DOCKET NO. 040-SE-1017

| STUDENT, B/N/F PARENT, | § | BEFORE A SPECIAL EDUCATION |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Petitioner | § | |
| | § | |
| V. | § | HEARING OFFICER FOR |
| | § | |
| HUNTSVILLE INDEPENDENT | § | |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT, | § | |
| Respondent | § | THE STATE OF TEXAS |

DECISION OF THE HEARING OFFICER

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner, STUDENT, b/n/f PARENT ("Petitioner" or "Student) brings this action against the Huntsville Independent School District ("Respondent)," "the School District") under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C.1§§1-1482 (IDEA) and its implementing state and federal regulation has main issuse in this case are whether the School District failed to implement Student's Individual Education Plan (IEP) and Weerland Intervention Program (B)P, and whether the School District's proposed change in placement for Student's appropriate.

The hearing officer concludes at the School District implemented Student's IEP and BIP during the 2017-8 school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school placement of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement for Student implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement implementation of the school year and proposed an appropriate placement in the school year and proposed an appropriate placement in the school year and proposed an appropriate placement in the school year and year

for good cause at Petitioner's red Independent Educational Evaluation was continued to January 17, 20

Paula Maddox RoalsonIn addition,***, the School District's Director of Special Education, attended the hearing as Respondent's party representative

Both parties filed written closing arguments in a timely manner. The Decirsithnis case is due March 2018.

III. ISSUES

A. Petitioner's Issues

Petitioner confirmed the following IDEA issues for decision in this case:

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

- 1. Respondent has denied Student a FAPE by failing to implement Stultentsring the 2017-18 school year
- 2. Respondent has denied Student a FAPE by failing to implement Studentsring the 2017-18 school year
- 3. Respondent has denied Student a FAPE by failing to train School District staff on implementation of Student's BIP.

Placement

- 4. Respondent has violated the IDEA by changing Student's placement without parental consent.
- 5. Respondent has failed to educate Student in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Parental Participation

6. Respondent has denied Petitioner meaningful parental participation by failing to consider the input of Student's parent.

Respondent contended Petitioner knowingly and willingly released these claims, and **Iteus** furt litigation of those claims is outside of the jurisdiction of the hearing officer in this matter. Respondent's affirmative defense was granited Order No. 3 and Petitioner's claims were limited to those arising after August 7, 2017.

VI. FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. Student is *** year old*** Grade student in the School Districtudenthas difficulty staying focused and on take the school environment Studenthas an inability *** and demonstrates inappropriate types of behaviors Student's behaviors significantly affect Student's educational progress and social functioning. Student is eligible for special education services under the categor *** and Other Health Impairment (OHI) for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). The School District identified Students eligible for special education services in March of 2016.
- 2. Student displays a significant vel of distractibility impulsivity, ***. Student exhibits ***. Student's ***. Student has difficulty ** expressingStudent's emotions and difficulty with being flexible ***.
- 3. ***. Student's ability to acquire academic and social skills is negatively impacted by the frequency and nature these challenging behaviors. Student engages in these behaviors to avoid.38 Tw 12 -0 0 12tngavoitr***esbth **. [(S)-4(tSpan <)-2(o0 Tw [(S)-4(tSpan <)-2(o0

DOCKET NO.

- 10. A School DistrictBoard Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA) is assigned to Student's campus. The BCBA meets with staff working with Student on a daily basis to review Student's behavior and provide guidance to staff on implementation to staff but also meets weekly with the School District behavior coordinator to review Student's behavior and implementation of Student's BIP.
- 11. Student's*** behavior isreinforced when Student is ***. Student will continue to engage in the *** behaviors if engaging in the behaviors results in the Student successfully***. ²⁰
- 12. Student has been engaging in the *behaviors at school for ***. Through these behaviors, Studentas been successful in avoiding ***. Student will be *2**.
- 13. The School District has tried a variety of strategies provided many different supplemental services, topeet Student's needs and to address Student's behavior in the general education environment. The School District has attempted positive reinforcement, a token reward system teaching replacement behaviors. The School District has also provided Student with an inclusion special education teacher in the general education classroom, an educational assistant, frequent breaks during instruction, and reduced assignments and expectation addition, the School District contracted with an outside BCBAto conducta functional behavioral assessment (FBA) better understand Student's behavior. To date, these supplemental aids and intervention strategies have not resulted in a reduction in Student's **** behaviors.
- 14. To address Student'seeds, Student requires targeted interventions in ***, positive behavioral supports, counseling services, and positive school experiences dent requires counseling services to help Student to express student's feelings appropriately, to problem solve, to develop coping strategies and to student regular and consistent positive inforcement when Student appropriate behavior. Student services appropriate behavior.
- 15. Student reads below grade level. Studiest difficulty ***. 26

¹⁹ TR Vol. 1, p. 8587.

²⁰ R.Ex. 7, p. 3334.

²¹ R.Ex. 7, p. 3940.

²² R.Ex. 7, p. 3940; R.Ex. 13, p. 34; TR Vol. 1, p. 92.

²³ J.Ex. 1, p. 2021.

²⁴ P.Ex. 3. p. 31.

²⁵ P.Ex. 3, p. 32.

²⁶ R.Ex. 13, p. 24.

- 21. The *** Classroom is staffed with ***teacher and ***paraprofessionals and has a small number of student typically from ***. It is a highly structured environment with a focus on individual student behavior interventions and student academic deficits.
- 22. Student's Parentattended and participated in the, 2017 ARD committee meeting and a follow-up meeting on**, 2017. Her objections to Student's placement change were received and consider by the School District.

23.

Student's uniqueand complex needsproposed a program to educate Student in the least restrictive environment

DOCKET NO.

Student. The Fifth Circuit has articulated a four factor test to determine whether a Tsechesol district's program meets IDEA FAPE requirements. Those factors are:

•

preference favor of educating students with disabilities in general education settiting their nondisabled peers. However, if a school district cannot satisfactorily educate a student with a disability in the general education setting, then the school district may remove the student from the general education setting and place them in special education classed J.S.C. § 1412 (a)(5); 34 C.F.R. §300.114(a) (1) (2) (i) (ii). This requirement of the IDEA is referred to as a school district's obligation to educate a student in the least restrictive environment and the least restrictive environment and

To determine whether a school district is educating a student with a disability ib RE consideration must be given to:

- Whether the student with a disability can be satisfactorily educated in general education settings with the use of supplemental aids and separate
- If not, whether the school district mainstreamed the student to the maximum extent appropriate.

Daniel R.R. v. El Paso Ind. Sch. Dist., 874 F. 2d 1036, 1048 (5th. 1989).

D. Educating Student In General Education Settings with Supplemental Alis And Services

The determination of whethea student with a disability can be educated in general education settings requires examination of the nature and severity of the student's disability, the student's needs and abilities of the school distat's response to the student's needs.

This determination requires an examination of:

- a school district's efforts to provide the student with supplemental aids and services in the general education setting
- a school district's efforts to modify the general education curriculum to meet the student's individual needs;
- the educational benefit a student is receiving while placed in the general education setting; and