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.)

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School Division	Name of Parents
Name of Child	Date of Decision
ESQ.	, ESQ.
Representing LEA	Representing Parents
	PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Party Initiating Hearing	Prevailing Party

Hearing Officer's Determination of Issues:

- 1. was provided a FAPE by the
- Public Schools.
- Public Schools did not fail to provide ABA therapy with a one-to-one aide as
 described in 's IEP for the summer school or for the 20 -20 school year
 nor fail to provide a aide with adequate training.
- 3. Compensatory ABA is not required.
- THE School Board is not required to provide or fund outside services for the provision of ABA therapy.

Hearing Officer's Orders and Outcome of Hearing:

As stated herein.

Public Schools is the prevailing party on all issues.

This certifies that I have completed this hearing in accordance with regulations and have advised the parties of their appeal rights in writing. The written decision from this hearing is attached in which I have also advised the LEA of its responsibility to submit an implementation plan to the parties, the hearing officer, and the SEA within 45 calendar days.

Virginia Department of Education P.O. Box 2120 Richmond, Virginia 23216-2120



DUE PROCESS HEARING REPORT AND DECISION

PUBLIC SCHOOLS			
School Division	Name of Parents		
26	Name of Child		
Representing LEA	Representing Parents		
Due Process Hearing Officer	Party Initiating hearing		

I. PURPOSE AND ISSUES FOR DETERMINATION:

parent of , made a written request for due process hearing dated

, but faxed to and received by the

Public Schools on

The request for due process hearing stated, "

Public Schools have not provided

a free

appropriate public education". (S Ex.1)

The issues for determination in the due process hearing:

- WHETHER WAS PROVIDED A FREE, APPROPRIATE, PUBLIC EDUCATION.
- WHETHER BY FAILING TO PROVIDE AN AIDE WITH ADEQUATE TRAINING, THE SCHOOL BOARD FAILED TO PROVIDE ABA THERAPY WITH A 1:1 AIDE AS DESCRIBED IN 'S IEP FOR THE SUMMER SCHOOL AND FOR THE 20 -20 SCHOOL YEAR.
- 3. WHETHER COMPENSATORY ABA THERAPY IS APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE ABOVE FAILURE.
- WHETHER, IN THE ABSENCE OF AN AIDE WITH ADEQUATE TRAINING, THE SCHOOL BOARD SHOULD FUND OUTSIDE SERVICES FOR PROVISION OF ABA THERAPY.

(see HO EX. 1)

II. ONE EXTENSION OF FINAL DECISION DUE DATE:

Upon appointment in this cause the undersigned hearing officer contacted the parties.

were not re	presented by counsel but were actively seeking cou	nsel and Public Schools was
represented by	. Esq. On the initial contact the	he parties agreed to a pre-hearing conference
set for	and the due process hearing set for	. The final decision due date
was		

On the undersigned was notified that , Esquire would represent the parents. At the pre-hearing conference, a joint motion was made to continue the due process hearing date from , and for extension of the final decision date beyond the 45 day period required by the Rules Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia.

requested additional time to investigate and to prepare for the due process hearing and both parties

requested additional time to investigate and to prepare for the due process hearing and both parties wanted to pursue mediation.

It was found to be in the best interest of the child (1.) that the parents have the right to retain counsel and be represented at due process hearing, if they so choose (2.) that counsel have adequate time to fully investigate matters, adequately prepare for hearing, and fully present all matters at issue and (3.) that there be opportunity for a full, complete, and fair hearing on all issues. Basic fairness requires that there be a full, fair, and complete hearing of the issues.

At this pre-hearing conference, on joint motion of the parties, it being found to be in the best interest of the child (for reasons as set forth above) the final decision date was extended and the due process hearing was continued. A timeline was established setting a second pre-hearing conference on the due process hearing on and the final decision date was extended to the due process hearing conference, both parties desired to present written briefs/arguments upon completion of the due process hearing and the final decision date of was established to allow 10 business days after due process hearing for transcript delivery then for each party to have 7 days for brief/argument submission and then for there to be 7 days for the decision to be tendered.

This was the only continuance/extension granted in this cause.

III. PROCEEDINGS:

1. First Pre-Hearing Conference was held (via telephone conference call) and upon motion of the parties the due process hearing date was continued, the final decision date was extended, and the below timeline was adopted. The extension was granted on the joint motion of the parties and upon finding it to be in the child's best interest (for the reasons previously set forth). The parties additionally expressed their desire to proceed with mediation and to attempt to resolve matters outside of the due process hearing.

At this first pre-hearing conference the below timeline was agreed to and established:

- i. Specific written issues to be provided no later that this date.
 ii. Second pre-hearing conference (via telephone).
 iii. Due Process Hearing.
 iv. Anticipated date transcript delivered.
 v. ... 's Brief/Argument due.
 vi. ... 's Brief/Argument due.
 iv. Final decision due date.
- 2. Second Pre-Hearing Conference was held on (via telephone conference). The parties confirmed that mediation efforts did not resolve matters and the due process hearing would proceed as previously scheduled. Counsel for parents agreed to submit narrowed issues for determination at due process hearing. The timeline set forth at the first pre-hearing conference was confirmed.
- 3. <u>Due Process Hearing was held on</u>, starting at 10:00 A.M. at the Third Floor

 Board Room, Public Schools Administrative Building, , , VA. before the

 undersigned duly appointed hearing officer. Per parent's motion the due process hearing was closed to the

 public.
 - a. The following witnesses testified at the due process hearing:

- b. <u>Exhibits</u>: The following exhibits were, by agreement of the parties, admitted into evidence at the due process hearing:
 - I. Parents' exhibits designated A through U.
 - II. School's exhibits designated 1 through 52 (and including 41A, 41 B)
 - III. Hearing Officer's Exhibit . . . designated as HO 1
- c. <u>Transcript</u>: The transcript of the due process hearing consists of one volume. At the request of all parties, the transcript pages were reduced in size to allow four pages of transcripts printed on one sheet of paper. A total of 315 numbered pages (reduced in size to 4 numbered pages on each sheet) comprise the transcript plus a word index was provided. The transcript is referred to as "Tr. pg. ___" (with the page number inserted at "___"). The Parent's Exhibits are designated as "P Ex. ___" (with the page number inserted at "___"). The School's Exhibits are designated as "S Ex. ___" (with the page number inserted at "___"). The Hearing Officer's Exhibits are designated as "HO Ex. ___" (with the page number inserted at "___").
- d. <u>Post-Hearing Timeline</u>: At the conclusion of the Due Process Hearing the parties confirmed their desire to provide written brief/arguments as requested at the first pre-hearing conference. Approximately 10 business days were required for the court reporter to provide a written transcript of the proceedings to the parties. Based upon this and to allow 7 day periods for each party's brief/agreement and 7 days for the final decision the following post-hearing timeline (which was discussed in pre-hearing conference) was set::
 - .. Transcript due (10 business days estimated being needed to prepare).
 - ... Brief/argument of due.
 - ... Brief/argument of due.
 - ... Due Process Decision due.

e. Tender of Transcript and Written Briefs/Arguments: The transcript was actually received on

In conference call with the parties held after receipt of transcript, the established due dates

of for 's brief/argument, for 's brief/argument, and

for the final decision date was agreed to be maintained. Each party tendered his or her

written brief/argument in a timely manner.

IV. FINDINGS OF FACT:

Based upon all of the evidence presented at due process hearing, including the testimony of witness and review of the exhibits admitted, the hearing officer makes the following findings of fact:

- 01. is a child born on and who at all times relevant to these proceedings resides with parents in the , Commonwealth of Virginia.
- 02. from the Virginia Autism Resource Center screened in home and found that could not label as autistic but verified was autistic-like because had so many characteristics of autism. (Tr. pg. 28)
- (then age 31 months) was found eligible for Special Education in the Early Childhood Special

 Education ("ECSE") REACH Program and was found eligible for Related Services. The Eligibility Committee

 found that " is displaying significant delays in all areas. shows autistic type characteristics."

 showed significant delays in communication, cognitive, and motor development (see S Ex. 5 and 9) and was

 identified as Developmentally Delayed and Speech /Language Impaired.
- 04. was found eligible for services in the Noncategorical Preschool Disabled Program with Speech as a related service. (S Ex.6) The eligibility committee recommended ECSE Class 3 hours five days weekly, speech therapy, and PT/OT Evaluation. (S Ex. 5).
 - 05. began receiving services from the Public Schools in the year 20 . (Tr. pg. 21)

was in the REA	CH program at	Elementary school. (Tr. pg. 35)	was referred to the
REACH program due	to a speech and languag	ge delay, not feeding self with a spoon	and fork, not playing
with toys appropriate	ly, and not interacting w	ith other children. (S Ex. 4.)	
06. <u>IEP's fo</u>	r periods prior to the s	ummer of 20 _ a number of IEPs and Ame	endments to IEPs were
developed for an	nd implemented includin	g;	
	nitial IEP - of . olid at 19 months with a	found delays across all developmental scatter to 24 months and fine motor skills a	
Communicat	ion Skills were within th	e 6-9 month range (feeding skills 16-19 mo	o.). Cognitive scores
were at the 9	-11 month range and Soc	cial skills at 12-15 months. (S Ex. 7)	
(b.)	Amendment to IEP of	(S Ex. 9).	
(c).	Amendment to IEP of	(S Ex. 10)	
(d.)	Amendment to IEP of	provided for a meeting to discuss	Receiving ABA
	training in classroom	with further recommendations pending ob	servation. (P Ex. D)
(e.)	Amendment to IEP of	provided direct ABA instruction, for	a 1:1 aide 3 hours a day
	beginning , a	nd for instruction of ABA in a distraction f	ree environment for
	discrete trial training	. (P Ex. 12)	
(f.)	Amendment to IEP of	provided for a direct ABA instructor	r. (S Ex. 13)
(g.)	IEP (Annual) of	provided:	
	from - from -	ECSE Classroom 3 hours a day 5 days ABA/1:1 Aide 3 hours a day 5 days a v : Summer School 5 ¼ hours a day 4 days : ECSE Class with a 1:1 Aide 3 hours a ABA with a 1:1 Aide 3 hours a day 5 d Speech Therapy 30 minutes 2 times a v	vk, from to s a week day 5 days a week lays a week veek
4		Occupational Therapy 30 min. two tim	es a week (S Ex. 14)
(h.)	Amendment to IEP of	added additional goals to current II	EP. (S Ex. 17)
07. <u>IEP of</u>	(S Ex. 20) The	e IEP of , provided for Early	Childhood Special
Education ("ECSE") Class 3 hrs 5 times a w	eek; ABA with a one-to-one aide 3 hours a	day 5 days a week;
Speech 30 minutes 2	times a week; Occupati	ional Therapy 30 minutes 2 times a week, a	and a one-to-one aide
Regional Autism cla	ssroom 5 days week. Ti	he beginning date services was	and the ECSE had an

but the remaining services' indicated Anticipated Completion "Anticipated Completion Date" of . ESY services were from Dates of to . the IEP Team found is a child who has been diagnosed with autism and who is On currently showing significant delays in all developmental areas and recommended ESY services for maintain current level of functioning. were set forth. ESY Extended School Year ("ESY") services from to services included ABA/ one-to-one aide 3 hours a day for 4 days a week, Speech once a week for 30 minutes and OT once a week for thirty Minutes. signed giving permission to implement. (S Ex. 20) after 08. Revised IEP of (S Ex. 26) A second IEP meeting was convened on IEP meeting. the school received a letter rescinding the approval earlier given by parents at the signed the IEP on meeting was attended by indicating permission for implementation of the IEP and agreement to the placement decision. to receive ABA service with a one-to-one aide 3 The revised IEP of provided for hours daily, monitoring by a Regional Autism in Class Teacher 5 days a week, speech services twice a week for signed this on 30 minutes, and occupational therapy twice a week for 30 minute each. giving permission to implement. (S Ex. 26) Amendment to IEP provided for 09. Amendment to IEP of (S Ex. 28) The ECSE with an one-to-one aide 3 hrs - 5 days a week and for ABA with an one-to-one aide 3 hrs for 5 days a week. Additionally, there was to be an ABA consultation once a week. The beginning date for services was (excepting one provision for and the anticipated date of completion of services is giving permission to implement. (S Ex. 28) signed this Amendment on . (S Ex. 32) The purpose of this amendment was to change the Amendment to IEP of amount of time with an aide to be trained in ABA from 5 days a week for 3 hours a day to 5 days a week for 1.5

hours a day. ECSE (with 1:1 aide) was provided at 4 hrs per day for 5 days a week and an ABA consult of 1.5

and the anticipated hrs a day for 10 days was provided. The beginning date for services was signed giving permission to implement. (S Ex. 32) date of completion is 11. Amendment to IEP of (S Ex. 37) The purpose of this amendment was to make changes in percentage of service. ECSE with a one-to-one aide was provided at 4.5 hours per day for 5 days a week, ABA with an one-to-one aide 1.5 hrs per day for 5 days a week and for an ABA consult of 1.5 hours. The and Anticipated Date of Completion was beginning date for services was This amendment was not signed by a parent to indicate permission for services. (S Ex. 37) 12. Amendment to IEP of . (S Ex. 40) This amendment was to change services to reflect 6 hours total instruction including related service within ESCE Classroom with removal of 1.5 hours per day of ABA services. REACH preschool classroom was provided for 6 hrs per day 5 days a week. The beginning date and Anticipated date of completion was for services was This amendment was not signed by a parent to indicate permission for services. (S Ex. 40) 13. Proposed IEP Amendment/Addendum of (S Ex. 41A) This proposed amendment IEP was to correct prior clerical error and to provide 9 hours of in home ABA services in compensation for 9 hours that were missed during ESY services in summer of . It attempted to clarify Special Education services per IEP and it provided ECSE, Classroom, for 4.5 hrs. per day for 5 days a week from Service location was for ABA with 1:1 aide for 1.5 hrs. per day 5 days a week from Elementary School ECSE Classroom. This IEP was signed by indicating was a member of the IEP committee but was not signed indicating if permission was or was not given for to receive Special Education Services as indicated by the addendum/amendment. (S Ex. 41A). to be a child who has been diagnosed with autism and , the IEP Team found 14. On who is currently showing significant delays in all developmental areas. signed giving written (see S Ex. 20). However, in the photo copy of the same page permission to implement this IEP on

's consent

below

signed giving permission to implement the IEP on

which

signature was a handwritten notation stating, ' Letter received that you rescinded your written approval for this IEP." (see S Ex 26)

15. On requested a meeting to amend the IEP to (a.) remove the one hour in the Autism classroom from 's IEP, (b.) provide the aide be trained by a trainer with over 500 hours one-to-one ABA discrete trial experience for both ESY and next school year, (c.) a program developer having over 500 hours one-to-one ABA discrete trial training experience and extensive training and (d.) ABA in a separate distraction-free room. (P Ex. G) A second meeting was to be held on

16. The school year began on but because there was no one-to-one aide for kept out of school three days (Wednesday , Thursday and Friday). On Monday went to school. (P Ex. M)

17. On wrote the Public Schools that, "I am requesting be kept out of the "ABA" program until a program is set up for I and that is trained thoroughly." (" "refers to) (S Ex. 31)

- following that on and attended multiple IEP in subsequent school years. observed and consulted with steachers in 20 -20 and 20 -20 school years each three weeks and consulted approximately 4 times after in the 20 -20 school year. (Tr. 196-198)

 testified that is capable of learning and that has seen "outstanding growth" and described as having made progress continually from the beginning (Tr. pg. 203)
- then given full time employment on (Tr. pg. 262). received training by the classroom teacher at the beginning of the school year and by autism specialists both as a substitute and upon going to full time status. has a high school diploma. (Tr. 262-264)

- 20. is 's teacher in the 20 -20 school year. This class had a maximum of eleven students in the class and the class is staffed with one teacher and two classroom aides plus 's one-to-one aide. (Tr. pg. 282)
- There is no national standard for training before you call yourself an ABA therapist, no licensure as an ABA therapist. (Tr. pg. 214, 215)
- 22. There are no state standards for aide training and no requirements under

 Public

 School's procedures other than a requirement that aides be high school graduates (Tr. pg. 163-164).

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

's parents brought this due process proceeding due to concerns that has not been receiving an appropriate education and particularly raising their concerns that the Public Schools failed to provide an adequately trained one-to-one aide for as required in IEP for summer school and school year 20 -20 . The parents further raise questions about compensatory therapy and the need for services to be Public Schools. provided outside the indicating permission for services on The IEP for the 20 -20 school year was signed by requested the IEP be amended and to this end a . However, on permission. and subsequently signed by indicating second IEP meeting was held signed as participants in the Parents Exhibit (P Ex. I) shows that on development of the IEP and the placement decision but the IEP does not bear any signature indicating if a parent signed the IEP on gave or did not give permission. School Exhibit (S Ex. 26) shows as participants and shows permission being given for implementation by dated changes. meeting with the second IEP Meeting Both "P Ex I" and "S Ex. 26" reflect the an Amendment to IEP (purpose was change of placement) was signed by was informed indicated that at the meeting consent. (S Ex. 28) indicating

	(the same aid	e who worked with	in summer	school) would be	aide but on ti	ie mist day
of school ()	did not have an aide.	As there wa	s no one-to-one a	ide for	cept
out of school thre	e days (Wedn	esday , Thu	rsday	, and Frida	y	.) On
Monday .		went to school (P Ex.	M)			
	testified	that an aide that they in	itended to of	fer the position to	did not accept th	at position
and the person the	ey eventually l	nired as an aide for	was	. (7	r. pg. 144-145)	
	expressed c	oncerns about school p	ersonnel trair	ning and that AB	\ was not properl	y being
conducted and on	В.,	requested	be kept out o	f the ABA progra	m. (P Ex. M; S I	Ex. 31) At
the	IEP Amend	lment meeting the min	ites indicated	I made	e suggestions for	training of
school personnel.	also exp	ressed concern that	was behind	I and requested a	home ABA progr	ram. (S Ex
32)						
On		indicated, afte	r in school	ol observation,	feelings that tw	o school
personnel workin	ig with w	ere "unsure of appropr	iate ABA tec	hniques" and that	t neither person c	ould get
to do anythi	ng productive	(P Ex. L)				
	testified tha	t on		, and	all told	the aide
() was not train	ed and should not be p	roviding serv	ices to . (Tr	. pg. 52)	
			A.			

Issues:

WHETHER BY FAILING TO PROVIDE AN AIDE WITH ADEQUATE TRAINING, THE SCHOOL BOARD FAILED TO PROVIDE ABA THERAPY WITH A 1:1 AIDE AS DESCRIBED IN 'S IEP FOR THE SUMMER SCHOOL AND FOR THE 20 -20 SCHOOL YEAR.

WHETHER COMPENSATORY ABA THERAPY IS APPROPRIATE GIVEN THE ABOVE FAILURE.

WHETHER, IN THE ABSENCE OF AN AIDE WITH ADEQUATE TRAINING, THE SCHOOL BOARD SHOULD FUND OUTSIDE SERVICES FOR PROVISION OF ABA THERAPY.

The above issues are related to the parents contention that so aide was not adequately trained and that not being adequately trained this affected the provision of ABA therapy and was a violation of the IEP. This in turn was impacting on the issue of provision of a FAPE (the issue of FAPE is discussed in "B" below).

In The IEP meeting of as revised by the IEP of (which was signed on by 's parent giving permission to implement) was to receive 3 hours daily of Applied Behavioral Analysis ("ABA") services with a one-to-one aide. This IEP was later amended on

to change the amount of time with an aide to be trained in ABA to 1.5 hours daily (S Ex. 32).

Addressing the matter of one-to-one ABA Training it appears that on a number of occasions expressed concerns over the one-to-one aide's ABA training. had requested ABA be stopped and expressed belief that 's aide was not trained appropriately.

provided training suggestions for 's aide. In of indicated that the 1:1 aide

working with must be trained by a trainer with over 500 hours one-to-one ABA Discrete Trial Experience (P

Ex G) and later at IEP meeting on made other training suggestions. (S Ex. 32)

State Law has no requirements which specify the training that must be provided to an aide and there are no requirements under

Public School's procedures other than a requirement that aides be high school graduates (Tr. 163-164).

was hired as an one-to-one aide for . was at first temporary and then given full time employment on . (Tr. pg. 262). received training by the classroom teacher at the beginning of the school year and by autism specialists both as a substitute and upon going to full time status. (Tr. 262-264) Coworkers who had experience in autism expressed opinion that was adequately trained (Tr. pg. 125-128, 218, 264).

Beginning approximately (disability service coordinator, regional program) provided training to . Training began while was a substitute assistant and continuing on after became a full time employee on (Tr. pg. 262, 263).

provided at least 30 hours of ABA training to up until when took

over and then provided additional training. Even after: took over went over to make checks on a daily basis. (Tr. pg. 264)

Public Schools Director of Special Education, testified did not state should not be doing one-to-one with (Tr. pg. 137). testified that was sufficiently and appropriately trained. did additionally indicated was ready and prepared and that the school planned to continue training as training was an ongoing process. (Tr. pg. 125, 126)

. Regional Disabilities Service Coordinator, provided training to assistants and teachers who deliver ABA instruction. (Tr. pg. 254-256) has provided services to and worked with

(Tr. pg. 260). provided classroom training to beginning on the of
when was a substitute assistant and continued training after became a permanent
employee. (Tr. pg. 262) provided some daily but undefined amount (as maintained no records) of
training prior to , then ten hours in the week of , and then thirty hours after that
week until took over with .

testified that the training received was sufficient to train as an aide/assistant to provide ABA Services (Tr. pg. 264). 's training was to be ongoing and discussed this with testified that, "There is always a need for change with the individual children, dependent upon their needs (Tr. pg. 264)

holds a Master's Degree in Special Education and has 28 years experience in
the area of autism. has taught autistic children and taught classes at University training teachers to
work with autistic children. received training in the area of Applied Behavioral Analysis and was involved
with building ABA/Discrete Trial Training/Lovass programs for Area schools (Tr. pg. 193)
testified that there is no specific Virginia licensure in autism nor in ABA. (Tr. pg. 187-189)

also testified that never stated to that 's aide was not trained or that the ABA had not been provided (Tr. pg. 221, 222)

began involvement with in 20 '-20 school year attending multiple IEP meetings from the 20 '-20 school year to the present school year and consulted with 's teachers for the same period (Tr. pg. 197, 198)

testified that believed had received adequate ABA training. (Tr. pg. 218) and confirmed that additional training in the classroom was provided to . (Tr. 303, 304)

had received training to keep notes and data sheets concerning ABA trials/data.(Tr. pg. 219-221) and testified that there was sufficient documentation to show whether was making progress.

created the data sheets that were used and maintained by and/or

These data sheets were in 's opinion appropriate and accurate (Tr. pg. 221).

testified to belief that ABA was being provided in the classroom and 's

IEP, as amended over the school year, was being implemented. (Tr. pg. 222) further indicated that there are

no standards for any on to deliver ABA and in some of the qualified nationally recognized programs there are

students with no training who are trained on site on an ongoing process. (Tr. pg. 214)

indicated also observed ABA being provided to in the REACH program and (teacher), and self had on occasion utilized ABA. (Tr. 275)

Evidence indicated that 's aide did receive ABA training when began working with and this training was of a continuing and an ongoing nature. The training was sufficient to comply with the requirements of the IEP's as they evolved over time. 's aide was not subject to state regulations as to training requirements and it is evident from the record that was provided training, assistance, and support.

's IEP's made provision for a one-to-one aide with ABA training. Under IDEA and its regulations the school is to provide special education and related services to a child with a disability as provided in the child's IEP. A school is in violation of IDEA if it fails to implement substantial or significant provisions of the IEP. (Houston Independent School District v. Bobby R., 200 F. 3d 341, 349 (5th Cir. 2000) However,

Public Schools did not fail to implement substantial or significant portions of the IEP.

Evidence at hearing indicated that there was adequate training of the aide and there was provision of ABA (by the aide, by the child's teacher, by , and by) consistent with provisions of the IEP's as the IEP's developed over time. Given this finding and in light of the finding set forth in "B" below, compensatory ABA therapy is not appropriate and outside services for the provision of ABA therapy is not required.

B.

WHETHER

WAS PROVIDED A FREE, APPROPRIATE, PUBLIC EDUCATION.

A "Free Appropriate Public Education" (FAPE) means special education and related services that:

- 1. Are provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge;
- 2. Meet the standards of the Virginia Board of Education;
- 3. Include preschool, elementary school, middle school or secondary school education in the state;

and

 Are provided in conformity with an individualized education program (see Regulations Governing Special Education Programs for Children with Disabilities in Virginia; 8 VAC 20-80-10)

Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District et al v. Rowley, 458 U.S.

176 (1982) provides a two prong test to determine the appropriateness of the education being provided the child. First, whether the school system has complied with the procedures of the IDEA; and second, whether the child's IEP is reasonably calculated to enable the child to receive educational benefit. Under the IDEA, a "free appropriate education" consists of educational instruction specially designed to meet the unique needs of the handicapped child, supported by such services as are necessary to permit the child to benefit from the instruction. White et al. v. School Board of Henrico County, 2001, 549 S.E.2d 16, 36 Va. App.137.

The "free appropriate public education" requirement of the IDEA is satisfied by "providing personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit the child to benefit educationally from that instruction."

Board of Education v. Rowley, 458 U.S. 176, 188 (1982).

holds licensure in Early Childhood Special Education and was 's teacher in

REACH class in the 20 -20 school year. class had a maximum of eleven students in the class and the

class is staffed with one teacher and two classroom aides plus 's one-to-one aide. (Tr. pg. 282) Around the

Break () stopped attending class. testified that was

making progress this year.

testified conducted probe testing and conducted measurements both in the school and home setting and concluded was making progress in this school year and in prior school years

(Tr. page 203-208) documented ABA Progress for (S Ex. 35) and indicated made progress in the areas of imitation skills, identify objects, labeling, the use of picture exchange, gross motor imitation, and in the use of action with objects and interaction with toys. improved in ability to put puzzles together, sort big and little, matching letters, catching balls, and was improving in other skills. 's fine motor skills and gross motor skills had greatly improved. Following one step directions had improved and use of tactile materials and tactile activities had improved. (Tr. 204-206)

also testified was making progress noting that on was unable to stay within the circle at school. got up and wandered but progressed to working with teacher and with the other students within the circle time. (Tr. pg. 271, 272)

has seen a lot of progress with and interaction with the other children (referring not to spontaneous interactions but interactions/opportunities set up for). has continued picture exchange skills from last year but there have been added things to the book used. indicated definitely was making progress towards. IEP goals and objectives for the 20 -20 school year. (Tr. pg. 294)

A free appropriate public education does not require that the child receive the best education possible but requires that the child receive a "basic floor of opportunity" and that it is reasonably calculated to offer a child educational benefit. <u>Board of Education v. Rowley</u>, 458 U.S. 176, (1982).

The Virginia Supreme Court further provided that the education to which access is provided must be sufficient to confer some educational benefit on the handicapped child. School Board of Campbell County v. Beasley, 238 Va. 44 (1989) (emphasis added)

The evidence indicates
Public Schools has proven that it has offered a n appropriate

education to
and has demonstrate that the proposed program of special education and related services

was reasonably calculated to afford and did afford educational benefit.

IEP was developed with the

direct and meaningful input of the parents and other IEP team members. There were a number of occasions in

which the parents asked for meetings to make amendments to the IEP and the IEP committee was convened to

address parental concerns.

's IEP was amended a number of instances at the parents request.

The IEP team devoted significant time and effort to its development. The IEP included the opinions of school officials, parents, and other professionals who were involved with . These individuals have a direct and personal knowledge of needs, requirements, and progress and significant weight is given their educational opinions.

CONCLUSIONS:

- 1. Public Schools has the burden of proof as to provision of FAPE and has carried the burden. Public Schools have provided FAPE was provided to . Additionally, the school has provided adequate training to 's aide and has provided ABA Therapy with a 1:1 aide as described in 's IEP's for the times at issue.
- 2. The parents initiated due process and raised the issue of aide training and the provisions of ABA services and they bear the burden of proving their case as to these provision. see <u>Spielberg v. Henrico County Public Schools</u>, 853 F.2d 256(4th Cir. 1988), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 1016 (1989) The parents have not met their burden as to provision of ABA services and as to allegations concerning aide training
 - 3. The requirements of notice to the parents were satisfied.
 - 4. has a disability.
 - needs special education and related services.

- 6. The LEA is providing a free appropriate public education ("FAPE").
- 7. Compensatory ABA services are not required as is being provided FAPE.

RIGHT OF APPEAL:

This decision is final and binding unless appealed by a party in a state circuit court within one year of this decision's issuance date, or in a federal district court.

20			
date:			
	-	7 44 100	

Copies of this Report and Decision reported this date to:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.