COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA





	PUBLIC SCHOOLS Appellant)
)
v		}
")
	Respondent)
	APPELAT	E DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND NATURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

I adopt this section from the decision of the Hearing Officer below.

II. PROCEEDURAL HISTORY

I adopt this section from the decision of the Hearing Officer below and add the Public Schools timely appealed the following addition information. decision of the Hearing Officer below. After the appointment of this Appellate Review Officer on the (received both parties were contacted. A telephone conference was held on or about I where it was determined that is was in the best interest of the student to take additional evidence. After a mutual request for a continuance, which was granted, the evidentiary hearing was set for ... All parties and counsel appeared on that date, however neither to interpret the hearing for party had made arrangements for a Parties and counsel waited on that date while school personnel attempted to secure an interpreter so that could participate in the hearing. An interpreter

was not available. Counsel for and and requested a continuance until so that an interpreter could be secured. Said continuance was not objected to by the School and was granted because it was in the best interest of the student to participate.

The evidentiary hearing was held on Both parties presented closing arguments orally and Counsel for the School presented a supplemental written brief at the hearing in order to expedite the decision in this matter. This decision was due and rendered on

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

After a review of the hearing record and the record of the evidentiary hearing at the appellate level I adopt the findings of fact made by the Hearing Officer below. I also make the following findings of fact.

S	peech language clinician at	School in
testified regarding the se	ervices provided to	during during
year of chool. At best,	provide services to	once each
week. For the first quarter this v	was in a group setting and thereafter	r it was individual
services. (ATr. 10,11.) The indi	vidual sessions were missed four to	six times as a result
of sched	duling conflicts. (ATr. 36.)	also provided a
detailed description of the types	of services provided to	(ATr. 30.)
a certif	ied teacher of the and	for
Public Schools, testified	I that or another in place wo	ould have provided the
services specified on the	proposed IEP. Services were to	o include two hours
per day of assistance with one o	ther student. (ATr.63,64.) In deve	loping or assessing the
services to be provided to	did not talk wit	th educators from
where ha	d been most recently educated. (A'	Tr. 73,74.)
testified	briefly regarding recollections	of the services
provided by (AT	r. 94-96.)	

There was other testimony provided regarding performance and activities following the original hearing. They were inappropriate for consideration by this Appellate Hearing Officer in determining the correctness of the original Hearing Officer's decision because the original Hearing Officer was operating without this information and I am not expected to determine whether, in retrospect, the decision was correct.

IV. LEGAL DISCUSSION

I adopt the *excellent* legal discussion of the Hearing Officer below. None of the evidence presented at the additional evidentiary hearing and none of the legal arguments presented at the appellate level alter the correctness of analysis. Correctly focused on the plan to identify the academic shortcomings and the plan for other required area's of transition services.

V. ISSUES

I adopt the issues of the Hearing Officer below.

VI. CONCLUSION OF LAW AND FINAL ORDER

I fully adopt and uphold the Conclusions of Law and Final Order of the Hearing
Officer below.



