may help advocate for the students we represent.

Per Uton Robinson's request at SEAC at the last meeting, we are in the process of preparing our input into next year's Special Education Plan. We are grateful for the opportunity to provide this input and working with you collaboratively to ensure the needs of all special needs children are being met.

Finally, if there are significant changes being made to Gifted ISPs, our Association would like to know what plans TDSB has to meet the needs of gifted students in the regular classrooms - how will you be differentiating to meet the needs of these students?

Sincerely,

Rosanna Del Grosso

Toronto Chapter President

C: John Malloy, Director of Education

Uton Robinson, Executive Superintendent, Special Education and Section Programs

 Principal Felsen, Principal, Northern Secondary School

 Kathleen Keane, ABC Provincial President

 Diana Avon, TDSB ABC SEAC Representative

 Pamela Gough, Trustee

 Alexander Brown, Trustee

 Melissa Rosen, Vice President, ABC Toronto

# April 25, 2017 Email from David Lepofsky, SEAC Chair, to the Association of Bright Children

Thank you for your April 3, 2017 email to me as SEAC chair for TDSB. I encourage you to direct both the questions and the feedback in that letter directly to TDSB special education staff and to the TDSB trustees. They are the right people both to answer your questions, and to act on your feedback. I am sharing your letter with the SEAC membership.

Best,

David Lepofsky CM., O.Ont,

Chair Toronto District School Board Special Education Advisory Committee

# April 2, 2017 Email to TDSB SEAC from the Toronto Family Network

**From:** Toronto Family Network [mailto:torontofamilynetwork@gmail.com]
**Sent:** Sunday, April 02, 2017 6:43 PM
**To:** M. David Lepofsky; Brown, Alexander; Ratsep, Margo
**Subject:** Toronto Family Network Correspondence to SEAC for Meeting of Monday, April 3, 2017

Dear SEAC Members,

Our families have contacted us regarding what was stated at the last SEAC meeting of March 20th and what is noted in the draft minutes of this meeting.

We would very much appreciate it if SEAC could take these comments from the families into consideration in relation to Motion #5. These comments are intended to clear up some misperceptions and confusion that appear to exist.

Terminology

The first matter is that there appears to be confusion regarding the use of the terms program and class. "Program" is carefully defined by the Ministry of Education as "an educational program that is based on and modified by the results of continuous assessment and evaluation and that includes a plan containing specific objectives an an outline of educational services that meets the needs of the exceptional pupil". According to the Ministry of Education document "Highlights of Regulation 181/98", the Individual Education Plan is "an outline of the special education programs and services that would be received".

By comparison, the placement is the class. To be more specific, the placement is the four walls of the classroom. Placement can only be one of two as per Regulation 181/98:  "special education class" or "regular class with appropriate special education services". To refer to the special education classes as "programs" is to cause confusion.

Regarding Input 5 (RC)

The families thought one could refer to this motion as "The Effective and Authentic Inclusion of Students...".

Regarding Input 6 (JPN)

The Ontario Human Rights Code supersedes and trumps the Ontario Education Act. The Education Act is legally required to meet the requirements of the Human Rights Code. This is what placed the Ministry of Education in the position that it had to develop in "Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation" (2014). As a matter of fact, based on case law, if services are to be reduced or withdrawn, parents must be informed of that intention, be provided reasons why this has been determined, must provide parents with an opportunity to respond regarding this decision, and only then may the decision to reduce or withdraw services be made.

Regarding Input 1.2 (DA)

Inclusion does not "take different forms for different groups".  By definition, one is either included or not. The **attached** photo taken of the display by Integration Action for Inclusion at the TCDSB Special Education Conference on Saturday, April 1st, 2017 very aptly illustrates what authentic inclusion looks like.

Regarding Input 1.3 (RC)

There may be no definition of inclusion in the Education Act however that is irrelevant as the Education Act must meet the legal requirements of the OHR Code and the OHRC document "Policy and Guidelines on Accessible Education" as well as The Charter and the UN Convention.

Regarding Recommendation 3

If one has "Comprehensive Inclusion" one cannot have "Segregation". Parents want to have authentic choice regarding placement and do not want to hear their children will be denied services unless they take a special education class. For the TDSB to even call these special education classes "Intensive Support classes" is to provide the perception and attitude that accommodations will not be provided in a "regular class" and yet Reg. 181 makes it clear that the "Placement" is "regular class with appropriate special education services".  The TDSB Financial Facts Revenue and Expenditure Trends produced by the Business Services department provide the important data which would indicate the TDSB's (lack of) progress in achieving a move to inclusion.

Regarding Input 3.1 (AC)

Not all parents "don't feel that the students are being segregated".  Some parents feel they have been left no choice. What data is there to support "there are programs in contained schools that are running very well and as inclusive as can be"?  The families could not understand how you can have a segregated school and be inclusive. If students feel "excluded" in "regular" class placements then there is something wrong with the way the environment and relationships within the environment are being managed.

Regarding Input 3.4 (CG)

Families are concerned that anyone would believe that there are "always situations where the board says it cannot effectively accommodate". Why would that be automatically accepted? What evidence is there to support this?

Regarding Input 3.5 (RC)

Families would like to know how it will be determined that one cannot "effectively accommodate". What criteria will have to be used?  This also involves the Ontario Human Rights Code and the necessity to provide accommodations "to the point of undue hardship".

Regarding Input 3.6 (DM)

The TDSB says that decisions must be data driven and evidence based. For sound and informed decisions regarding any and all matters, one must be able to "justify" how and why this position/decision was made. Actually, according to education case law, decisions regarding lack of provision of accommodations must be "justified" with evidence and even reduction of support services accommodations require evidence to justify why the decision would have been made. At tribunal hearings, data must be provided to "justify" claims. Families are concerned that removal of the last statement in 3(a) would allow for reduction, withdrawal or denial of accommodations supports. Families are concerned that if decisions can be made without data or evidence, how can one be assured that sound, informed and effective decisions are being made in the best interests of the student?

Regarding Input 3.7 (DF)

It is incorrect to state that "undue hardship is not measurable".  As a matter of fact, undue hardship is measurable based on the OHRC documents. There are specific criteria that must be met for an institution to demonstrate "undue hardship". With respect to "push-back from teaching staff who did not train for this" and Input 4.4 (RC) teachers "didn't sign up for this" families were very surprised that this was stated because people apply to the Faculties of Education to become teachers. There are no qualifiers here. All graduate teachers are expected to teach all students. Faculties of Education that do a good job in teaching "best practices" enable teachers to teach all students.

Regarding Input 4.1 (DA) and 4.2 (NG)

Measuring the effectiveness of the program/IEP is through the assessment of a baseline and later an assessment of progress made. Research indicates that special education classes are not more effective than a regular class placement with appropriate special education services.  The "measures" are available.

Regarding Input 9.3 (DF)

UDL is not about "special education".  It is about all education and best practices.

Regarding Input 11.2 (DF)

This determination should be part of the School Climate Survey that is required by the Ministry of Education to be conducted at least once every two years.

Recommendation 19

Finding out what has worked on inclusion elsewhere has already begun. The video by Cyndi Pitonyak "How to Move a County to Inclusion" has been circulated widely and received positive support. Inviting her to the TDSB to speak with SEAC and trustees would be advisable. Other experts with hands-on practical experience in the field, such as Dr. Gordon Porter, Michael Bach, Sheila Bennett, Gary Bunch, Kathie Snow and Cheryl Jorgensen, have been recommended by the Toronto Family Network as those to approach to learn how inclusion has worked elsewhere. The Toronto Family Network has produced an extensive list of suggested resources relating to inclusion which has been made available.

We would appreciate confirmation of receipt of this correspondence and confirmation that any discussion regarding its contents will be included in the minutes of the meeting. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Toronto Family Network

Janis Jaffe-White, Coordinator

Reva Schafer, Resource Parent