CASE CLOSURE SUMMARY REPORT

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

A.	E 22 12 18 18 18 18 18	
3745	RECEIVED	20110
and of	Complaints & Due Process	CHINE ES
, , , C	29.57.67	7

9	
School Division	Name of Parents
Name of Child	Date of Decision or Dismissal
Counsel Representing LEA	Counsel Representing Parent/Child
Party Initiating Hearing	Prevailing Party
Hearing Officer's Determination of Issue(s): WHITHER PETITIONER (PAREN	T) COULD CHALLENGE THE STUDENT IS
PLACEMENT AT THE	SCHOOL BY INITIATING A DUE PROCED
ILEARING	
Hearing Officer's Orders and Outcome of Hea	ring:
(ASE DISMISSED THE	PLACEMENT WAS A NON-EDUCATION
PLACEMENT INIATED BY	THE
"FAPT" DUT POT THE	
parties of their appeal rights in writing. The wr	g in accordance with regulations and have advised the ritten decision from this hearing is attached in which I to submit an implementation plan to the parties, the ar days.
Printed Name of Hearing Officer	Signature

VIRGINIA:





Petitioner,	3	
	— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,
v.		I
	SCHOOL BOARD	
)	
)

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DECISION

I. INTRODUCTION:

A. Background:

The undersigned was appointed by the Respondent, the

School Board (" ") to serve as the hearing officer with respect to a request for a

Due Process Hearing filed by Petitioner, concerning her

(Hereinafter the "student"). The student is sold and has been diagnosed with

Rett Syndrone and is severely limited in development.

By letter dated (Exhibit 1), Petitioner filed request for a Due Process

Hearing challenging the student's placement at the , a residential placement

facility and requested that the student be returned to the School in

County.

On

filed a "Motion and Memorandum In support of

School Board's Motion to Dismiss" ("Motion to Dismiss", Exhibit 2),

for the purpose of dismissing Petitioner's hearing request. The Motion is based on the following:

1), the residential placement was not made by

, but rather was the result of a non-

educational placement initiated by the

Family Assessment and Planning

Team ("FAPT"); therefore, Petitioner must challenge any placement through FAPT; 2), the Petitioner was committed to a state psychiatric facility pursuant to court ruling that was mentally incompetent to stand trial on a criminal matter. As a result, any legal proceeding initiated by Petitioner required the services of a fiduciary and no fiduciary initiated the hearing request on behalf of Petitioner; 3), Social Services and not the Petitioner has custody of the student and therefore Petitioner cannot initiate a Due Process Hearing.

B. The Record:

The Record in this matter consists of the following:

1. Hearing Request filed by Petitioner dated

1;

and received by

on

2. Letter from Petitioner to

dated

received by

on

- 3. Hearing Officer's Letter to Petitioner dated
- 4. Petitioner's letter to Hearing Officer dated
- 5. 's "Motion and Memorandum In support of

School Board's Motion to Dismiss," dated

, including 5 Attachments.

,;

C. ISSUE:

Whether Petitioner may challenge the student's placement at the by initiating a Due Process Hearing?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on the evidence presented in this matter, I find that:

- By Order dated , the Juvenile and Domestic

 Relations District Court placed the student in the custody of the

 Department of Social Services. As of the date of this Decision, no evidence has been submitted indicating that the Petitioner now has custody of the student.
- 2. On , Family Assessment and Planning
 Team ("FAPT") decided that the management of the case concerning the student be assigned to
 the Department of Social Services and that the student should be placed in the

 The FAPT was created pursuant to the Comprehensive Services Act for At-Risk Youth and
 Families, Va. Code §2.2-5200 et seq. Although is represented on the FAPT in
 accordance with Va. Code §2.2-5207, there is no evidence suggesting that is to
 be held accountable for a placement decision of the FAPT.
- 3. In making the non-educational placement determination, FAPT listed on the ARYFS Case Action Form³, under the heading "Qualification of Type of Services," that the student would receive residential special education services.
- 4. The determination of the FAPT issued on was clarified on to state that it was the intention to declare the "Qualification of Type of Services" for the student "as solely being Residential Foster Care." 4

Attachment 2 to Respondent's Motion to Dismiss

Attachment 1 to Respondent's Motion to Dismiss

4. On , Petitioner was found incompetent to stand trial on criminal charges and was placed in a State Hospital on an inpatient basis.⁵ Although Petitioner has communicated with the Hearing Officer by telephone and in writing (see Exhibit 4), no evidence has been submitted that there has been a change in Petitioner's status.

CONCLUSION

Based on the evidence, the student was not placed in the School by

as an educational placement, but rather, placement was the result of a determination
reached by the FAPT. The Petitioner must therefore utilize the applicable procedures in court if
wishes to challenge the placement decision. Also, the Petitioner was declared incompetent
by court order; consequently, any proceeding should have been initiated by a fiduciary pursuant
to Va. Code § 37.1-141. Furthermore, although not a determining factor here, it is noted that
based on the evidence, Petitioner does not have custody of the student, such being with the
Department of Social Services, who has not initiated this proceeding.

ORDER

For the reasons discussed above, it is hereby **ORDERED** that this matter is **DISMISSED**.

Attachment 1 to Respondent's Motion to Dismiss

APPEAL INFORMATION

This decision is 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.

Date Hearing Officer

⁵ Attachment 4 to Respondent's Motion to Dismiss