



---

# **FUNDING MODEL IMPLEMENTATION** **Inclusive Education**

**WORKING GROUP REPORT**

---

OCTOBER 4, 2019

## Overview

In early 2018, an Independent Panel (the “Panel”) performed a review of BC’s K-12 Public Education Funding Model with an emphasis on creating a system that is responsive, equitable, stable and predictable, flexible, transparent and accountable. The K-12 public education funding formula and allocation has not changed since 2002 and many stakeholders expressed the view that the system is not funded adequately.

While the current system meets the needs of the vast majority of students, the Panel found that there are a number of student populations, such as children and youth in care, Indigenous learners and students with unique learning needs whose educational needs could be better served. Service to these groups of students was found to be inconsistent and inequitable across the province and the Panel heard that the inability for school districts and communities to provide services was often linked to the funding model. Teachers and support staff expressed concerns about the level of resources and supports available and indicated that it is difficult to advocate for more help in classrooms. Parents/stakeholders identified that they were unsure of what to do or where to go if there were concerns about services.

The intent of the Panel’s recommendations was to provide a framework to strengthen equity of educational opportunity for a broader range of students by reducing service disparities across the province. The Panel wanted to maintain a student-focused approach that allows boards to focus on the timely provision of supports and services to students. The Panel’s goal was to ensure greater transparency on how funding is used and to improve the financial management and efficient utilization of funding. In addition, the Panel wanted to ensure funding was easier to access and that funding and funding rules are not a barrier, either real or perceived, to service provision.

After the report’s release in December 2018, four working groups were established with key education partners and stakeholders to assist the Ministry of Education in establishing implementation options. The Inclusive Education Working Group (the “Working Group”) was established to assist the Ministry of Education with determining the best approach for implementing Recommendation 6:

### Recommendation 6:

*The Ministry should create a single Inclusive Education Supplement that incorporates all of the following:*

- *Supplemental Special Needs Funding;*
- *English/French Language Learning;*
- *Supplement for Vulnerable Students;*
- *CommunityLINK;*
- *Ready Set Learn;*
- *Supplemental Student Location Factor; and*
- *Funding currently in the Basic Allocation that was previously allocated to high incidence categories of special needs*

This single Inclusive Education Supplement should allocate funding through two components:

**Component 1:** Students requiring high-cost supports should be funded and school districts should continue to report and claim these students to the Ministry for funding. Specifically:

- Funding eligibility criteria and the annual funding rate for students requiring high-cost supports should be developed and communicated by the Ministry, focusing on those students that are physically dependent and/or have needs that significantly impact the students' learning; and
- All funding claims in this category should be based on a medical diagnosis and should be subject to compliance audits to verify that eligibility criteria have been met.

**Component 2:** The remaining inclusive education funds should be allocated to school districts through a prevalence-based model, using a comprehensive range of third-party medical and socio-economic population data. Categories of data and weightings should be as follows:

- Health factors (50%)
- Children/youth in care (20%)
- Income and earnings (20%)
- English/French Language development (10%)

While it was not the main recommendation of focus, the Working Group was also asked to ensure Recommendation 1 was considered from a global perspective as it has implications for the entire funding model.

Recommendation 1 stipulates that the Ministry should initially allocate funds to address students requiring additional supports and for unique school district characteristics as these areas represent the primary cost-drivers for school districts. All remaining funds would then be distributed per student.

## Areas out of Scope but Important Considerations for Implementation of Recommendation 6

Over the course of the seven meetings, several important topics emerged that were deemed as out of scope for the Working Group. These should be considered when the funding system is finalized and are as follows:

**Quantum:** This particular topic was raised multiple times and comprised a significant portion of the dialogue. The Working Group was assured that the implementation of Recommendation 6 is not intended to reduce resources currently provided under the inclusive education supplement. The Working Group started from the premise that funding under a new model would support the same or improved services and if not, the Working Group's advice on implications would likely be different. The Working Group expressed significant concerns that funding in the current system is not meeting the needs of students and that any new model must contain sufficient funding as a baseline and the ability to increase over time if/when needs change. Members of the group reflected that many school districts currently spend more than their Special Education allocation provided due to the quantum and that the majority of school district annual budgets are allocated to staffing and benefits, which limits the flexibility to allocate additional funding to supports and services. The Working Group also assumed that if future costs to support student needs increase, the quantum would also increase.

**Other panel recommendations:** Although the Working Group did receive presentations from the leads of the Financial Management Working Group and the Advisory Committee for Enhancing Student Learning for context, some of the information and discussion was limited due to confidentiality concerns. In addition, the Group was asked not to consider or assess any of the recommendations beyond those it was tasked with.

**Collective bargaining:** The Working Group agreed to leave bargaining topics at the bargaining table and did not engage in a conversation or analysis of how a future funding model may impact collective bargaining conversations or future Collective Agreements. The Working Group does acknowledge and recognize that any changes in a funding model will likely impact future Collective Agreement negotiations.

**Other ministries:** There are clear linkages in Inclusive Education to other Ministries and Crown Corporations (e.g., Ministry of Children and Family Development, Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills & Training, Community Living BC) and the Ministry is aware that these Ministries will be impacted and will continue to work with them through the changes, however the Working Group agreed that discussing other Ministry programs and services were out of scope. The Working Group did however highlight that it is crucial in any implementation to ensure that other Ministries currently using Ministry of Education designations or school district completed assessments are aware of any future changes so that students do not lose services or access to programs and that there is a shared understanding of the value of student assessments to support learner success. The Working Group also acknowledged that the Ministry of Education will need to engage with other Ministries to ensure inter-ministerial protocols are updated as necessary.

## Other Considerations

### **Economic modelling**

Similarly to quantum, this particular topic was raised several times over the course of the seven meetings. Due to complexities and timing, the Working Group was not able to see modelling of a potential Inclusive Education supplement. The Working Group felt it would have benefitted from either a hypothetical model of a school district or an example comparing current funding and the proposed new funding. The Working Group understands that this work is still underway and that the Inclusive Education supplement must be modelled and considered within the framework of all the other funding pieces whilst ensuring improved service to diverse learners. However, the Working Group felt this impacted their ability to fully assess implementation implications. The Working Group expects their respective organizations to have an opportunity to be reconvened or to provide further feedback once the modelling is complete.

### **Future policy work**

Although the Working Group was able to consider multiple implications and provide opportunities to address them, there are some outstanding pieces related to policy and program implementation. The organizations represented in the Working Group would like to be involved as the Ministry moves the policy work forward (e.g. to be able to review and have input into the final Complex Needs/High-Cost category). Many in the working Group also asked for an ongoing Committee on Inclusive Education to continue to build on the relationships established and to continue to have input into the Ministry's work in this area.

### **First Nations consultation**

The Ministry of Education recognizes its unique consultation obligations to First Nations as rights holders separate and outside of this process. The Ministry will ensure that bilateral discussions, as committed to under the BC Tripartite Education Agreement (BCTEA), take place as part of commitments to support improved educational outcomes for First Nations students.

## Background

The Working Group met seven times between March and August 2019. The Group was comprised of 20 external members representing key partners in the BC K-12 education system and four Ministry of Education staff from the Inclusive Education Branch (Learning Division) and Funding and Financial Accountability Branch (Resource Management Division). Co-chairs of the Working Group were Cloe Nicholls, Executive Director of Learning Supports from the Ministry of Education and Piet Langstraat, Implementation Coordination Committee. Names and affiliations of Working Group members are appended to this report (Appendix A). This report reflects what was discussed by the Working Group and is a Ministry document that is not endorsed by any of the organizations represented in the Working Group. Over its seven meetings, the Working Group spent considerable time talking about and understanding the current funding model and delineating the difference between a funding model and a spending model. Through further meetings, the Working Group identified and explored many implications and potential opportunities to address them.

## Considerations for Potential Implementation

### 1. Accountability & Transparency

Implications related to accountability and transparency are relevant under a future hybrid model but would also create improvements if addressed under the current model.

**Implication:** Given that Recommendation 6 proposes that funding identified for specific purposes (e.g., Ready Set Learn, English Language Learners (ELL), CommunityLINK) be rolled up into a broader Inclusive Education supplement and for districts to continue to have full discretion of how to spend the funding across their district, the Working Group agrees that accountability is the fundamental underpinning of all the Funding Model work. The Working Group believes that for Recommendation 6 to be successfully implemented, a robust, transparent accountability structure is required. This accountability structure must be focused on more than just financial accountability and must include clear actions the Ministry will take to ensure equitable outcomes for all learners. The Ministry as well as boards of education have a shared responsibility to ensure financial and system accountability; various levels and forms of support are required to ensure accountability. However, many in the Working Group also articulated that accountability is fundamentally important in the current system as well, and that efforts to better demonstrate how boards assess students, allocate funding and provide services and supports would be expected in either model.

**Opportunity:** Ensure that any shifts in Inclusive Education funding are aligned and implemented in concert with the Framework for Enhancing Student Learning and the recommendations from the Financial Management Working Group. It must be clear to the public which factors are considered for funding, what can be considered as appropriate service expectations and how districts will budget to provide those services. The Ministry should ensure boards create a public, transparent process outlining how students will be assessed (e.g., diverse abilities, children/youth in care, ELL); the types of services and supports that are expected to be in place; the process that will be followed to ensure supports are in place; the funds budgeted for those supports and what recourse is available for parents, caregivers and students if the process is not followed, if they require more information or if they disagree with a board decision. There also needs to be a way for school districts to consult with the Ministry to ensure accuracy of the prevalence model data, thereby ensuring checks and balances for the amount of funding provided.

## 2. High Cost Component – Policy & Eligibility

**Implication:** A new complex needs/high-cost category will need to be developed. Confirmation is needed that full funding for the “high cost” category will be regularly monitored and adjusted based on actual costs of services and supports.

Although the Panel’s report refers to a “high-cost” category, the Working Group agreed that a more inclusive and appropriate term would be “complex needs and high-cost supports”. This recognizes the complexity of student needs without suggesting those students are “expensive” or a burden. This report will use the term “complex needs/high-cost supports” for clarity.

**Opportunity:** The Working Group discussed options for a new category and came to the following options:

- A. Create a new category that includes the current criteria for Category A (Deafblind) and B (Physically Dependent) and also expands the physically dependent criteria (currently feeding, dressing, toileting, mobility, personal hygiene) to include additional functional domains (social/emotional regulation and safety, self-determination and independent living, communication/language processing and cognitive). Students would need to have complex needs in multiple functional domains in order to qualify for this category.
- B. Keep Category A and B and add a third category that includes complex social/emotional behavioural needs. This third category would also need to meet the criteria as described in Category A.

Further assessment of options and related discussions for this category is attached in Appendix B. The Working Group did reach consensus that the current Level 1 category is not meeting the needs of all students, particularly those with complex socio-emotional or behavioural challenges and that it should be expanded slightly to ensure additional supports can be provided. This expansion should also be done thoughtfully and with clear criteria to ensure transparency for parents and school districts as well as to ensure that the category can be funded appropriately. The Working Group recognizes there is a possibility that this category could grow in a way that is ultimately unsustainable unless there are clear criteria and a review process in place.

Further work is required to finalize the criteria for this category, create system-wide understanding and look at options to address cost escalation as well as monitor/evaluate designations of students in these categories, with attention to the proportional designation of specific populations of students. Many of the organizations represented in the Working Group would like to take part in that future work.

## 3. Prevalence Component – Data & Modelling

**Implication:** Prior to the prevalence model being implemented, it will be essential to know the degree to which funding levels may change in school districts and share this information publicly as this may have staffing and resourcing implications. As stated above, the Working Group had a strong desire to see this modelling and provide input as a part of the process.

**Opportunity:** Ministry staff will begin work in Summer 2019 to create models and metrics for sample districts comparing the current system to a system based on prevalence. This modelling will provide greater understanding and certainty as well as transparency to school districts and will help to inform the Ministry of short-term transitional funding needs and any required funding policy adjustments. The Working Group emphasized the need for ongoing refinement of the formula to ensure the model continues to meet the needs of the students it is meant to support.

Funding for all seven areas of funding outlined in Recommendation 6 are collapsed into one and there needs to be examples through modelling and discussions with school districts.

**Implication:** The weighting assigned to each sub-component as recommended by the Funding Model Review Panel of the prevalence data calculation in Component 2 requires modelling to be evaluated.

**Opportunity:** The weighting of the prevalence data calculation as recommended by the Funding Model Review Panel; Health Factors (50%), Children/Youth in care (20%), Income and earnings (20%) and English/French Language Development (10%); will need to be reviewed and recalibrated as the process of modeling continues.

**Implication:** Under a potential prevalence model, the current 12 special needs designations will no longer be used to categorize students or to trigger supplemental funding and disaggregated data by designation may no longer be reported. Data on levels of support and outcomes for students with diverse needs and from diverse circumstances must continue to be collected and published to support student success. Individual confidentiality and masked data will need to continue to be respected.

**Opportunity:** The Ministry needs to establish a rigorous data collection method with a quality assurance component to ensure that school districts continue to track and report on students with diverse needs. Data by designation will continue to be available from the Ministry of Health and used as a part of establishing the prevalence formula; the Ministry should report out on all data used in the model as permitted by the Ministry of Health. Individual confidentiality and masked data will need to continue to be respected.

The Ministry has started an internal Data Quality Strategy team to generate options for data transitions. The Ministry would like to ensure that students who are currently designated in a specific category will not be lost and that there will be a transition with the current data. The Working Group supports this idea and many members in the Group are interested in being engaged in that work moving forward.

**Implication:** Census and some other data will not be current enough to recognize emerging needs, particularly in the case of data for English Language Learning (ELL) students and income and earnings census data may also lack accuracy in serving as a proxy for instructional need as questions related to language spoken in the home do not correlate with an established need for ELL services and supports. Census data may also lack relevance for quantifying the complexity of language diversity in school districts as census boundaries differ from school district boundaries.

**Opportunity:** The Working Group believes the Ministry should consider accessing additional data sources that may provide more recent evidence of emerging needs. The Working Group understands that the best available third-party data is the census, however other reliable and available data sources across the whole province should also be considered.

For example, school districts collect data through the 1701 process that could be used to create a new robust data source as this data includes information on primary home language for each registered student. This information is provided by parents on school registration forms and no additional 'incentive' is required to encourage school districts to collect the data.

Some working group members suggested data for Income and Earnings may come from the Ministry of Social Development or be determined through similar formulas used with the vulnerable student supplement (as a component of CommunityLINK).

**Implication:** Widely divergent levels of access to and utilization of local medical and other support services for children may impact the accuracy of the medical data used for prevalence. The Working Group specifically discussed the implications of access for rural/remote and First Nations communities and indicated that there will need to be a specific strategy to ensure that these populations as well as others who may not have access to or utilize supports and services are represented.



**Opportunity:** The Ministry will need to work with parent groups and other Ministries to help increase awareness of the proposed new model and its purpose. This should include ensuring that there is an understanding that this is not a move to a medical model and that privacy will be protected. As the model is a prevalence model (not an incidence model), not every student needs to be captured; there is an ability to scale up the data the Ministry does have and apply it to the whole school district. This ensures that students who do not have access to or do not utilize services for a range of different reasons are still represented in the model. The Ministry will also ensure a specific focus on rural/remote and First Nations communities in reviewing the prevalence data.

#### 4. Supports & Services

Implications related to supports and services are relevant under a future hybrid model but would also create improvements if addressed under the current model.

**Implication:** Services and supports for students in the current system are not solely dependent on funding, for example students with designated learning disabilities are provided with supports through block funding. Continuing to assess students' needs in order to ascertain the services that best fit the needs of the learner is key in any funding system for Inclusive Education. The elimination of a requirement to assess, categorize and designate students to receive supplementary funding for the prevalence component of a hybrid model could result in decreased focus and effort to complete student assessments as the money will already have been provided to the school district. The Working Group agrees that there needs to be a way to ensure assessments to inform instruction, supports and services will continue with the proposed new model. The Working Group also believes quality Individual Education Plans (IEP) need to continue to be a part of planning and support for students with diverse abilities and disabilities.

**Opportunity:** Ministerial Orders and the Inclusive Education Policy and Guidebook will need to be updated to ensure schools and districts are aware of their continued responsibilities to assess student needs and provide supports and services. Such assessments must be commonly understood and transferrable so that students moving from one school or district to another, or outside the BC public school system, will be accompanied by a copy of the assessment (with parent permission) and supporting documentation to support their learning needs.

**Implication:** With some Inclusive Education funding no longer tied directly to assessments, Ministry designations and ELL service, parents will require assurances that their child's educational needs will be identified and met along with their child's human rights and that their parental rights and responsibilities as advocates for their children are not being lost with the implementation of a new model.

**Opportunity:** A *Parent Guide* will be developed collaboratively with parents and caregivers to describe the proposed new funding allocation system, the rights of parents and students and the responsibility of school districts to accommodate students with diverse abilities or disabilities and diverse language backgrounds. The Working Group also agrees (as above) that boards should be required to publicly outline how they plan to provide services to students within their budget, including how they will continue to assess student learning needs. The Working Group feels this strategy is relevant in any funding model moving forward and would also benefit the current model.



## 5. Transitions/Timing

**Implication:** Shifting to a new funding model is a complex and iterative process. There may be factors (such as student shifts in ELL student demographics) unique to school districts that are not accounted for within the initial prevalence model and weighting.

**Opportunity:** The Ministry should work with school districts to articulate a process whereby concerns or additional unique school district factors that impact student needs can be shared with the Ministry for funding consideration. For example, arrivals of significant numbers of refugees within a school year or increased diverse learners with complex needs and high-cost supports. A strong model may capture transient student populations in school districts as a variable and consider that some larger school districts may be able to absorb this variability while smaller school districts may experience a more significant impact.

**Implication:** The proposed new funding model will require local and provincial procedural changes to Ministry policy and a clearly communicated understanding of the factors considered in the prevalence funding calculation for each school district.

**Opportunity:** The Ministry will need to provide support through resources and tools for practitioners, particularly in the transition phase, to enhance understanding and to build operational capacity. This is also necessary to ensure that a similar level of support can be expected when a student transfers from one school district to another. School districts will need to be provided with clear information to understand the new funding model and how it strives to represent the diversity and complexity of the needs of students in their district and reflect the current practices in Inclusive Education. School districts will also need to understand what their options are to seek additional funding (if any) if they feel there are unmet needs.

**Implication:** The significant changes in funding model and implications related to service delivery are not yet well understood. There is a high degree of uncertainty and even fear of the unknown. Current Ministry Policy, Ministerial Orders and the Special Education Policy Manual will require updating and there will also be impacts on inter-ministerial agreements.

**Opportunity:** Ministry staff has and will continue to activate a comprehensive engagement and communication strategy to support the successful implementation of the new Inclusive Education funding model. Key elements will include:

- Clarity on how the new model allocates appropriate funding and helps to fulfill a commitment to prioritizing support for individuals and communities with the highest needs;
- Confirmation of the amount of funding that will be allocated to each school district, the rationale and formula used to determine the funding amount and clear processes that will be followed within each school district to spend the funding equitably on student services and supports;
- Explanation of how individual student and family confidentiality will be protected in the data gathering process;
- Confirmation that government will have a transparent process to provide adequate, sustainable and equitable funding for students with intensive supports including equipment and full-time support staff;
- Development of a *Parent Guide* and an *Inclusive Education Guidebook* to ensure a shared understanding of the operation of the new model and service delivery expectations;

- Engagement in comprehensive work with stakeholders (many already represented on the Working Group) to develop and pilot the details of the implementation strategies;
- Training for staff in the education sector to implement the new model and accompanying accountability mechanisms;
- A managed implementation to support the transition to the new model;
- Any shifts in Ministerial Orders, Policy or Guidebooks to be in place prior to implementation;
- Conducting a review of the new model one year after its full implementation and conducting ongoing and regular reviews of the model thereafter;
- Assurance to parents and Student Services staff that an individual student's diagnosis or designation – or absence of either – will not impact the provision of services;
- Assurance that individual school district assessments will not affect the prevalence model and that not being recognized in the prevalence model will not impact services and supports in the system; and
- Potential to engage with post-secondary institutions to update certification and degree program components to become more inclusive.

Ministry staff recently engaged in an intensive consultation and collaboration with education stakeholders and rights holders to update the Special Education Policy Manual. Further updates to the policy and related Ministerial Orders will need to be completed to align the final policy with the potential shifts in funding allocation. This work should involve members from this Working Group as well as Ministry partners.

## 6. Building Capacity

**Implication:** Senior leadership staff in the education sector will require ongoing new learning to implement the new model and its accompanying accountability mechanisms.

**Opportunity:** Increased and improved understanding of the model will support senior leadership staff to implement the model.

## 7. Audit & Compliance

Implications related to audit and compliance are relevant under a future hybrid model but would also create improvements if addressed under the current model.

**Implication:** The existing financial audit program will need to be changed so that it aligns with a new funding model.

**Opportunity:** New audit requirements should be developed and field tested. Such an initiative will allow for an additional emphasis on qualitative elements rather than audits confined to procedural compliance (“yes or no” evidence that services have been provided). Any new audit program will need to take into account the hybrid funding model for Inclusive Education and the potential to have different approaches between Component 1 (complex needs/high-cost supports) and Component 2 (prevalence).

The Working Group felt the current audit process in place would also benefit from an additional emphasis on qualitative elements and student outcomes, rather than a narrow focus on fiscal compliance. The Working Group also discussed the benefits of increasing program/policy compliance regardless of which funding model is in place (e.g., adherence to Special Education Policy Manual; quality of IEPs; monitoring of student well-being and outcomes) in addition to ensuring fiscal compliance remains in place.

## 8. Ongoing Monitoring of the Implementation

**Implication:** Monitoring success of the proposed new model and adjusting accordingly must take place to ensure adequate funding for direct service to children.

**Opportunity:** The Framework for Enhancing Student Learning is a tool that can be leveraged for accountability and will include requirements for school districts to share student results related to specific learner cohorts. Collecting this data, as well as other data, will allow for ongoing adjustments to the model and will establish accountabilities for appropriate use of resources to provide the necessary services and supports to ensure the success of all students. These outcomes should be reported on annually so that any necessary adaptations and improvements can be made in a timely manner. See Appendix B for summary notes related to various themes that were discussed by the Working Group.

## Conclusion

- The Working Group agrees that this is an incredibly complex topic resulting in a range of viewpoints within the Working Group and beyond.
- A full analysis can be performed, or starting change management within respective organizations can begin and concerns about quantum can be addressed when modelling becomes available.
- There is a general agreement that the current Inclusive Education system is not providing adequate supports to students, families, school staff and communities due to a range of complex factors.
- There is also a general agreement that this new model is an opportunity to leverage to improve the Inclusive Education system.
- Increased and improved training for staff in the education sector will be needed for successful implementation of the new model.
- The Working Group supports the opportunities identified in this report but believes the Ministry should ensure there is on-going involvement with the education sector to inform and advise the policy and program implications, the operation of the new model and future assessments and evaluations of the funding system.
- The Working Group would like the Ministry to provide specific timelines for funding implementation moving forward, including stakeholder communication and engagement.

## Attachments

**Appendix A** – Working Group Membership and Meeting Dates

**Appendix B** – Themes from Working Group sessions

## Appendix A: Working Group Membership and Meeting Dates

### Membership:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Cloe Nicholls (co-chair)	Ministry of Education
Piet Langstraat (co-chair)	Implementation Coordination Committee
Darleen Patterson	BC Association of School Business Officials
Kim Currie	BC Confederation of Parent Advisory Councils
Lisa Gunderson	BC Confederation of Parent Advisory Councils
Dr. Bob Eslinger	BC Council of Administrators of Inclusive Supports in Education
Tracy Humphreys	BCEdAccess
Deena Buckley	BC Principals' & Vice-Principals' Association
Teresa Downs	BC School Superintendents Association
Stephanie Higginson	BC School Trustees Association
Donna Sargent	BC School Trustees Association
Clint Johnston	BC Teachers' Federation
Tracey Mathieson	Canadian Union of Public Employees - BC
Warren Williams	Canadian Union of Public Employees - BC
Satnam Chahal	English Language Learning Consortium
Angela Clancy	Family Support Institute of BC
Barbara Kavanagh	First Nations Education Steering Committee
Karen DeLong	Inclusion BC
Blair Mitchell	Representative for Children and Youth
Terry Taylor	Rural Education Advisory Committee
Patricia Kovacs	Ministry of Education

### FMI Secretariat Support:

Sofie Grahn	Ministry of Education
Cara Williams	Ministry of Education

### Meetings:

- March 8, 2019 - Victoria
- April 15, 2019 - Victoria
- May 9, 2019 - Victoria
- June 6 and 7, 2019 - Victoria
- July 4, 2019 - Victoria
- August 7, 2019 - Victoria

## Appendix B: Themes Generated from Inclusive Education Funding Model Working Group

This document summarizes themes that were generated during an Inclusive Education Working Group meeting held on June 6, 2019. This document was created by Ministry of Education staff but is not considered a Ministry document outlining Ministry perspectives. The document is a summary of a discussion that took place during the Working Group meeting.

These themes were generated following a group brainstorm on the following questions:

1. Given what has been presented on how a possible prevalence funding model would work, what would the implications be?
2. What elements need to be in place to make the “spending plan” (supports and services) successful?
3. What most concerns you/your members about this situation?
4. What is unclear/needs more information?

Themes	Description of Implications – We will need to...	Mitigations – How could we address this?
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>Establish a process to ensure continuation of assessments for supporting student learning.</p> <p>Provide clarity about the types, purposes, accessibility and timing of assessments to accurately assess student needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require that school districts establish a process to assess the needs of students and ensure the assessment process is transparent and publicly available. Factors that should be a part of the process include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consultation with parents.</li> <li>○ Continuation of meaningful IEPs. Make it a plan to meet the needs of the child, not a driver of funding.</li> <li>○ Map out the diverse ways that student needs can be determined, that may lead to various kinds of assessments.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If we are changing criteria for how we assess kids, we need to ensure cross-ministerial involvement (ministries of Children and Family Development, Health, Mental Health and Addictions, etc.).</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify best practice in a policy or handbook to ensure assessments are student focussed not spending focussed.</li> <li>• Provide information on the different types of assessments available within the school district.</li> <li>• Expand the notion of what an assessment is beyond psych-ed (i.e., behavioural, classroom teacher, parent, showing how assessments are flexible and responsive to student needs).</li> <li>• Ensure there is clarity here on when/why we engage with level A, B, C assessment including language proficiency assessments.</li> <li>• Ensure transfer of information from early childhood (CDCs, etc).</li> <li>• Address regional concerns as they relate to assessment (especially Level C). This has implications for resourcing, training and timely accessibility.</li> </ul>

## Appendix B: Themes Generated from Inclusive Education Funding Model Working Group

<p><b>Provision of Supports and Services</b></p>	<p>Identify the types of supports and services that can reasonably be expected to be in place, based on student needs and/or diagnosis.</p> <p>Improve families/caregivers support.</p> <p>Implement school-based teams or cohorts of supports for students and/or a Community of Practice Paradigm.</p> <p>Address Children and Youth in Care (CYIC) needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop provincial guidelines that outline supports and services aligned to student needs.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The guidelines should:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Be broad enough to consider context</li> <li>○ Include examples that can be accessed and used to shape practice</li> <li>○ Align supports and services with other ministries (e.g., Health, Children and Family Development)</li> <li>○ Consider access based on geography</li> <li>○ Describe how to provide highly-qualified support staff to support kids, not one person assigned to one student</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ensure there are clearly defined contacts/information on Ministry website.</li> <li>• Include relevant provisions, decided between district and local First Nations.</li> <li>• Develop a provincial handbook for parents/guardians as a resource to navigate the system.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The handbook should include:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A clear process for parents/guardians to access services</li> <li>○ Clear communication of supports/services available</li> <li>○ Language that is accessible to families</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Family advocate that follows up with families that works alongside the school district.</li> <li>• Describe processes for establishing school-based teams or cohorts.</li> <li>• Ensure all members of the team know what they are doing to support the student.</li> <li>• Ensure there is co-teaching and co-planning time imbedded into the school schedule.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Accountability</b></p>	<p>Develop a structure from the Framework for Enhancing Student Learning to ensure accountability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a province-wide contact log for the school district CYIC contacts.</li> <li>• Identify the additional supports and services that should be provided to CYIC.</li> <li>• Ensure the structure is informed by strong planning; linked to strategic plan.</li> <li>• Include qualitative data and not only data from the warehouse.</li> <li>• Require incident data reported out to Ministry/school districts.</li> <li>• Strengthen the appeal/complaint process in place. Include a level of appeal beyond the district and board of trustees. Provide an advocate/representative.</li> <li>• Ensure auditors have a background in special education and have recent field experience.</li> </ul>



## Appendix B: Themes Generated from Inclusive Education Funding Model Working Group

Accountability (Continued)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine how to select students for audit purposes.</li> <li>• Include audits for a selection of IEPs to review for quality.</li> <li>• Compare district audit results to determine impact of the prevalence funding model.</li> <li>• Minimize school district paperwork.</li> <li>• Require public reporting that provides confidence for <u>all</u> stakeholders that is easy to access and understand (e.g., funds received and allocated for complex needs; funds received and allocated via prevalence model).</li> <li>• Require districts to report out on accountabilities.</li> <li>• Develop guidelines for how school districts are accountable to the students in the previous funding model.</li> </ul>
<p>Ensure funding is allocated equitably within school districts and that prevalence funding is being directed appropriately to support student learning needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish a process for ensuring IEPs are put in place including reporting requirements.</li> <li>• Align IEP accountability and reporting processes with school district reporting timelines.</li> <li>• Monitor beyond report cards to include student and parent surveys disaggregating responses (e.g., CYIC, Indigenous, ELL).</li> <li>• Require schools to look beyond just ensuring students are meeting expectations to providing comments that show how students are progressing.</li> <li>• Include target setting in administrative procedures for school districts.</li> <li>• Ensure supports are clearly identified for all students including those that can't meet grade level expectations.</li> </ul>
<p>Monitor student outcomes/achievement/goals in IEPs and ensure regular progress reporting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the deliverables that are a part of BCTEA to ensure inclusive education supports are a part of LEA.</li> </ul>
<p>Ensure inclusive education supports are a part of the Local Education Agreement (LEA) between school districts and First Nations.</p>	

## Appendix B: Themes Generated from Inclusive Education Funding Model Working Group

<p><b>SD Capacity</b></p>	<p>Ensure capacity to implement the model equitably.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure leaders within the system support and understand the new model.</li> <li>• Ensure recruitment/retention of staff with proper training, across the province.</li> <li>• Build internal school district capacity by working with pre-service and in-service providers to ensure educators are supported to increase their capacities.</li> <li>• Provide guidelines on how teachers can effectively work with support workers to ensure collaboration.</li> <li>• Ensure unique geographic factors are considered when determining costs.</li> <li>• Ensure training resources are available for educators to support them to teach all students.</li> <li>• Provide more spaces for EA training and standards for EA training across the province.</li> </ul>
	<p>Address different requirements for IT supports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to technology, including supports and services in rural/remote areas.</li> <li>• Online access to education programs (e.g., Yorkville and Athabasca).</li> </ul>
	<p>Promote diversity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure diversity and culture are lenses through which support is provided, communication is messaged and how resources are developed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Transition</b></p>	<p>Address obstacles for student transitions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require school districts to use MyEducationBC and enable the system to hold all student information.</li> <li>• Align supports under the existing model with the new model.</li> </ul>
	<p>Ensure transitions between First Nations and provincial school systems include all relevant student information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require school districts to use MyEducationBC and enable the system to hold all student information.</li> <li>• Use BCTEA to formalize a process for school district and First Nation schools to work together to develop strong relationships.</li> </ul>