

This is a redacted version of the original decision. Select details have been removed from the decision to preserve anonymity of the student. The redactions do not affect the substance of the document.

Pennsylvania Special Education Due Process Hearing Officer Final Decision and Order

Closed Hearing

ODR File Number

24043-2021KE

Child's Name

Y. G.

Date of Birth

[redacted]

Parent

[redacted]

Counsel for Parent

Henry Young, Esquire
30 Cassatt Avenue
Berwyn, PA 19312

Local Educational Agency

Reading School District
800 Penn Street
Reading, PA 19601

Counsel for LEA

Jacqueline Lembeck, Esquire
10 Sentry Parkway – Suite 200
P.O. Box 3001
Blue Bell, PA 19422

Hearing Officer

Michael J. McElligott, Esquire

Date of Decision

01/31/2021

Introduction

This special education due process hearing concerns the educational rights of Y.G. ("student"), a student who resides in the Reading School District ("District").¹ The student is identified as a student who qualifies under the terms of the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Improvement Act of 2004 ("IDEIA")² as a student with a specific learning disability in reading and a health impairment (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, "ADHD"). The parties disagree over the student's programming and potential for identification of a specific learning disability in mathematics.

The student's parent claims in her complaint that the District denied the student a free appropriate public education ("FAPE") through various acts and omissions related to the student's attendance at the District from kindergarten (2017-2018 school year) through 3rd grade (2020-2021 school year). Analogously, the parent asserts these denial-of-FAPE claims under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, particularly Section 504 of that statute ("Section 504").³ Furthermore, the parent claims that the District acted with deliberate

¹ The generic use of "student", and avoidance of personal pronouns, are employed to protect the confidentiality of the student.

² It is this hearing officer's preference to cite to the pertinent federal implementing regulations of the IDEIA at 34 C.F.R. §§300.1-300.818. *See also* 22 PA Code §§14.101-14.162 ("Chapter 14").

³ It is this hearing officer's preference to cite to the pertinent federal implementing regulations of Section 504 at 34 C.F.R. §§104.1-104.61. *See also* 22 PA Code §§15.1-15.11 ("Chapter 15").

indifference toward the student's needs and, therefore, makes a claim for disability discrimination under Section 504.

The District counters that at all times it met its obligations to the student under IDEIA and Section 504. Accordingly, the District argues that the parent is not entitled to any remedy.

For reasons set forth below, I find in favor of the parent.

Issues⁴

1. Has the District provided the student with FAPE over the period student's 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grade school years?
2. Has the District treated the student with deliberate indifference, amounting to discrimination against the student on the basis of disability?
3. If either/both of the questions is/are answered in the affirmative what, if any, remedy is owed to the student?

⁴ A portion of the first evidentiary hearing on December 2, 2020 was related to fact-finding regarding whether parent "knew or should have known" (KOSHK) of the actions which formed the basis of her complaint at a point prior to August 2018, which was two years prior to the filing date of her complaint in August 2020. Thereafter, on December 11, 2020, the undersigned hearing officer issued a KOSHK ruling, finding that the parent knew or should have known, no later than June 2018, of the alleged actions/omissions in her complaint. Therefore, a denial-of-FAPE evidentiary record was developed as of August 2018, at the outset of the student's 1st grade year.

Findings of Fact

All evidence in the record, both exhibits and testimony, were considered. Specific evidentiary artifacts in findings of fact, however, are cited only as necessary to resolve the issue(s) presented. Consequently, all exhibits and all aspects of each witness's testimony are not explicitly referenced below.

Evaluation & IEP Chronology

1. In July 2017, the student was evaluated as part of the transition from early intervention services to kindergarten at the District. (School District Exhibit ["S"]-10).⁵
2. In June 2018, the student's individualized education program ("IEP") underwent its annual revision. The June 2018 IEP was in effect at the start of the student's 1st grade year (the 2018-2019 school year). (S-29, S-30).
3. In May 2019, at the end of 1st grade, the student's IEP underwent its annual revision. The May 2019 IEP was in effect at the start of the student's 2nd grade year (the 2019-2020 school year). (S-38, S-39).
4. In November 2019, in the fall of 2nd grade, the student was re-evaluated. (S-43).
5. In 2nd grade, the student's IEP was revised twice, once in December 2019 and once in February 2020. (S-49, S-55).

⁵ As part of the student's kindergarten programming in the 2017-2018 school year, the student had been identified with needs in speech and language (S&L). In December 2017, the student was re-evaluated for continued S&L services. It was determined that the student no longer required special education for S&L needs and was exited from S&L services. (S-21).

6. In 3rd grade, the student's IEP was revised twice, once in October 2020 and once in November 2020. (S-66, S-70).

Behavior

7. The student was diagnosed with ADHD by an outside agency and exhibited problematic behavior in early intervention. (S-10).
8. Once the student enrolled in the District, the student's behavior improved, and the student did not exhibit problematic behaviors. (S-29, S-38, S-48, S-54, S-65, S-69).
9. In every IEP in effect for 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grades, the IEP noted that the student's behavior did not impede the student's learning, or the learning of others. (S-29, S-38, S-48, S-54, S-65, S-69).
10. The June 2018 IEP, in effect for most of 2nd grade, contained an attention goal (the student would be re-directed with one verbal prompt). This goal area was mastered early in the school year, was noted as an area no longer of concern, and was removed in subsequent IEPs. (S-29, S-32, S-33, S-34; NT at 231-338).
11. The student's teachers, both regular education teachers and special education teachers, all testified that the student did not present any behavioral difficulties in working with the student. This testimony was consistent and credible, and was accorded heavy weight. (P-10; Notes of Testimony ["NT"] at 231-338, 345-407, 513-578, 630-678, 684-740, 745-786, 790-859).
12. The November 2019 re-evaluation report ("RR") contained behavioral ratings completed by both the student's teacher and the student's mother. Neither the teacher nor the student's mother rated

the student as clinically significant in any sub-test or composite index. (S-43).

13. Following the statewide closure of schools as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the District provided online instruction over the period March – June 2020. As of the date this record closed, the District had not yet returned to live instruction in the 2020-2021 school year. (Parent Exhibit [“P”]-1 at pages 30-35; S-57; NT at 169-218, 581-620).

14. At times in the spring of 2020 and the fall of 2020, the student would not log into the online learning environment. In November 2020, the student’s IEP was revised to add an attention goal and to add incentives to encourage the student to log into the environment, which increased the student’s engagement in the fall of 2021. (P-10; S-57, S-65 at pages 15, 26, S-69 at pages 14, 26; NT at 231-338, 345-407, 513-578, 684-740, 745-786, 790-859).

15. Parent requested that the student receive a 1:1 aide in the home environment to help the student attend to online instruction, or to receive in-person services, or services with an attendant, in a community-resource center. (NT at 169-218).

16. The student’s teachers testified credibly that once the student has logged into the online learning environment, the student is engaged with instruction. (NT at 231-338, 345-407, 513-578, 684-740, 745-786, 790-859).

17. The student’s difficulty in logging into the online learning environment is not related to the student’s identification as a student with a disability or the student’s special education programming. On

this record, it appears to be related to the dynamic of the home environment. (P-10, S-69 at page 14; NT at 169-218).

Reading

18. In the July 2017 re-evaluation report, the student was identified as a student with a specific learning disability in reading. (S-10).
19. The June 2018 IEP, in effect for the 1st grade year, contained one reading goal (sight-word recognition). (S-29).
20. On progress monitoring for this goal over the course of 1st grade, the student showed progress, identifying sight words at the pre-primer, primary, and 1st grade levels, progressively from 99 sight words identified, to 110, to 134. (S-29 at page 14, S-32, S-33, S-34).
21. On the District's regular education benchmark assessments over the course of 1st grade (with probes in the beginning, middle, and end of the school year), the student made progress on the oral reading fluency and nonsense word fluency sub-tests, as well as the reading composite. (P-2 at page 3).
22. The May 2019 IEP, in effect at the outset of 2nd grade, contained two reading goals (reading accuracy and retelling length/quality). (S-38 at pages 20-21).
23. In June 2019 and over August – October 2019 (the beginning of 2nd grade), the student made progress on the reading accuracy goal, progressing from 24 words with 85% accuracy to 37 words with 97% accuracy. The student made slight progress on the retelling goal, from

a 15-word retell with a quality of 1 to an 18-word retell with a quality of 1. (S-40, S-44).

24. As a result of the November 2019 re-evaluation, the student's IEP was revised in December 2019. (S-43, S-48).
25. The December 2019 IEP contained two reading goals, one revised (oral reading fluency) and one continued (retelling length/quality) from the previous IEP. (S-48 at pages 20-21).⁶
26. Over the course of December 2019 and January 2020, the student made progress on the oral reading fluency goal, increasing from 48 words read at 96% accuracy to 49/98%, to 63/98%, to 67/99%. The student made progress on the retelling goal, increasing from 9-word retell at a quality of 1, to 14-word/1, to 21-word/2, to 32-word/2. (S-52).
27. In February 2020, the student's IEP team met to revise specially-designed instruction in the student's IEP. The reading goals remained the same. (S-54).
28. On Monday, March 17, 2020, Pennsylvania schools were closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic and did not re-open for the remainder of the school year. The District did not obtain progress monitoring data in April 2020 or thereafter. (S-56; NT at 790-859).
29. On the District's regular education benchmark assessments in 2nd grade (with probes in the beginning and middle of the school year, prior to the school closure), the student made progress across all oral

⁶ Baseline data for the retelling goal, however, was re-calculated for passages at the 2nd grade level.

reading fluency sub-tests, as well as the reading composite. (P-2 at page 3, P-11 at pages 1-

30. In November 2020, in the fall of 3rd grade, the reading goals in the student's IEP were updated to reflect the student's progress, both in oral reading fluency and in retell length/quality. (S-69 at pages 24-25; P-15 at pages 4-5).

Mathematics

31. In July 2017, in the District's initial re-evaluation report anticipating the student's transition to kindergarten, the student's intellectual ability (from a private evaluation) was in the low-average range and in the average range on the District's cognitive testing. (S-10 at pages 3, 10-12).
32. The District also assessed the student's achievement, and the student showed deficits in number recognition, and ordering (along with general deficits across pre-academic skills). (S-10 at pages 12-13, 21).⁷
33. The student's first IEP in the District, in September 2017, included a goal for number recognition (including visual recognition, number writing, and counting), a goal on which the student made

⁷ The July 2017 RR was focused primarily with understanding the student's behavior needs, as acting-out and problematic behaviors were predominant in early intervention. As indicated above, however, these concerns largely evaporated in the educational environment at the District, and the student's needs/programming became more geared to academic concerns.

progress across all three aspects during kindergarten. (S-14 at page 14, S-18, S-25, S-26).⁸

34. On the District's regular education benchmark assessments over the course of kindergarten (with probes in the beginning and end of the school year), the student made progress on beginning quantity discrimination (moving from well-below-benchmark to below-benchmark), and number identification (moving from below-benchmark to at/above-benchmark). The student regressed in next number fluency (from below-benchmark to well-below-benchmark). (S-69 at page 10).
35. In the June 2018 IEP, in effect for the 1st grade year, the student's number recognition goal accounted for the student's progress and increased the range of the student's number recognition, number writing, and counting to the range of 1 – 110). (S-29 at page 15).
36. By January 2019, midway through 1st grade, the student had mastered all three aspects of the number recognition goal. The District did not revise or re-visit the student's mathematics goal at that time, waiting until May 2019 to re-visit the student's needs in mathematics. (S-33, S-34; NT at 169-218).
37. On the District's regular education benchmark assessments for 1st grade (with probes in the beginning and end of the school year), the student remained below-benchmark through the year in advanced quantity discrimination. The student regressed in missing number fluency (from at/above-benchmark to below-benchmark) and in

⁸ As set forth above, the KOSHK ruling does not allow for programming prior to June 2018 to be the basis of a claim by parent. Such evidence may, however, serve as a basis for gauging the District's understanding of the student's needs and programming.

computation (from below-benchmark to well-below-benchmark). (S-69 at page 10).

38. In the May 2019 IEP, in effect for 2nd grade, there was no goal or specially-designed instruction for mathematics. (S-38).
39. The student's regular education teachers in 2nd grade (the classroom teacher who had certain duties in mathematics assessment, and the mathematics teacher who worked with the student every day in mathematics) both testified that the student did not present any learning concerns in mathematics, but assessment data over 2nd grade indicates otherwise. The testimony of these teachers regarding the student's needs in mathematics in 2nd grade is accorded reduced weight. (NT at 345-407, 684-740).
40. On the District's regular education benchmark assessments for 2nd grade were markedly below benchmark. On the probe for the beginning of the school year, in September 2019, the student scored 50. On the mid-year probe, in January 2020, the student scored 38. While this scoring data is not contextualized on the record, it appears the benchmark performance is denoted by a wide range of three-digit scoring (e.g., the expected benchmark score for 3rd grade would range between 381-465). (P-18 at page 2; S-69 at page 10).
41. Over September 2019 – January 2020, the classroom teacher assessed the student in mathematics fourteen times on an irregular schedule. The scoring rubric contained four categories: > 90% correct, 75 – 89% correct [or "too few answers given"], < 75% correct [or "very few answers given"], or "incomplete session". The student completed every session. The student never received 90+ % correct. Four times, the student scored 75 – 89% or gave too few answers.

Ten times, the student scored below 75% or gave very few answers. (P-11 at pages 4-5, P-12).

42. The classroom teacher who performed these assessments did not share the results with the teacher instructing the student in mathematics. (NT at 345-407, 684-740).
43. The teacher instructing the student in mathematics was unaware that the student had previously had IEP goals in mathematics and did not review the student's annual regular education benchmark assessments in mathematics. (NT at 684-740).
44. In November 2019, as part of the District's re-evaluation of the student, cognitive and achievement testing revealed a statistically significant discrepancy between the student's cognitive ability (full-scale IQ 92) and standard scores in math fluency/addition (71) and math fluency/subtraction (80). (S-43 at pages 30-34).
45. The November 2019 RR recognized a need to increase the student's automaticity with addition and subtraction but did not recommend identifying the student with a learning disability in mathematics, or recommend specially designed instruction to address this need. (S-43 at pages 45-46, 49).
46. The December 2019 IEP failed to note the need to support automaticity in addition and subtraction and did not contain any goals or specially designed instruction in mathematics. (S-48).
47. The February 2020 IEP failed to note the need to support automaticity in addition and subtraction but was revised to include use of math flash cards or computer programs in regular education to increase math fluency. (S-54 at page 23).

48. As indicated above, in mid-March 2020 Pennsylvania schools closed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and did not re-open for the remainder of the school year. The student did not receive any IEP goal-driven instruction in mathematics.
49. In the current 2020-2021 school year, and at least through the time when the record closed in this matter, the District did not return to in-person instruction. (NT at 169-218, 581-620).
50. In early October 2020, in early 3rd grade, the student took the beginning probe for the District's regular education benchmark assessment. The student scored 48, with expected 3rd grade performance on this assessment at that point being between 381-465. (P-18 at page 2; S-69 at page 11).
51. In mid-October 2020, the student's IEP team met to address adding support for the student's math instruction. (S-65; NT at 513-578).
52. At the point the IEP team met, the student had taken two mathematics tests. On the first test, the student received a grade of 5%. On the second test, the student received a grade of 25%. (S-65 at page 13).
53. The October 2020 IEP again failed to note the need to support automaticity in addition and subtraction, did not contain a mathematics goal, and contained the same specially designed instruction in the form of flash-cards/computer-program. The IEP indicated that the student would receive "small group learning support services during virtual learning to help support (the student's) current math needs". But this was not reflected in the student's placement in the IEP. (S-65, quoted at page 13; NT at 513-578).

54. In November 2020, the student's IEP team met for the annual revision of the student's IEP. (S-69). In the mathematics curriculum the student was assessed with, and is being instructed in, the student is at the very first level of instruction, addition and subtraction. The student is working only with addition and, as of December 2020, had not moved onto subtraction. (S-69 at page 11; NT at 513-578).⁹
55. In the fall of 2020, the student's absences from the online environment were the most numerous in mathematics. The student's 3rd grade regular education and special education teachers opined that this was a reason for the student's low scores in mathematics. These opinions are accorded little weight where, as set forth below, the District has failed to provide necessary special education in mathematics for the student. (S-69; NT at 513-578, 745-786).¹⁰
56. The November 2020 IEP recognized as explicit needs basic math computation in addition and subtraction, and math problem-solving (S-69 at page 18).
57. The November 2020 IEP contains two mathematics goals (math computation/addition and math problem-solving) and added specially designed instruction in the form of direct, explicit instruction in mathematics in a special education setting. (S-69 at pages 25-26, 28; NT at 513-578).

⁹ The student achieved 4 correct out of 7 addition problems (57%) and 2 out of 13 subtraction problems (18%). (S-69 at page 11).

¹⁰ Indeed, it comes as no surprise to this hearing officer that the student is not enthusiastic about mathematics instruction since it has been faulty for multiple school years. See the *Discussion* section below.

Witness Credibility

All witnesses testified credibly and a degree of weight was accorded to each witness's testimony. Where particular emphasis was accorded to a witness's testimony on a particular issue or event, that is pointed out above in a specific finding of fact, as applicable.

Discussion

IDEIA/Denial-of-FAPE

The provision of special education to students with disabilities is governed by federal and Pennsylvania law. (34 C.F.R. §§300.1-300.818; 22 PA Code §§14.101-14.162). To assure that an eligible child receives FAPE (34 C.F.R. §300.17), an IEP must be reasonably calculated to yield meaningful educational benefit to the student. (Board of Education v. Rowley, 458 U.S. 176, 187-204 (1982)). 'Meaningful benefit' means that a student's program affords the student the opportunity for significant learning in light of his or her individual needs, not simply *de minimis* or minimal education progress. (Endrew F. ex rel. Joseph F. v. Douglas County School District, 580 U.S. , 137 S. Ct. 988, 197 L. Ed. 2d 335, (2017); Dunn v. Downingtown Area School District, 904 F.3d 208 (3d Cir. 2018)).

Here, the District provided FAPE to the student in the areas of behavior and reading. The record is very strong that the student has not exhibited problematic behaviors in the educational environment at the

District. It may have been a large concern in early intervention, and based on this was the focus of early special education programming at the District. But the student's behavior, on this record, has not been problematic at any point since the student came to the District. And any issues related to engagement with the pandemic-related online learning environment is unrelated to any student behavioral need and certainly does not require an aide to access the environment, or in-person attendance at a learning center.

Likewise, the District has provided FAPE to the student in addressing the student's needs in reading. These needs have been long-identified and from year to year, the student's progress in reading has been demonstrable and appropriate, through special education progress-monitoring and District regular education benchmark assessments.

The District has, however, denied the student FAPE in failing to identify and address the student's needs related to specific learning disabilities in mathematics, both in computation and in problem-solving. Initially, in kindergarten and early 1st grade, the District was addressing appropriately the student's fundamental need for number recognition, ordering, and counting. And by January 2019, midway through 1st grade, the student had mastered this number-sense foundation. But at that point, the District's attentiveness to the student's needs in mathematics ceased.

Rather than re-visit the student's potential needs in mathematics, the District simply treaded water from January 2019 – May 2019. With mastery of the number-sense goal, the District did nothing to evaluate and/or to program for potential additional needs in mathematics. And those needs were certainly there, as the student's benchmark scores in mathematics declined across the board by the end of 1st grade. One can draw no other conclusion than that the District simply stopped trying to understand the student's needs in mathematics and, moving forward with IEP development thereafter, mathematics was nowhere to be found for two years, until mathematics became part of the student's special education program (albeit not in a very robust way) in the February 2020 IEP.

But there were certainly signs that mathematics were a problem, and a significant problem, for the student. As just pointed out, by the end of 1st grade the student the student's mathematics performance had declined, ominously in math fluency (below-benchmark) and computation (well-below-benchmark). And these benchmark assessments continued to signal abysmal achievement in 2nd grade. But, apparently, no one was paying attention.

This lack of attentiveness and communication is evident in the testimony of the 2nd grade teachers who worked with the student in mathematics. The classroom teacher was assessing mathematics (with results largely falling into the lowest assessment range) but not sharing those results with the mathematics teacher. The mathematics teacher was

unaware of any of the student's history related to special education in mathematics, or the alarming benchmark assessment data.

In February 2020, the student's IEP finally included a flash-card/computer-program intervention outside of special education, and then the pandemic overtook the world. Benchmark assessment in October 2020, at the start of 3rd grade, again was extraordinarily low, as was the student's instructional performance in mathematics. By November 2020, the student's IEP included an explicit recognition of needs in math fluency, computation, and problem-solving, along with robust specially designed instruction, delivered daily by a special education teacher.

It is the considered opinion of this hearing officer that the District knew, or should have known, in February 2019 that goal master of the number-sense goal the month before was not the end of the story for the student's needs in mathematics and that it should have continued to explore the student's needs in mathematics, which (as ultimately resulted much too late) necessitated special education in math computation, math fluency, and math problem-solving. Accordingly, compensatory education will be awarded for a period from February 2019 through November 2020 when appropriate programming was put in place.

In sum, then, the District provided FAPE to the student in the areas of behavior and reading, and denied FAPE to the student in mathematics.

Section 504/Denial-of-FAPE

Section 504 and Chapter 15 also require that children with disabilities in Pennsylvania schools be provided with FAPE. (34 C.F.R. §104.33; 22 PA Code §15.1).¹¹ The provisions of IDEIA/Chapter 14 and related case law, in regards to providing FAPE, are more voluminous than those under Section 504 and Chapter 15, but the standards to judge the provision of FAPE are broadly analogous; in fact, the standards may even, in most cases, be considered to be identical for claims of denial-of-FAPE. (*See generally P.P. v. West Chester Area School District*, 585 F.3d 727 (3d Cir. 2009)).

Therefore, the foregoing analysis is adopted here— the District provided FAPE to the student in the areas of behavior and reading, and denied FAPE to the student in mathematics.

Section 504/Discrimination

Additionally, the provisions of Section 504 bar a school district from discriminating against a student on the basis of disability. (34 C.F.R. §104.4). A student with a disability who is otherwise qualified to participate in a school program, and was denied the benefits of the program or

¹¹ Pennsylvania's Chapter 14, at 22 PA Code §14.101, utilizes the term "student with a disability" for a student who qualifies under IDEIA/Chapter 14. Chapter 15, at 22 PA Code §15.2, utilizes the term "protected handicapped student" for a student who qualifies under Section 504/Chapter 15. For clarity and consistency in the decision, the term "student with a disability" will be used in the discussion of both statutory/regulatory frameworks.

otherwise discriminated against on the basis of disability, has been subject to disability discrimination in violation of Section 504 protections. (34 C.F.R. §104.4; S.H. v. Lower Merion School District, 729 F. 3d 248 (3d Cir. 2013)). A student who claims discrimination in violation of the obligations of Section 504 must show deliberate indifference on the part of the school district in its purported acts/omissions. (S.H., *id.*).

Here, the District did not act with deliberate indifference toward the student. Even though the District's programming in mathematics faltered to the point that it denied FAPE to the student, nothing on this record indicates that the District was deliberately indifferent to the student's needs and, ultimately, the District undertook the steps necessary to put in place an appropriate program.

Accordingly, the District has not discriminated against the student on the basis of the student's disability status.

Compensatory Education

Where a school district has denied FAPE to a student under the terms of IDEIA, compensatory education is an equitable remedy that is available to a student. (Lester H. v. Gilhool, 916 F.2d 865 (3d Cir. 1990); Big Beaver Falls Area Sch. Dist. v. Jackson, 615 A.2d 910 (Pa. Commonw. 1992)).

In this case, the District has denied the student a FAPE by not recognizing in February 2019 that even with goal mastery on foundational number-sense, the student still required ongoing special education in mathematics. From February 2019 through the entire next year of schooling,

through February 2020, the student went without necessary goal-driven, specially-designed instruction, and progress monitoring, for needs in multiple areas of mathematics. Even with the pandemic-related school closure in March 2020, the District still did not have in place appropriate special education programming in mathematics until November 2020.

Therefore, it is the considered opinion of this hearing officer that 200 hours of compensatory education is an equitable remedy for the denial of FAPE on this record.

As for the nature of the compensatory education award, the parent may decide in her sole discretion how the hours should be spent so long as those hours take the form of appropriate developmental, remedial, or enriching instruction or services that further the goals of the student's current or future IEPs, or identified educational needs. These hours must be in addition to any then-current IEP and may not be used to supplant an IEP. These hours may be employed after school, on weekends and/or during the summer months, at a time and place convenient for, and through providers who are convenient to, the student and the family. Nothing in this paragraph, however, should be read to limit the parties' ability to agree mutually and in writing as to any use of the compensatory education hours.

•

ORDER

In accord with the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set forth above, the Reading School District denied the student a free appropriate education by failing to appropriately address the student's needs in mathematics.

As of the date of this order, the student's identification profile at the Reading School District shall include an indication that, in addition to the student's already-identified areas of disability, the student has specific learning disabilities in mathematics computation and mathematics problem-solving. (22 PA Code §14.125(1)).

The student is awarded 200 hours of compensatory education.

Any claim not specifically addressed in this decision and order is denied and dismissed.

s/ Michael J. McElligott, Esquire

Michael J. McElligott, Esquire
Special Education Hearing Officer

01/31/2021