

LAMBTON-KENT DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD

SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

~ Thursday, April 20, 2017 @ 7:00 p.m. at Wallaceburg District Secondary School ~

Present:	Rose Gallaway - St. Clair Child and Youth Services (Chair)	
	Dawn Babkirk – Learning Disabilities Association of Chatham-Kent	
	Jennifer Gillespie – Member “at large”	
	Elizabeth Hudie – Trustee (Acting Vice-Chair)	
	Chris King – Community Living, Sarnia-Lambton	
	Jerry Knight – Lambton County Developmental Services	
	Eva Lizotte – Community Living, Wallaceburg	
	Jean McIntyre – Member “at large”	
	Janet Vanderwerf – VIEWS for Children Who Are Blind or Have Low Vision	
Regrets:	Jack Fletcher – Trustee	
	Gordon Crompton – Community Living, Chatham-Kent	
	Tabitha Vercillo, Epilepsy Support Centre	
	Jen Scheuneman – Autism Ontario, Chatham-Kent and Sarnia Lambton Chapters	
	Susan Mitchell – Member “at large”	
	Anika Altiman – First Nation Representative	
Resource Staff:	Angie Barrese, Superintendent of Education	
	Sandra Perkins, System Coordinator of Special Education	
	Elsa Natvik, Lambton-Kent Secondary Administrators’ Association	
	Bruce Davidson, Special Education Coordinator (Secondary)	
	Lisa Valade, Special Education Coordinator	
	Lori Gall, Recording Secretary	
Guests:	Carolyn Bus and Sheila Ward – Elementary Enrichment, & Eva Thompson – Secondary Enrichment	
Agenda Item	Details/Discussion	Action Items
Call to Order and Approval of Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rose called the meeting to order Janet moved, Eva seconded “<i>That the Agenda be approved.</i>”; All in favour 	
Approval of Minutes of March 23, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elizabeth moved, Eva seconded “<i>That the Minutes of March 23, 2017 be approved.</i>”; All in favour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lori
Business Arising from Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no business arising from the Minutes 	
Presentation – Enrichment/Gifted Program Supports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lisa Valade introduced Carolyn Bus and Sheila Ward the elementary enrichment Resource Teachers, & Eva Thompson the secondary enrichment Resource Teacher The Enrichment Team informed the members of SEAC that the presentation would be interactive in order to provide first-hand knowledge about the sorts of experiences they provide the students they support; the exercise involved solving riddles/puzzles/clues to get inside of a ‘breakout box’; the boxes are an offshoot of breakout rooms that are popular right now At the conclusion of the exercise the team members said that breakout boxes are adaptable to any subject The boxes are focused on an inquiry-based learning style and help to strengthen the student’s communication skills by challenging them to work collaboratively The breakout boxes allow staff to deliver content in a way that’s engaging Some points about the Gifted and Enrichment Programming that were embedded within the exercise include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding unique gifts by inclusion in the Board’s enrichment program helps guide our students as they develop into contributing members of society Students with exceptional general intellectual abilities have the capacity to think abstractly, acquire information quickly and to easily recall what they have learned 	
Presentation – Enrichment/Gifted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While gifted students have exceptional intellectual ability, they typically demonstrate asynchronous development that results in a mismatch 	

Agenda Item	Details/Discussion	Action Items
Program Supports (continued)	<p>between their cognitive, emotional and physical development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early intervention and selection for programming is important so that young gifted and enrichment students continue to be engaged and successful learners as they progress through their schooling ○ A Board-wide Otis Lennon School Ability Test (OLSAT) is administered to all Grade 4 students within the Board (unless their parents object) ○ Enrichment conducts testing throughout the year for other students if the school calls and asks them to do so ○ During the 2016-2017 school year enrichment testing was conducted for 794 students (at 32 schools) in the North and 566 students (at 20 schools) in the South ○ Students to receive enrichment programming can be put into one of three tiers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tier 1 – Classroom Enrichment ▪ Tier 2 – Enrichment Opportunities plus Classroom Enrichment ▪ Tier 3 – CORE Gifted Programming, IPRC Intellectual: Giftedness plus Enrichment Opportunities, plus Classroom Enrichment ● There are currently 175 elementary enrichment students and 430 secondary enrichment students within the Board ● The members of SEAC thanked the team for their presentation noting that it was fun to learn the information they were delivering in this manner 	
Special Education Plan Items for Review in April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bruce provided an overview of the Sections and Appendices of the Special Education Plan to be discussed/reviewed ● He noted that there were no changes made to the following portions of the Special Education Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ List of Appendices; Glossary of Terms; Acronyms ➤ Section 1.0 – The Board’s Consultation Process ➤ Section 2.4.2 – Placements, Programs and Services ● The following portions of the Special Education Plan were amended and the revisions were presented to the members of the Special Education Advisory Committee for their review and comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 2.4 – Identification, Placement, and Review Committee Process; the details on the number of IPRCs, based on October 31, 2016, were updated ▪ Appendix 2.4.3 – SEAC Insert; the list was updated to reflect current membership ▪ Appendix 2.12.1 – Planning for Staff Development; the chart was updated for 2016-2017 ▪ Appendix 2.12.2 – After-School and Other Workshops with a Special Education Focus; the list was updated to include 2016-2017 information ▪ Appendix 2.12.3 – Educational Assistants and Tutor Escort P.D. Day Workshops; the list was updated to include 2016-2017 information ▪ Section 2.14 – Accessibility of School Buildings, and Appendix 2.14.1 – Annual Accessibility Plan; the SEAC members were told that the Accessibility Plan will be replaced with the Board-approved version once it is available ▪ Section 3.0 – the Board’s Special Education Advisory Committee, and Appendix 3.1.1; the list was updated to reflect current membership ▪ Appendix 3.1.12 – SEAC Meeting Information Flyer; the list was updated 	

Agenda Item	Details/Discussion	Action Items
Special Education Plan Items for Review in April (continued)	<p>to reflect current membership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 4.0 – Transition Planning and Coordination of Services with Other Ministries or Agencies – the SSP ASD Section was removed, and other amendments to wording were made; a ‘Connections for Students’ section was added; and, the list of organizations was updated ▪ Appendix 4.6 – Memorandum of Understanding between School Support Program-Autism Spectrum Disorder; Appendix 4.6 is no longer utilized so it will be removed from the Special Education Plan. <i>(Appendix 4.7 will be renumbered to become Appendix 4.6)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dawn asked about the difference in the number of IPRC referrals, and asked if there are students on IEPs that aren’t being identified?; Bruce said 60% of elementary students have IEPs without an identification and, in secondary, 40% of secondary students have IEPs without an identification; he explained that there are a number of reasons for this, such as: in the Steps to Success process, students must have an IEP before they’re identified; it’s more prevalent in elementary because they’re catching them earlier (Grade 3/4), but by Secondary this slows down • Sandra said if a student requires SEA equipment or an FM Sound System then an IEP would need to be put into place, so that’s an example of a situation where the need for equipment drives the process for the creation of an IEP • Rose added that sometimes parents don’t want their child identified in elementary school because they think there’s a stigma attached to having an identification but often the parents realize their child could benefit from being identified as they progress to post-secondary education • Liz commented that, during Kindergarten intake, it could be life circumstances that necessitate an IEP being put into place to get the student additional supports • Dawn asked if a student can go to an IPRC without having a Psychoeducational Assessment done?; Angie said that the parents could request it and an IPRC could be held but, until the Assessment has been done, an identification can’t be made • Dawn asked why (if many of the supports are being put into the student’s IEP) would the parents <i>want</i> to get an IPRC?; it was noted that the documentation establishes the need for special supports and becomes important when students are going to leave secondary school • Bruce noted that many post-secondary institutions won’t accept identifications that were completed before the student was 18 years of age • Sometimes IPRCs are completed in Grade 8 when staff notice that students are stressed and they feel that they would benefit from more support in secondary school • Angie explained that when post-secondary institutions put stipulations on when the IPRCs should be done it is problematic because the Board is completing them to help the student when they’re in out schools in order to allow staff to develop the best plan for the student • Chris commented that post-secondary institutions differ, and not all are driving the timing of the IPRC process • Sandra said LKDSB staff are stepping up to the plate to honour student needs • Eva asked for the difference between an assessment and a diagnosis? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When an assessment is done it is completed so in keeping with Ministry criteria and a marked difference between a student’s performance and their <i>potential</i> performance (more than 20 points difference determines that the student has a learning disability) 	

Agenda Item	Details/Discussion	Action Items
Special Education Plan Items for Review in April (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders , Fifth Edition (DSM 5) contains all diagnoses for various disabilities, language disabilities, etc. – when a student meets those criteria, they get a ‘medical’ diagnosis; this diagnosis is what post-secondary institutions want, not an assessment • In our Board, while a Psychoeducational Assistant can conduct all the testing, only Christine Davenport (the Manager of Psychological Services) can actually <i>diagnose</i> a student with an exceptionality 	
Correspondence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no correspondence submitted to SEAC. 	
<p>Association Reports, Other Business and Sharing of Best Practices</p> <p>Association Reports, Other Business and Sharing of Best Practices (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elizabeth said the Board is still working on the Accommodation Review for the south schools; they still have not gotten any feedback from the Ministry on the decision for the ARC in the north • Elizabeth said that the GSN numbers have been received which means that the budget will be shared with the members of SEAC soon • Lisa said there were approximately 70 Pre-School Intake Meetings held • Eva said that their management team is working to get Community Living Wallaceburg designated as a ‘LEAN’ organization • Eva reported that they got funding from Community Living Ontario to initiate a family engagement process that will allow parents to share best practices and troubleshoot; they are planning an event for December 10, 2017 • Community Living Wallaceburg held its boxed lunch fundraiser and sold 1,900 lunches; in some cases they were able to utilize their clients in helping to prepare the lunches • Community Living Wallaceburg offered a Day Camp during the March Break; there were 7 students registered which they are considering as a success since it was the very first time they’d offered a March Break Day Camp • Chris said that, for legal reasons, Community Living Sarnia-Lambton’s JobStart Program has been renamed the <i>JobPath Program</i>; all other aspects of the Program will remain the same • Community Living Sarnia-Lambton’s ‘Transition Kits’ were presented through the Ontario Disability Employment Network (ODEN); Chris reported that 28 agencies and 9 boards of education have purchased the kits; he also noted that staff will make a presentation in Chicago this summer, in a Pilot Project that’s offered through <i>Walgreens</i> • Chris noted that the <i>Mayor’s Luncheon</i> is May 19th at the Legion; an invitation will be shared with the membership; anyone interested should be sure to RSVP in order to attend • Dawn said that LDAO has a couple of new websites, including <i>LD at School</i> that provides resources for teachers; she will share the information with the membership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chris • Dawn
Future Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rose reminded the members that, if there is anything they would like to have placed on a future Agenda, they just need to let Lori know 	
Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 18, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. at Wallaceburg District Secondary School, Room 141 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All
Adjournment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m. 	