



24 Edna Avenue, #2 Toronto, ON M6P 1B5
(416) 531-8553 fax (416) 531-8102
www.inclusive-education.ca
inclusion@sympatico.ca

What does the *Revised* Ministry of Education IEP Resource Guide mean for Students, Parents and Educators seeking effective inclusive education?

This document tells you about key sections you will find in the new Guide, and (*in italics, below*) the concerns the Coalition has about ways to improve IEPs

- November 2004 -

The New IEP Resource Guide 2004 is available on the Ministry of Education website
www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/elemsec/speced/guide/resource/index.html

The French language version is at

www.edu.gov.on.ca/fre/general/elemsec/speced/guide/resource/index.html

(All page references below relate to the English document)

IEPs must be completed within 30 school days after the start of a special education placement – which is the first day of school in September for most exceptional students, whose placements do not change from year to year.

Thus, **most IEPs across Ontario were due on October 20th, 2004**. *It is very important that a plan be in place to support a successful school year.*

The Ministry's IEP Template requires the date of completion of the IEP to be written beside the date for the start of placement – for easy reference! (p. 55)

In semestered high schools, **a new IEP should be developed within 30 school days after the start of each semester.**

IEPs for non-identified students should be completed within 30 school days of the start of school too. (p. 42) IEPs are required by law for all students who have been deemed “exceptional” at an IPRC. However, they are written for many students who have not been deemed “exceptional”. *Indeed, many parents concerned about inclusive education wish to bypass the expensive IPRC process. They prefer that all of the school team's energy go into improving support within regular classrooms, without ever considering segregation.*

(Page 21 reminds us that parents may waive annual IPRC reviews.)

This Guide is clearer about the school's legal responsibilities.

It cites Education Act Regulation 181, the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, and the Ontario Student Record (OSR) Guideline 2000. Parental consent must be obtained for the release of medical and assessment information. Background information is relevant only if it relates to school programming.

The school Principal is responsible for ensuring that legal requirements are met. S/he must sign the IEP within the time limits (p. 17) and is legally responsible for these time limits being met. (p. 42). The Ministry wording suggested on the IEP Template says the Principal's signature means that the IEP has been developed in accordance with the Ministry's IEP Standards – not the law (page 56).

Regulation 181 states that IEPs be developed “in consultation with the parent and, where the pupil is 16 years of age or older, the pupil”.

After all, those with the most at stake are the student and the family.

This is important, but its meaning may be a matter for legal interpretation.

A lawyer has advised us that the essential meaning of “consult” is that there must be *the fullest possible mutual sharing of the information (both facts and opinions) between the official responsible for making a decision and the person or persons who stand to be affected by it*

We welcomed the Ministry’s previous 1998 IEP Guide because it encouraged a collaborative team approach, detailing everyone’s roles. Some of these roles are omitted from the new Guide (e.g. that the classroom teacher “demonstrates awareness of the parents’ expectations for their child’s program”, and that parents “advocate for their child’s best interest”.) The old Guide said teachers and Principals could ask parents how “they wish to become involved in their child’s educational program”. We wonder if the new Guide downplays this – asking instead how “they wish to become involved in consultation during the development of the IEP”.

The IEP template in the new Guide (p. 55) has a section stating that the IEP was “developed by” a list of staff members only. Certainly this confirms staff responsibilities. However, it does not change the fact that parents/older students are legally required to be “consulted”, as *real* IEP team members.

The new Guide clearly states that the Principal has a legal responsibility to ensure that parents/older students *are* consulted. *However, this process looks more like “involvement” than consultation. It follows the rather minimal 2000 Standard – requiring that IEP formats have check-off boxes for parents/older students to indicate whether they were consulted, declined consultation or received a copy of the completed IEP, and include a log of consultation “activity” (p. 56). It is important that parents write comments about the IEP process and product (in the space provided in the Template) that could become evidence at any subsequent legal process, if they feel their and their child’s rights have been violated.*

After the provincial review of selected IEPs, the Deputy Minister called for better consultation and communication with parents/older students. *Surely communication between home and school is most important when a student changes schools, or moves from elementary to secondary school. While the new Guide encourages the receiving teacher to meet the student and talk to other teachers, we know that collaboration with the parents should take place too.*

Parents have information that helps teachers. It is unfortunately human nature that parents’ questions and suggestions are more likely to be rejected, as criticism, if they are offered after the IEP has already been written. Teamwork is a necessary part of effective inclusive education, We think this works better when parents are partners throughout the entire IEP process.

Be careful about school staff roles and responsibilities:

In the 1998 IEP Guide, we were encouraged that the Ministry considered classroom teachers’ roles apart from special education teachers’ – because this reinforces the Ministry’s stated direction that regular class placement should be the norm, for exceptional students.

The Coalition knows that *students do not feel they really belong unless the classroom teacher is committed to their success.* In December 2001, the Deputy Minister wrote that IEPs were more effective “when they were developed by classroom teachers responsible for providing direct instruction to the student”. The new Guide says IEPs should state – and parents should be told - whenever special ed teachers do “take direct responsibility... for developing, teaching and assessing” parts of the program (p 18) It is still expected that the classroom teacher – not the special ed teacher – will do most of the communicating with parents.

It is helpful to clarify that staff the Ministry now calls “Teacher’s Assistants” have responsibilities which must be preformed “under the supervision of the teacher”.

Information: STRENGTHS and NEEDS

The new Guide states that IEP statements about areas of strength and need must be consistent with such wording on the IPRC statement of decision (p. 23). *This means we must be very cautious: describing students negatively too often provides school boards with a rationale for segregation, rather than providing accommodations to be provided in the regular classroom.* The new Guide is clearer about collecting only that medical and psychological information that is relevant to the development of an IEP (pp. 8 – 15), and only if parents/older students give consent. For non-identified students, the IEP must state the student characteristics that make special education support necessary (p. 21). **Ministry IEP Standards require “clear and specific” statements of student strengths and needs.**

*But some of the IEP examples in the new Guide are neither clear nor specific; information about strengths is too cryptic and vague – e.g. Student A has “problem-solving skills”; Student B has “gross motor abilities”; and Student C has “memory skills”. This lack of detail is unlikely to be very helpful to new teachers, and could even mislead. The Coalition knows that **improving education means building upon students’ strengths**. Surely teachers also need to know **what motivates students**, thus it is not very helpful that the new Guide considers it “appropriate” “only in some cases” to communicate the student’s interests, personal characteristics, and achievements considered non-academic. Certain acquired skills should be noted in an IEP, so the student can move on from there. Parents know much more about the student than this year’s teachers, and it may be important for the student to express preferred learning styles and supports.*

The new Guide specifically states that the IEP should list the student’s challenges and skill deficits. *The Coalition urges parents to be very cautious about this. **Too many students have been held back because teachers saw only their disabilities and focused on “can’t do” language**.* The new Guide insists that needs not be defined as “what the student needs” or “what the student needs to do”. *We can remind schools that Regulation 181 states that the ultimate purpose of an IEP is to determine precisely those supports “to be provided” to the student. Again we think the IEP examples in the Guide describe student needs too vaguely and in ways that could promote segregation, and do not inspire better programming.*

The new Guide does provide **helpful ways to look at strengths and needs** when it suggests that teachers consider how the student responds to materials, tasks, other people, and environmental variables (pp. 14-15).

PLANNING OR PRE-JUDGMENTS?

Advocates for inclusive education must always beware of expectations that are too low, and IEPs that do not work towards the highest achievement possible for individual students. *We have been appalled that the ISA funding formula rewarded school boards financially when students were prejudged as being incapable of academic learning and future employment – sometimes before they ever started school. After all, if students do not receive academic instruction, they won’t learn! Instead, **the Coalition encourages school teams to “aim higher” for students’ futures**. Through a variety of projects across Ontario, we have extensive experience in training students, teachers and parents about curriculum adaptation – so that daily lessons are enriched and students connect with their classmates and the provincial curriculum to the greatest degree possible.*

*Our experience has shown that schools too often pre-judge some students’ needs as too great to meet the learning expectations of the Ontario curriculum. This has too often meant resorting to “**Alternative**” expectations for the student. Because these may not relate to what the rest of*

*the class is doing, teachers then find little reason for the student to remain in the regular classroom. The **segregation** this promotes is what the Coalition's People First consultants criticize – from their own experience - as neither “special” nor “education”.*

Indeed, the new Ministry Guide provides an appalling example of an IEP for a student identified as having a Developmental Disability that involves an Alternative program related to bathroom use (pp. 67-75). Janice Strickland, the representative for students with the label developmental disability on the Minister's Advisory Council on Special Education was joined by other reps to object to this degrading example at a MACSE meeting mid-October, and suggested changes. She also alerted other MACSE reps and Ministry staff to the following serious problems with pre-judgments and asked that the Ministry provide clarification or corrective action.

No one can predict the future, but we need to be careful not to make assumptions that do harm. To hope that a student can earn credits and to put every effort into supporting such learning and to be WRONG, is less dangerous than prejudging a student as incapable of credits, graduation, etc. and to be WRONG (“Least Dangerous Assumption”, Anne Donnellan, 1984). If students are not taught academics, they certainly will not learn. Coalition members have seen students thrive among positive role models. Furthermore, student learning can depend almost as much on motivation as upon ability.

*Beware that the new Guide states that IEPs for secondary students must indicate **whether the student is working towards a secondary school diploma, a secondary school certificate or a certificate of accomplishment** (p. 27). If educators have decided a student will never graduate, students and parents certainly need to know; so it's in the IEP Template (p. 53). *But this involves very serious prejudgment – likely to alter student learning opportunities and possibly to reduce teachers' motivation to instruct, include and support students, from the very start of grade 9. The Coalition is alarmed that Principals would make this life-altering decision alone, and the new Guide does not require any explanation or rationale to be provided, within the IEP.**

According to the new Guide (pp. 39-40) and Template (p. 53), IEPs must state **whether students will be exempted from Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) tests** later that year. These days, provincial test results matter very much to government and school boards. Exemption can mean that Grade 3 or 6 students are excluded from much of that year's classroom preparation, and means high school students will never graduate. The Principal must specify reasons for this prejudgment.

The Ministry's IEP Standards did not clarify how decisions should be made about whether learning expectations for a student will relate to the provincial curriculum. *The Coalition thinks there should be checks and balances for greater accountability concerning something as important as that.* In December 2001, the Deputy Minister said that 75% of the IEPs reviewed needed to more closely connect student programming to the Ontario curriculum.

“Phase 3” is a large section - new to this year's IEP Guide – attempting to provide greater clarity about measuring learning and specifying in what way assistance is to be provided.

The highlighted box on page 6 states that **IEPs must record all accommodations and specify wherever learning expectations are:**

- **based on the Ontario curriculum but Modified for a student, and/or**
- **Alternative in program areas not found at all in the provincial curriculum.**

Page 7 states that if learning expectations coincide with the regular grade curriculum, they need not be written in an IEP, but any Accommodations must be specified. Students can take Alternative courses in some areas while aiming for Modified expectations in others.

Specific direction is provided re both Modified and Alternative expectations for students labelled gifted (p 27), but they are *not* expected to need Accommodations unless they have other needs specified.

Alternative courses at secondary level do not contribute to high school credits – whether offered to students labelled as gifted or disabled. The Ministry wants to make sure parents and students know this; so the IEP must specify. The Guide states that school boards must use the Ministry’s “K course” non-credit codes and titles (p. 26).

But where **secondary school students enrol in credit-granting courses where Modifications are planned, principals must state at the outset of the semester, in the IEP, whether or not students can earn credits** (p. 47). *We think it is wrong that no rationale is required for another serious prejudgment by the Principal. Is it fair to determine that the provincial curriculum must be modified too much, before teaching even begins and before accommodations are ever tried? It used to be that students could accumulate partial credits, returning to learn the remaining objectives of the course later. This would seem to be an Accommodation preventing Modification – adjusting the time available to fulfill all of the course requirements, and the pace of learning.*

The new Guide says the IEP team must consider a “range of options” concerning programming. But on page 25, it lists only 4 options, so that the teacher responsible for direct instruction decides whether subjects or courses should be classified as (one of):

- **No Accommodations or Modifications**
- **Accommodated only**
- **Modified** (expectations come from provincial curriculum grade levels above or below the student’s age-appropriate grade level)
- **Alternative** (expectations are outside the Ontario curriculum)

Accommodations are listed as Instructional, Environmental and Assessment (pp 28-29). *But this gets confusing.* On the same page, changing the “number and complexity of the regular grade-level expectations” is called a Modification (pg. 26), but on page 29 “reducing the number of tasks assessed” is called an Accommodation. On page 37, individualized teaching strategies and assessment methods – which are Accommodations – are listed for Alternative programs too. *This can also be misleading.* Page 26 shows students may require Accommodations plus Modifications, in any given course or subject area.

It is necessary to ensure that Accommodations are available for any student with a disability, in accordance with the Ontario Human Rights Code.

We think this means that schools should provide Accommodations first, before deciding to downgrade or substitute curriculum. *The Coalition developed our Curriculum Adaptation Pathway to help teachers think about whether the student needs help to participate in the classroom, and then try a variety of increasingly complex accommodations - to build a scaffold to higher learning. This process can enrich the classroom, use resources better, and prevent that lowering of expectations that leads to segregation.*

The new IEP Guide specifies that Accommodations are “only those strategies and supports that differ from what is normally provided during classroom instruction” (p. 28). But surely many suggestions on page 29 are methods typically incorporated for any student – quiet setting, oral responses, peer tutoring, repetition, and so on. ***Effective inclusive education involves progression towards universal instructional design to meet differing student needs of all kinds. Accommodations provided for one student enhance the learning of others (for example, one student needs to be read aloud to, which in turn reinforces the learning of another student who needs to read aloud.)***

The new Guide reminds schools of their legal responsibility to develop a **Transition Plan** for every student identified with a disability 14 years of age and over. It must state goals, actions required and who is responsible for those actions (pp. 40-41). Further information is available in the Ministry's 2002 Transition Planning Resource Guide. The new IEP Guide provides only one example of a Transition Plan – *and it is a Transition Plan that seems to severely limit the future of a high school student with a developmental disability! Instead of proposing ways for the students to explore possible careers, it merely aims to slot the student into “supported employment” and “independent living” services – called “Community Living Associated” “wait-listed programs/services” – whether or not they are even available. Responsibility is almost totally shifted away from the school to the student, parents and community agencies.*

THE SCHOOL'S LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE SUPPORT

Lest the help a student needs is not made available in the natural course of classroom learning, an IEP provides what might be deemed legally-enforceable protection of his or her accommodation rights. Regulation 181 says it outlines “the special education program and services to be received by the pupil”.

*The IEP Standards seemed to shrink away from that commitment, stating that: “The IEP reflects the school board’s and the principal’s commitment to provide the special education program and services, *within the resources available to the school board*, needed to meet the identified strengths and needs of the student.” The new Guide does not use that “squeaker clause” which appears to be inconsistent with the legislation, and would negate the value of IEPs altogether. **But it still downplays school responsibility by stating that an IEP describes supports “required by a particular student”.** After all, exceptional students have a right to be supported, and their teachers and parents want that legal commitment honoured - to ensure that what students require is really received.*

*The Coalition may have a major difference of opinion with the Ministry of Education here. Kathy Schaffer (Education Officer in the Special Education Policy and Programs Branch) has been known to provide helpful clarification to school staff about using the IEP to improve educational planning. Yet, she told us she tells school personnel to “write what is true”: that is, to specify in an IEP only those supports it knows it will provide this year. We would say, instead: **“Write the truth about the student. An IEP is meant to design changes in the school system. Aim higher.”***

We think the law intends IEPs to be a way to ensure that students get the help they really need, not just what schools are prepared to provide. The Education Act defines “special education program” essentially as an IEP – “containing an outline of educational services that meets the needs of the exceptional pupil”. The Ontario Human Rights Code protects students’ rights to disability-related “accommodation plans” too.

We think IEPs are the best way to bring support to both students and their teachers. But if a support is not written in an IEP, chances are it will never be available. And if a student truly needs a particular support in order to achieve the year’s learning objectives, he or she should never be penalized (or have academic expectations lowered) because the school is unable or unwilling to provide supports known to be necessary.

Section 5 of the IEP Standards outlines 3 general types of “Special Education Strategies, Accommodations and Resources” (and these 3 are alluded to, briefly, on page 28 of the new Guide):

- **Teaching Strategies**
- **Human Resources**, and
- **Individualized equipment**

The Coalition's Curriculum Adaptation Pathway considers daily lesson planning – not to write this into the IEP, but to help IEP teams consider classroom realities when they determine the individual program relative to those 3 areas. By attempting to separate “Accommodations” from “Modifications”, the new Guide confuses this. It should be clear wherever a student needs any of those 3 types of support to meet a particular learning expectation. The IEP Template would be more helpful if it listed supports deemed necessary for success opposite each of the learning expectations (p. 54), not on separate pages (p. 53 and p. 55). This would make it clear whenever expectations cannot be met because support has been denied. The new Guide does add reference to Assessment methods (p. 38).

It is very helpful that the new Guide is specific about Human Resources (pp 38-39) IEPs must outline all the kinds of support provided *directly* to the student by school board staff – specifying **type of service, date it is to start, planned frequency or intensity and the location where help is to be provided**. Where board staff help is *indirect* – *i.e. in consultation with the classroom teacher* – it may be more difficult to quantify, but type of service and minimum frequency must be stated. *Students, parents and teachers all need to know exactly what help is required - which they can count on and demand, if necessary. Parents have not wanted to sign IEPs that were not specific about this. Now, if the IPRC Placement states that support is to be provided in the regular classroom, without withdrawal, it would be unacceptable if the IEP stated that a special ed teacher was to provide direct instruction in the resource room. It should be clear in the IEP if a student needs a Teacher's Assistant on the playground, or available on call, for personal care.*

*It is of great concern to the Coalition that **what has almost disappeared from the new Guide is reference to Individualized Equipment**. It is alluded to on page 28. However, so much detail is provided about other supports in the list on page 29, that we wonder why equipment seems to have been almost overlooked in examples provided. **IEPs should outline – as thoroughly as for Human Resources (above) – specifics about equipment, its availability and application, staff training needs, technical support, location, etc.** Equipment can make a world of difference – to assist some students to meet provincial curriculum expectations, required for high school graduation. Although the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO) limits the help students can receive in order to pass standardized provincial tests, no Individualized Equipment is allowed in the test unless it was recorded in the IEP. And the Ministry of Education reimburses school boards for much of the cost of Individualized Equipment, through Intensive Support Amount grants (ISA#1), and now every Board receives a grant based on its student population, for technical support and training. *The attention of IEP teams must be drawn to this crucial area for support planning.**

IMPROVING LEARNING

Learning expectations must be specific. It is important that IEPs communicate the student's **Current Level of Achievement** – as a baseline; show the learning expected; and measure success relative to the identified expectations. Parents and students should know where they stand – relative to provincial curriculum grade levels and/or individual progress. The new Guide requires that IEPs show exact **grade levels** for any student achievement, where the program is Modified from above or below grade level. **Annual Program Goals** set expectations for learning that year, but can be revised. Examples provided in the new Guide seem easy to confuse with **Specific Learning Expectations** which delineate the knowledge and skills which are to be demonstrated in student evaluation. (pp. 31-37). Wherever a student's expectations differ from the Ontario curriculum, they should be clearly noted.

This becomes particularly important in secondary schools, where decisions about whether students gain credits are made by Principals. Examples provided show students in Academic classes while working on Applied goals/expectations. Current level of achievement is to be written in terms of previous marks in pre-requisite courses, wherever they exist, showing whether Modified or not. This means it is very clear when students are currently achieving *far below* grade level. A course is not defined as Alternative as long as expectations arise from somewhere in the provincial curriculum. *An IEP that shows that a secondary student is at a primary elementary literacy level, for example, should not make her less welcome in a grade 11 English course. Her teachers should get help to plan instructional Modifications respectfully and everyone needs useful feedback about successful learning.*

Where a student takes **Alternative programs or courses**, the new Guide (p. 37) suggests that Current Achievement be **more anecdotal, without grade levels or marks**. But, Annual Program Goals should be written as “**observable, measurable outcomes**”. Learning Expectations should specify **expected knowledge and skills**, and certainly this would make it easier to celebrate success. *Examples provided relate to numbers of times a student performs certain actions – yet it is difficult to imagine school staff really being able to count the number of times a student expresses anger without physical contact, or follows instructions, throughout the whole school day. Another example is provided of an IEP for a secondary student identified with a Developmental Disability, in a regular class placement. Her “numeracy program” is called Alternative, even though it does relate to the provincial curriculum. Her geography, music and health courses are all Modified but non-credit. But then she has a “personal care” program wherein she is to readjust her clothing in the washroom “with one verbal prompt”, and wash her hands and return to class without “vocalization” 5 out of 10 times. (See p. 73).*

The Coalition encourages parents and older students to take the lead in setting priorities, in Individual Educational Planning. For example, is it instruction in bathroom use that we want – perhaps taking the student out of the class - or respectful assistance with everyday bodily functions, usually between classes? Inclusion is more likely where the learning objectives chosen relate to the Ontario curriculum. After all, the same objective that can be described as “communication” might also be found in provincial literacy programs or the high school English curriculum. Students often benefit greatly from communication role models by staying in class, rather than being withdrawn for direct instruction. Teachers need assurance that students can remain in class and benefit from class lessons, while still achieving individual objectives. Too often parents are asked to “choose” between social and academic goals, when we know all students have both. Social goals can be listed separately in an IEP – but it may be more logical to list social opportunities (group projects, sharing interests, recess breaks) as instructional strategies promoting academic learning. These would be accommodations, not modifications.

How is the IEP used? Implementation, Evaluation, Adjustment and Reviews

An IEP is a working document - not to be just filed away. *But there are records management issues: the new Guide says everyone gets a copy – but also states that the IEP remains in the OSR file. And if the working copy is to replace the filed copy at the end of every school year or semester, what happens to the previous year’s IEP? It can be important to compare IEPs from year to year to ensure that support is not suddenly denied by the school.*

IEP implementation involves checking that all those responsible really do what they were to do. The classroom teacher, in particular, must ensure accommodations are provided, although this is ultimately the Principal’s responsibility. Student progress must be evaluated at least once every report card period (p. 46), but assessment is continuous. *Clear communication and “consultation with” students and parents are recommended before any changes are made. A variety of strategies should be tried to see what works best, but again the new Guide does not*

promote the continuous improvement of Accommodations –in particular, too little attention is paid to the provision of Individualized Equipment. The Guide calls for fine-tuning of Modified or Alternative learning expectations, depending on the student’s rate of progress. But the Coalition encourages school teams to plan proactively to help more students achieve provincial curriculum expectations for high school credits and graduation.

The new IEP Resource Guide and Ontario’s IEP Standards provide some clarification and some help, but also present serious additional problems. The Education Act, Regulation 181 and the Ontario Human Rights Code may offer legal remedies.

On November 30th., The Ontario Human Rights Commission will release Guidelines on Accessible Education, which will address disability and the duty to accommodate in the educational sector. These guidelines will outline the Commission’s interpretation of the legal responsibilities of all parties to the accommodation process with respect to: access to education, combating negative attitudes and stereotypes, determining and providing appropriate accommodations, respecting the confidentiality of persons with disabilities, developing a dignified and effective accommodation process, and applying the undue hardship standard.

The Ontario Coalition for Inclusive Education is informing the Minister of education of its many serious concerns about limitations and oversights in this new document. We are encouraged by recent steps taken by Education Minister Gerard Kennedy to stop the harmful special education funding formula and promote better educational outcomes in special education. The IEP Resource Guide was written before these changes were announced. The Coalition plans to let the Minister and his staff know about our concerns with the document’s limitations. We can encourage real consultation and real educational improvement – for individual students and for all of Ontario’s schools.

BACKGROUND: This revised guide builds upon earlier work of the Ministry of Education:

- **The Education Act defines “special education program” as:**
 - ✓ “in respect of AN exceptional PUPIL” (not a group)
 - ✓ “based on and modified by continuous assessment and evaluation” - of how that student learns
 - ✓ “containing specific objectives” - for that student
 - ✓ “containing an outline of educational services that meets the needs of the exceptional pupil”

Thus **Program** is designed for one student at a time, not groups. This means support should come to students right where they belong - in regular classrooms in their own neighbourhood schools. Segregation can be avoided when students get the help they need to learn, and teachers get the help they need to teach the students of all abilities who have a right to attend regular classrooms.

- 1997 Draft Monograph #5 – about planning behavioural support to avoid suspensions and expulsions.
- September 1998 – *Education Act Regulation 181*
- The Ministry now defines **5 types of “placements:**
 1. regular class with indirect support
 2. regular class with resource assistance
 3. regular class with withdrawal assistance
 4. special education class with partial integration
 5. special education class full time
- 1998 *Individual Education Plan Resource Guide*
- 2000 *Individual Education Plans: Standards for Development, Program Planning, and Implementation*
- Ontario’s Provincial Auditor expressed concern about the lack of school board compliance to IEP Standards in his 2001 Report on Special Education. This related to problems noted in the 1993 Audit too.
- From 2001 to 2003, the Ministry conducted an IEP Review, looking at a sample of IEPs chosen by school
- The Ministry created an IEP Template which it suggested Boards utilize
- In 2003, the Ontario Human Rights Commission published its consultation report: “*The Opportunity to Succeed: Achieving Barrier-free Education for Students with Disabilities*”. (Corresponding *Guidelines* are about to be released providing details as to discrimination, the duty to accommodate, undue hardship and accommodation planning.)