VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFICE OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES RECEIVED

POST HEARING REPORT

APR 10 2006

Dispute Resolution & Administrative Services

Public Schools	Administrative		
School Division	Parent		
Superintendent	Child		
, Esq.			
Counsel for School Division	Counsel for Parent/Child		
F. Mather Archer	Public Schools		
Hearing Officer	Party Initiating Hearing		
The Public Schools (PS) filed a Complaint requesting an expedited due process		
hearing to determine appropriate placement of a his disability category, and appropriate services all arising from his behavior problems since enrolling in Elementary School ().			
		ISSUES:	
1. Is 's placement in a	regular education class with special education support the		
appropriate placement for l	nim?		
2. Is 's current categor	y of Emotional Disturbance the correct category?		
PRELIMINARY MATTERS:			
EXHIBITS:			
The following exhibits were presented	by PS:		
As listed and indexed in black	notebook.		
The Parent presented no exhibits, but u	sed the PS exhibits for her purposes.		
OTHER MATTERS:			
Confusion existed regarding wi	ho served as parent for . PS carries Mrs.		
('s natural mother) as his parent.	's grandmother) stated that she was		
legal custodian of and had been	since some time in the 1990's. Early in the first day of		
the hearing, Mrs. , Mrs. and	walked out of the hearing; The hearing continued		
in their absence until on or about 1:00 l	PM, when, by previous arrangement made with me, PS		

counsel had to attend the hearing on in the Juvenile and Domestic Relations

District Court (District Court) filed by PS to enforce the parent's participation in this hearing.

The next day (Day 2 of the hearing) PS counsel reported that the District Court ordered

Mrs. and Mrs. to participate in the hearing. Mrs and failed to appear;

but Mrs. was present and served in loco parentis.

DECISION

SUMMARY OF THE CASE.

This case arose out of the difficulty the PS was having controlling 's misbehavior which was seriously interfering not only with his education, but with that of other children in his class as well. PS had little or no cooperation from Mrs. , the Parent. As a result, PS determined to change 's placement on the basis of his behavior.

The case was concluded on Day 2. is ordered to be placed in an interim alternative educational setting in a self-contained class for 45 days following the date of this decision.

Findings of Fact.

Having heard and observed the demeanor of the witnesses and considered the documentary evidence, I find the facts set out below.

- is a 10-year-old boy who is a child with a disability. was enrolled in Elementary School () on 6 September, 2005 in the 4th grade.
- 2. was previously enrolled in Elementary School (), where he was in a self-contained special education class. He was initially evaluated as developmentally delayed (DD) in 2002 when he was in kindergarten. He was placed in a self-contained class in November of 2002. In 2003, was enrolled in Elementary School where his category was changed to emotionally disturbed (ED) at the eligibility meeting, and he was placed in a self-contained special education classroom in the 2003 IEP. The Parent did not consent to that IEP because of the change to ED. After problems at , was transferred to a self-contained class at in April, 2004. (Tr 1, pp. 52-53; Tr II, pp. 147-149).
- At , 's IEP was changed to place him in a self-contained ED class
 at Elementary, but the Parent wanted him out of self-contained and out of

special education. So, he was put in a regular ed class, with a part-time breakout for special ed teaching in the ED self-contained class where he had been, under the '03 IEP. This was done to comply with the Parent's insistence, and to judge how would do. While Ms. was arranging for matriculation in , in April 2004, his mother was enrolling him in which could not provide a self-contained ED classroom. (Tr II, pp. 149-153)

- 4. Since the Parent did not consent to his being placed in self-contained as ED in the 2003 IEP, has had to operate under the category DD. In order to update his IEP for his new school, there were 2 IEP meetings on 9/15/05 and 12/19/05. The Parent consented to re-evaluation of The 9/15/05 meeting was a planning session for the triennial review in which the Parent gave permission for the assessments necessary for modification of the IEP. However, the Parent withdrew her consent and the evaluation has not been accomplished. (Exh D1-4, 9-11) (Tr 1, pp. 52-53; Tr II 153-156)
- 5. The 12/19/05 IEP meeting was changed to the 21st and held in the Parent's absence as she declined to attend. A functional behavior assessment (FBA) and a behavior intervention plan (BIP) were prepared for review. The team met and finalized the documents. However, the BIP was never implemented because Mrs. did not attend the meeting and withheld her consent to implementation of the BIP. Mrs agreed only to the school contracting with regarding his behaviors.

There was no effective change in 's behaviors and no support forthcoming from Mrs. In his placement in the general education class with special education through December made no satisfactory academic progress (Exhs D-5 through 11; M-4) (Tr 1, pp. 53, 58-62)

- 6. was placed in the general education setting with 45 minutes of special education services daily when deemed necessary. (Exh D-2)
- 7. 's misbehavior began manifesting itself on or about 9/13/05, consisting of misbehavior on the bus, running in the hall, kicking students, distracting other students, which steadily increased through January, 2006. (Exhs D, E, G)

has been given out-of-school suspensions on 6 occasions, and several inschool suspensions. (Exhs I, J, K)

8. Academically, has been failing in all his subjects, except in writing in which he received a "D" in the first quarter of the year. His academic progress has been declining since he enrolled in . (Exh F) (Tr 1, pp 80 - 81)

- 9. 's behavior interferes with his learning: he doesn't do his homework, refuses to do assignments, goes to sleep, doesn't complete assignments, for which his teacher and her helpers used various incentives and strategies to overcome the misbehaviors and keep him on task limiting his being a distraction to the other students in the class. (Tr 1, pp 82-87) (Exh M-3).
- 10. On 2/16/06 was denied recess time because of his behavior earlier in the day.

 He was to spend recess time in the office of the Assistant Principal, Mrs.

 objected and caused a conflict of an hour and a half with Mrs.

Mr. the teacher called in to help in the effort to keep in the office.

created an argument and altercation with the two adults of considerable proportions. The school security guard was called to quell his behavior, and needed to handcuff to subdue him. He continued to disrupt things and the security guard called police, one of whom went to 's home to bring his mother to the school. Eight adults were required to calm . His behavior for the hour and a half was of a child totally out of control. was suspended for 10 days.

(Tr 1, pp. 18-29, 31, 49) (Tr II, pp. 9-34; 39-44; 49-55; 60-64; (Exh L)

- 11. The incident on 2/16, resulted in the IEP meeting originally set for that day being rescheduled for 2/23. The purpose was to rewrite 's IEP because of the numerous incidents of 's misbehavior since his matriculation in , and to undertake a Manifestation Determination Review (MDR). Although she received the 2/17 notice of the meetings, Mrs declined to attend. The MDR, followed by the IEP meeting, proceeded in her absence. (Tr 1, pp. 18-19, 32-33; Exh D-13, 14).
- 12. The MDR team determined that 's behaviors are a manifestation of his disability. (Exh D-16, 17) (Tr 1, pp. 35
- 13. The IEP team concluded that 's appropriate placement was in a self-contained special education classroom, rather than in the general education classroom with special education support in which he had previously been placed. (Exh D-15)
- has not been re-evaluated since 12/9/03, and he is due for the Triennial Review. (Exh D-1)

Conclusions of Law.

's behaviors, during the course of the 2005 school year to the date of the request for a due process hearing, presents a trying time for and the school staff,

as well as a sad time. has literally failed in his schooling, and the due process hearing is an appropriate action. It is unfortunate that 's mother and grandmother and the school staff have been unable to communicate and cooperate with one another so as to foster his receiving the educational benefit with which his behavior has so drastically interfered.

Notwithstanding, all due notice has been given by PS to the Parent. is clearly a child with a disability, although the category is not clear. He is in dire need of special education and related services. PS has provided and is providing a free appropriate public education to the extent they can, given the obstructions that they face.

Issue 1:

Is 's placement in a regular education class with special education support services the appropriate placement for him?

While has been in a regular education class, even with sped support of 45 minutes a day, his academic progress since his matriculation in September, 2005, has decreased drastically to failing and his misbehavior has drastically increased. It has become obvious that his current placement is the most inappropriate placement for him. He needs a self-contained special education classroom for two clear reasons: he has not received educational benefit from the time he entered because of his disability and his behavior. And his behavior has gotten to the point that he has become a serious danger to himself, other students and school staff.

At this point, although the PS at have practically exhausted their strategies, supports, and supplementary aids and services, nevertheless, 's behavior has continued to worsen. To return him to the regular education class, with or without special education services, would be futile, and would simply be dangerous to and to others. It is clear that PS has demonstrated by substantial evidence that if were to remain in his general education classroom with special education support he would likely cause harm to himself and to other people. He came very close to that on 2/16/06.

Issue 2:

To date, has not been reevaluated since 2003. Consequently, there is considerable confusion in PS about his disability category. His current IEP (also dated 2003) used the ED category which (together with the self-contained class) caused the Parent to refuse to consent to that IEP. The school has continued to operate on the basis of the outdated DD category while trying to help improve. So, a reevaluation is a real necessity for clarification of his category of disability. If that is done, the appropriate placement of can be determined by

the IEP team, and a placement that is appropriate can be determined. In short, it is not known that the "current category of ED" is appropriate since the Parent has not permitted the PS to operate on that basis with ; but it is very clear that the DD category is inappropriate since that ended when completed his 9th year of age in May, 2005.

ORDER

It is accordingly ordered as follows:

will be placed in an interim alternative educational setting in a self-contained special education class at the earliest possible time, the setting to be determined by the IEP team, for a period of 45 days from the date of this decision;

PS shall provide a reevaluation of 's disability in order to, among other matters, determine the correct and appropriate category of his disability, and modify the 2/23/06 IEP as necessary; and

PS shall implement the IEP, as modified, and place in an appropriate placement; and

If the above cannot be accomplished within the 45 day period, a motion to extend the time for another 45 days or less may be filed in accordance with the regulations.

Hearing Officer

April 6, 2006

Cc:

parties & counsel

Virginia Department of Education.

NOTICE: This decision is final and binding unless it is appealed by either party to a state circuit court within one year following the date of this decision, or to a Federal district court within 90 days following the date of this decision.