State Level Appeal

Completines &

# CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY REPORT

(This summary sheet must be used as a cover sheet for the hearing officer's decision at the end of the special education hearing and submitted to the Department of Education before billing [26] [1]

	Public Schools				
School Division		Name of Parents			
Name of Child		Date of Decision			
	, Attorney at law				
Counsel Representing I	ÆA	Counsel Representing Parent/Child			
Parents		Settod=			
Party Initiating Hearing	3	Prevailing Party			
See copy of order  Hearing Officer's Orde	ers and Outcome of Heari	ng:			
See copy of order					
parties of their appeal I have also advised the	rights in writing The WI	n accordance with regulations and have advised the itten decision from this hearing is attached in which to submit an implementation plan to the parties, the r days.			
Printed Name of Hea	oring Officer	Signature			
Finited Name of Flea	ing onion				

#### VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

#### PUBLIC SCHOOLS

## SPECIAL EDUCATION DUE PROCESS HEARING

Parents				
Student				
PUBLIC SCHOO School Division	OLS,			
FINDINGS OF FACT	AND CONCL	USIONS OF LAW		
This matter came on for final hearing in	n	Virginia, before		
duly appointed Hearing Officer, on				
Appearances:				
, Attorne	y At Law, for		Public Schools	
.**				
This matter concerns the appropriatene	ss of the Individ	iual Education Progra	am (IEP) of	
proposed by the	ublic Schools(	olic Schools(' ) for the school year		
20 - for their , the student,	C	"), who has been for	und eligible for	
special education as a child with a disability,	disability being	ng Down Syndrome,	parents having	
filed a request for a due process hearing challen	ging the approp	riateness of the propo	osed IEP, to which	
parents have not agreed, requesting instead that	t be give	en the benefit of a fu	ll-time aide, a class i	
word processing and payment by ".	" for a "Fast F	Forward" program, to	all of which "	
" objected and refused to agree.				
The program for was fully deve	cloped at the IE	P meeting of	which has	
been offered as an exhibit by	he parents diese	ree with many of the	provisions of that	

IEP. One point of disagreement is that the parents insist that it would be beneficial to

would make more progress under the program proposed by them where

classes, whereas the witnesses on behalf of

full time aide accompany

to have a

would be co-

feel that

taught by a regular education teacher and a special education teacher, in regular classes. This would be the least restrictive environment for

's parents insist on home schooling for for math courses, claiming that

would be better taught at home, mother being a certified. Virginia school teacher, whereas the school

personnel strongly believe that would be better served by attending the regular math class, which

would be the least restrictive environment and would enjoy the other benefits of attending classes with

peers.

The parents want to offer a word processing class to help develop word skills which failed to offer because there is no computer class taught in the middle school, but did offer a resource period with specialized instruction in word processing.

The witnesses for do not believe that requires the "Fast Forward" methodology and it is not therefore offered as part of IEP

's father attended the hearing on \_\_\_\_\_\_, as well as previous hearings, however, no expert witnesses were produced, the father objecting to having to pay \_\_\_\_\_\_, a private practitioner in the field of Clinical Neuropsychology, a "\$500. fee to attend the hearing and explain examination and recommendations for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, is a well known private practitioner in field, a Clinical Neuropsychologist. It was duly pointed out by counsel for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ that \_\_\_\_\_\_ did not therefore have the opportunity to cross examine \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, but \_\_\_\_\_\_ report was listed as an exhibit by counsel for \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ report and statements were referred to by some of the witnesses who appeared on behalf of

The professionals who did testify on behalf of have impressive qualifications, and all of them are familiar with to some degree, and have studied and observed , abilities and needs. They participated in the IEP procedure and are quite confident that the present IEP, which was rejected by the parents, is an appropriate education for , and is reasonably calculated to provide with substantial educational benefit.

For the foregoing reasons the Hearing Officer finds that the Public Schools has offered an appropriate special education program in the less restrictive environment for by the

Public Schools.

### APPEAL INFORMATION

This decision is final and binding upon all of the parties unless one or both parties appeal.

Appeal must be made within thirty (30) administrative working days from the date of this decision. Any appeal may be addressed to the Virginia Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia.

Dated this day of

Hearing Officer

Copy furnished to:

Virginia Department of Education

, Esq. ; Director of Special Programs

# VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PUBLIC SCHOOLS SPECIAL EDUCATION DUE PROCESS HEARING



Student

PUBLIC SCHOOLS,

School Division.

## ADDENDUM TO FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

## RIGHT OF APPEAL

A decision by the hearing officer in any hearing, including an expedited hearing, shall be final and binding unless the decision is appealed by a party in a state circuit court within one year of the issuance of the decision or in a federal district court.

Dated this day of

Hearing Officer

Copies furnished to:

Virginia Department of Education Attn: , Esq.

> , Esq., , Director of Special Programs