This is a redacted version of the original decision. Select details have been removed from the decision to preserve the 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 No. 32787-25-26

Child's Name:
C.K.

Date of Birth:
[redacted]

Parent(s):
[redacted]

Counsel for Parent(s):
Hattie Dougherty, Esq. and Brandi Suter, Esq.
Extraordinary Law, LLC
PO Box 291
Ingomar, PA 15127

Local Education Agency:
Pennsylvania Leadership Charter School
1001 Commerce Drive
Cheswick, PA 15024

Counsel for the LEA:
Kimberly Colonna, Esq.
McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC
PO Box 1166, 100 Pine Street
Harrisburg, PA 17108

Hearing Officer:
Savannah L. Murphy, Esq.

Date of Decision:
07/15/2026

Introduction

The present matter concerns C.K. (hereinafter referred to as "Student[1]"), a [redacted] grade Student currently enrolled within the Pennsylvania Leadership Charter School (hereinafter referred to as "Charter School"). Parents brought forth claims under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act[2] (IDEA). Student is eligible for special education services under the disability category of Multiple Disabilities. Students currently receives full time Life Skills Support with Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Orientation and Mobility Support, and Vision Support.

Due to disputes regarding the implementation of nursing services at Student's school district of residence (hereinafter referred to as "Home District"), Parent enrolled Student at Charter School in January of 2026. On January 30, 2026, Charter School issued a Notice of Recommended Educational Placement (NOREP) for Full-Time Life Skills Support with comparable services from Student's December 2025 IEP. Parent rejected the January 30, 2026 NOREP. On February 27, 2026, Charter School issued a proposed IEP and NOREP offering Full-Time Life Skills with Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Orientation and Mobility Support, and Vision Support.

On March 17, 2026, Parents filed a Due Process Complaint, rejecting District's February 27, 2026 NOREP. Parents' Complaint requested an order finding that the Charter School failed to timely enroll Student; failed to provide a comparable program upon enrollment; failed to provide Student with related services; failed to provide Student with appropriate instruction time; that the Charter School is unable to provide Student FAPE; a

[1] This Decision will be made available to the public. Therefore, the final published version of this decision has been redacted for the purpose of concealing the Student's personally identifiable information. 34 C.F.R § 1513(d). 20 U.S.C. § 1415 (h)(4)(A); 34 C.F.R § 300.513(d)(2).

[2] 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400-1482, implementing federal regulations 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.1-300.818, and applicable Pennsylvania regulations in 22 Pa. Code §§14.101-14.163.

comparable program to Student's last agreed upon placement that meets the needs of Student and; compensatory education for the time Student was denied FAPE.

Following two hearing sessions, a complete review of the record[3], and for all reasons set forth below, I find in favor of Charter School, in part, and Parent, in part.

Issues Presented

The issues presented for adjudication in this matter are:

1. Whether Charter School denied Student a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) From January 14, 2026 until such time Student receives an appropriate program.
   a. Whether Student received comparable services when transferred to Charter School.
2. If so, Whether Student must be prospectively placed at an approved private school.
3. If so, whether Student is entitled to compensatory education for the from January 14, 2026 until such time Student receives an appropriate program.

Joint Stipulation of Facts

During the Hearing session on May 20, 2026, testimony included Student's attendance between August 2025 and December 8, 2025. On the record, the Parties discussed the submission of an additional Joint Exhibit and Stipulation of Facts to supplement the testimony. On June 3, 2026, the Parties jointly submitted Additional Fact Stipulation and Joint Exhibit 18. The following findings of fact have been transferred directly from the Joint

[3] On July 1, 2026, after timely receipt of written closing statements from the parties, Charter School filed a Motion to Exclude Untimely Evidence arguing that Parent's use of citations from PDE's website and Parent's use of anecdotal phrases regarding events that occurred after the conclusion of the hearing in their written closing should be excluded as untimely disclosed. Written Closings submitted by the Parties are not evidence. This Hearing Officer carefully reviewed the record and will only reference that which is relevant within.

Additional Fact Stipulation to this Decision and were only changed for formatting purposes or to protect the identity of Student.

1. Documentation related to [Student's] absences at the prior District was provided to [Charter School] and is submitted here as proposed Joint Exhibit 18.
2. Because the [S]tudent's absences prior to December 5, 2025 were excused by [Home District], [Charter School] concluded that those absences did not disqualify the [S]tudent from transferring to [Charter School].

Findings of Fact

I have reviewed the record in its entirety. The following Findings of Fact and subsequent Discussion and Application of Law and Fact will only address that which is relevant to the instant matter.

Background Facts

1. Student has a significant medical history. Some of Student's diagnoses include [redacted], cognitive delay, Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), [redacted]. (J-1 at 10, 22-23; S-1 at 2-4; N.T. at 269-70).
2. Student attended their Home District of residence from the 2024-2025 school year until January of 2026. (S-1 at 12).
3. Student was last evaluated by Student's Home District on December 12, 2024. (2024 RR). The ER contains Student's medical history, Parent input, teacher input, input from related service providers, a review of records, observations, cognitive assessment, academic assessment, and adaptive behavior rating scales (S-1).
    a. Prior to the issuance of the 2024 RR, Student did not have previous aptitude or achievement testing. (S-1 at 4).

b. According to Teacher input, Student was able to identify letters, but not letter sounds. Student was able to draw a large circle, and almost an "X", but could not draw other shapes or letters. Student's academic achievement was limited. (S-1 at 4-5).
c. The 2024 RR contains brief input from Physical Therapy, Speech and Language, Vision, O&M, and OT providers. No new formal testing was completed by any related service provider in the 2024 RR. (S-1 at 5-10).
d. According to Speech and Language input, a language sampling and analysis, speech intelligibility sampling and analysis, observations and Parent and Teacher input was collected to provide updated present level information. Student used a Voice Output Communication Aid (VOCA) device that was provided by outpatient speech therapy. Student's speech was not always intelligible, and Student was encouraged to use the VOCA device to assist in speech communication. Overall, Student demonstrated receptive, expressive, and articulation deficits. (S-1 at 5-7).
e. In November of 2024, a functional low vision evaluation was completed to assess Student's functional vision. The functional low vision assessment determined that Student qualifies for visual support and meets criteria as a student with visual impairment. Student demonstrated significant difficulty with visual efficiency, visual novelty, systemic visual scanning, particularly in unfamiliar environments. (S-1 at 8-9).
f. As part of the 2024 RR, Student was observed to participate in an activity with another student. Student was given a first-next-last and a categorization activity. Overall, Student was responsive to simple directives, and was actively engaged with the teacher, but inconsistently completed most tasks correctly. (S-1 at 15).

g. The Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence, Fourth Edition (WPPSI-IV) was used to assess Student's cognitive ability. Overall, Student received a Full-Scale Score of 64, which is in the extremely low range. (S-1 at 16).
h. The Wechsler Individual Achievement Test – Fourth Edition (WIAT-4) was used to assess Student's academic achievement. Student received an average score in word reading because [student] was able to identify 23 of 26 letters. However, Student received low scores in Math and Listening comprehension. (S-1 at 16-17).
i. The Bracken Concept Scale was used to assess Student's school readiness. Student received scores in the very delayed range in School Readiness, Self-Social Awareness, and Receptive School Readiness Composite. (S-1 at 18).
j. Student's teacher and Parent completed the Adaptive Behavior Assessment System (ABAS-III) rating scales to assess Student's adaptive behavior. Parent rated Student in the extremely low range in all areas. Overall, Student's teacher rated Student in the low to extremely low range in all composite areas. (S-1 at 18-20).
k. The 2024 ER determined that Student was eligible for special education under the disability category of Multiple Disabilities. Prior to the issuance of the 2024 RR, Student was eligible for special education under the disability categories of Vision Impairment and Multiple Disabilities. (S-1 at 12, 21).
l. Student's needs were identified as follows: pre-reading, math, social skills, vision needs in locating information and visual targets, low vision compensatory skills, visual efficiency, reduce visual fatigue, visual memory and landmarks, visual scanning, spatial awareness, fine motor skills, and visual motor skills. (S-1 at 22).

m. Recommendations included, curriculum adaptations, peer and adult models, visual and verbal cues, small group instructions, opportunities for repeated practice, verbal praise, visual learning manipulatives, structure and routines, multi-sensory approach to learning, adaptive equipment and technology, and extended time. (S-1 at 23).

4. Student's most recent IEP prior to Student's transfer to Charter School was dated December 17, 2025. Student received Full-Time Multiple Disabilities Support with Speech and Language Therapy, Vision Services, Orientation and Mobility Services, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Specialized Transportation, and individual nursing support, including during transportation. (J-1 at 11, 59, 70-71).
5. Due to Student's unique medical needs, Student received nursing support during the day and during transportation. Due to transportation and nursing support issues, Student was often unable to attend school during the 2024-2025 and first half of the 2025-2026 school year. (J-1 at 11, 59). Parent cared for Student on the days Student could not attend school. (N.T. at 317).
6. Nursing services included but was not limited to [redacted]. (J-1 at 24, 59; N.T. at 278).
7. Student required individualized transportation with a lift van to and from school. (J-1 at 59).
8. Student received Physical Therapy (PT) for 180 minutes per month to address Student's limited motor function. (J-1 at 12, 59). Student was transported in [a mobility aid] which was used for longer distances. However, Student was able to walk short distances, when closely observed. (J-1 at 12; S-1 at 5).
9. Due to Student's ocular deficiencies, Student received Vision Therapy in a group setting 4 times per month for 45-minute sessions. Student

required items to be placed midline, large print materials, high contract materials, reduce of visual cluster, a line guide for reading, and response time for visual latency. (J-1 at 13, 59).

10. Student received Orientation and Mobility (O&M) services individually 4 times per month for 30-minute sessions. Student's mobility decreased on days when arthritis symptoms are present. Student used a [redacted] when walking and was able to navigate familiar spaces with support. Due to Student's vision needs, Student has increased difficulty navigating an unfamiliar space. (J-1 at 14, 59).
11. Student received Speech and Language support individually for 100 minutes per month and in a group for 180 minutes per month to address articulation, expressive, and receptive language needs. Student's preferred mode of communication is oral speech, use of the VOCA , and non-verbal communication such as gestures and facial expressions. (J-1 at 17, 59).
12. Student received Occupational Therapy (OT) individually for 180 minutes per month to address fine and visual-motor skills. Student was able to engage a zipper with assistance and manipulate snaps with minimal assistance. (J-1 at 20, 59).
13. In November of 2025, after an Assistive Technology consultation was completed, it was recommended that a trial of TouchChat with WordPower continue to supplement Student's verbal communication. (J-1 at 21).
14. Student was not permitted to attend school on days a nurse was unavailable. (J-1 at 24).
15. Student is described as kind-hearted, engaged, with no major behavioral concerns. However, Student had difficulty expressing feelings and would scream or hit when frustrated. (J-1 at 27-28).
16. Student's annual IEP goals listed in the December 2025 IEP include:

a. When given an object or picture of an object that is a CVC word, Student will identify the letter or letter sound at the beginning, middle, and end of the word with an average of 100% for beginning, 80% for ending, and 60% for middle sounds. Baseline: 43% average, 72% beginning, 51% ending, and 34% middle. (J-1 at 38).
b. Student will accurately read 20 common primer sight words when presented in isolation or within simple sentences with at least 80% accuracy. Baseline: 10% accuracy. (J-1 at 40).
c. Given real coins ore visual representations, Student will correctly identify and state the value of a penny, nickel, dime, quarter, and one dollar bill with at least 80% accuracy. Baseline: 0% accuracy. (J-1 at 42).
d. When given a large group of items, up to 25, and the directive to count out a stated number of objects, up to 20, Student will count out only the desired amount of objects with 80% accuracy. Baseline: 20% accuracy. (J-1 at 43).
e. Visual Goal: Given verbal or visual prompts and a structured visual task, Student will identify the appropriate low-vision strategy for systematic scanning in 3 of 5 opportunities with 100% accuracy. Baseline: Student located and identified 5 items near working environment. (J-1 at 44).
f. O&M goal: Student will demonstrate two basic [redacted] techniques in 3 of 5 opportunities. Baseline was Student located 3 landmarks in the school and identified environmental signage on 5 routes. (J-1 at 46).
g. Physical Therapy goal: Student will stand on the BOSU Ball, positioned upside down, independently for 10 minutes while

catching and throwing a variety of items in 4 of 4 trials. Baseline: 5 minutes (J-1 at 47).

h. Speech and Language goal: given verbal directions and visual supports, Student will demonstrate understanding of spatial concepts by accurately identifying or manipulating objects in response to directions with 80% accuracy. Baseline: 50% accuracy. (J-1 at 49).

i. Speech and Language goal: Student will increase expressive sentence complexity and grammatical accuracy by producing spoken sentences that include appropriate grammatical markers to clearly describe pictures or answer simple wh-questions with 75% accuracy. Baseline: 40% accuracy for verb tense, 40% accuracy for plural -s, and 50% accuracy for pronoun use. (J-1 at 51).

j. OT goal: Given a slant board and tabletop writing surface, Student will increase visual motor-integration and fine motor control to independently write name within a 1-inch designed writing space in 4 of 5 letters. Baseline: 4 of 5 letters within larger boxes. (J-1 at 53).

k. OT goal: Student will independently engage and pull up a zipper on a coat in 2 of 3 opportunities. Baseline: Student required moderate assistance. (J-1 at 55).

17. According to the December 2025 IEP, Student's SDIs included use of a slant board, [redacted], large print materials, access to VOCA device, explicit sentence expansion, 1:1 instruction when presenting new skills, and small group instruction when practicing targeted IEP skills. (J-1 at 57-58).

18. Parents approved Student's home District's recommendation of full-time Multi-Disabilities Support with related services on January 6, 2026. (J-2).

19. Student did not attend school within the home District since December 5, 2025 due to discrepancies regarding nursing orders. (J-3 at 1). These issues along with inconsistent transportation and nursing availability led to Parents' decision to enroll Student at Charter School. (N.T. at 273-76).
20. On January 7, 2026, Student's doctors issued a letter recommending that Student receive RN/LPN skilled nursing services 8 hours per night, 7 nights a week, and 9.5 hours per day on school days for school accompaniment, including transportation and on non-school days to cover Parent's work schedules. (P-1 at 1; N.T at 271-73).

Student's Enrollment: January 2026

21. Parents sought enrollment of Student to Charter School on January 7, 2026. (J-9 at 7; S-4 at 1-3).
22. According to Student's attendance records, Student's absences from December 5, 2025 were not marked as excused. This discrepancy delayed Student's enrollment. (J-4 at 1-9, S-3 at 1, 3-6; N.T. at 184-86; N.T. at 281-82).
23. By January 22, 2026, the Charter School confirmed with Student's Home District that all absences had been excused. Charter School continued to finalize Student's enrollment and orientation scheduling. (J-4 at 10).
24. On January 26, 2026 Parent completed all enrollment paperwork required by Charter School. (S-5).
25. Charter School began to enroll Student into Life Skills classes on January 27, 2026. (J-6 at 1,3; S-6; N.T. at 192). Student began classes on February 2, 2026. (J-9 at 7; S-6).
26. On January 30, 2026, Charter School issued a Notice of Recommended Educational Placement (NOREP). Charter School recommended that Student's receive full-time Life Skills Support, with comparable services from Student's December 2025 IEP. Within 45-60 days, Charter School

would develop a new IEP for the remainder of the school year. (J-8 at 1-2). Parents rejected the NOREP because Charter School did not offer the same level of support from Student's December 2025 IEP. (J-8 at 3; N.T. at 290-91).

Charter School's Proposed Program: February 2026 IEP

27. Charter School drafted an IEP for Student on February 27, 2026. (J-9).
28. Student was enrolled in the following courses and related services: Life Skills Social Studies/ Science, Life Skills Language Arts, Life Skills Math, Life Skills 1, Life Skills Support, Adaptive Art, Speech and Language Therapy, OT, PT, O&M Support, and Vision Support. Student also had the opportunity to observe a general education course, and participate in Health, Safety, and PE. (J-9 at 7).
29. Student's classes are in a small-group with about approximately 3 other students. (N.T. at 132).
30. The February 2026 IEP contains information from Student's December 2024 RR, December 2025 IEP, updated benchmark testing, and teacher input. (J-9 at 7-14).
31. As of February 2026, Student's Speech and Language, OT, PT, Vision Support, and O&M support providers were not yet available and had not started with Student. (S-7).
32. Parent requested nursing services during the school day. Charter School disagreed with Student's need for nursing services within the cyber environment. (J-9 at 27; N.T. at 167-69, 195-96).
33. Parents expressed concern regarding Student's ability to navigate classwork in the cyber environment. Charter School offered 1:1 instruction three times per week, and a monthly meeting with Parent and case manager. (J-9 at 27, J-11; N.T. at 106-08).
34. Student's areas of need were identified as pre-reading skills, functional math skills, visual efficiency, systematic visual scanning, gross motor

skills, expressive and receptive language, fine motor skills, visual motor skills, and social skills. (J-9 at 23-24).

35. Student's annual IEP goals were adapted as follows:
    a. When given a picture of an object that is a CVC word, Student will identify the letter or letter sound that the word begins 8 of 10 occurrences, middle sounds in 6 of 10 occurrences, and ending sound in 6 of 10 occurrences. A baseline was to be determined. (J-9 at 32).
    b. When given 20 words from the Dolch Sight word Primer list, Student will read 18 of 20 words. Baseline was to be determined. (J-9 at 34).
    c. Given a pattern to match every other week, Student will place 8 items in order. Baseline was to be determined. (J-9 at 36).
    d. When given visual representation of objects to count, up to 25, Student will correctly count 20 items on 3 of 4 probes. Baseline was to be determined. (J-9 at 38).
    e. Student's Vision Support, O&M, PT, Speech and Language, and OT goals would be drafted within the first 3 sessions with Student. (J-9 at 40-44; N.T. at 103).
36. The February 2026 IEP listed SDIs for Student including modified adapted curriculum based on instructional level, individual instruction to support IEP goals, small group instruction in life skills courses, extended time, daily schedule of virtual lessons and support lessons, a life skills kit, high contract materials, solid black background for educational materials, large print text, and a monthly meeting between Student's case manager and Parents. (J-9 at 45-46).
37. February 2026 IEP offered Student Vision Services once a week for 45 minutes, O&M once per week for 30-minute sessions, PT, once per week

for 45 minutes, Individual Speech and Language Therapy for 75 minutes per week, and OT once a week for 45 minutes. (J-9 at 47).

38. Charter School issued a NOREP on February 27, 2026, recommending Full-Time Life Skills with the proposed related services, and determined that Student was eligible for Extended School Year (ESY) services. (J-9 at 52; J-10; N.T. at 224-25).

39. Charter School provided Student with a Touchscreen Laptop to assist with Student's completion of virtual classwork. (J-12). The touch screen enabled Student to follow along with class by tracing. (N.T. at 69).

40. Student's schedule included one synchronous social studies / science, math, language arts, and life skills class per week for 30 minutes, one synchronous adaptive art class every other week for 30 minutes, three 1:1 support sessions per week for 30 minutes. (J-13; N.T. at 111). The remainder of Student's education was asynchronous. (N.T.at 53-54, 58, 76).

41. Virtual assignments are provided daily in each core subject with step-by-step instructions, typically based on one of the curriculum or support tools utilized by Charter School. Each assignment is expected to take 20 to 30 minutes. (P-3, P-4, P-5, P-7, P-8, P-9, P-10; N.T. at 59, 64, 66, 74, 119). Parent indicated that Student completed some assignments in about 5 minutes. (N.T. at 300, 303-04).

42. Student timely completed organized and accurate asynchronous work in most occasions. (N.T. at 82).

43. If a student had difficulty with an asynchronous assignment, the teacher offered individualized support during office hours or another scheduled time to review the assignment with the student. (N.T. at 76-77, 84-85,).

44. Student and Student's case manager work on Student's IEP goals and progress monitoring during the scheduled 1:1 sessions (N.T at 97, 136-38).

45. Charter School emphasizes the role of the parent/guardian learning coach. Charter School requires that each student have a learning coach, who is a designated adult, with them during the virtual school day to assist with completion of assignments. The Learning Coach's duty depends on the needs of a student. (J-14 at 13; S-5 at 7; N.T at 107, 169-70, 175, 292).

46. Parent signed Charter School's enrollment agreement that specifically acknowledged review of Charter School's Expectations of the Parent/Guardian, Attendance Policy, and Instructional Property/ Acceptable Use Policy. (S-5 at 8-9; N.T. at 190-91).

47. Parent assists Student with logging into and attending synchronous virtual classes, and in assignment completion for both synchronous and asynchronous lessons. (N.T. at 293-94). Student had difficulty logging into and navigating the lessons. (N.T. at 297-98, 301, 330).

48. Charter School utilized the following curriculums and support tools: ABC Mouse, TeachTown, Raz-Plus, Get Epic (a book library), IXL, BoomCards, SplashLearn, and Edmark. (J-15 at 1; S-11; S-12; S-13; S-14; S-15; S-16; S-17; S-18; N.T at 56-57, 63, 70-71, 81, 99-100, 122, 156-57, 208-09, 212-16, 230-336). Student received instruction at the lowest level. (N.T. at 100, 146).

March 2026- May 2026

49. When related service goals were finalized with the related service provider, Charter School sought written permission form Parent to implement the related service goals. (N.T. at 110, 127).

50. Student's Speech and Language Therapy started on March 5, 2026, and was provided in person. (S-7 at 1).

51. Student' Speech and Language annual IEP goals were developed as follows:

    a. Student will increase expressive sentence complexity and grammatical accuracy by producing spoken sentences that include appropriate grammatical markers to clearly describe pictures of answer simple wh- questions in 8 of 10 trials. (S-7 at 4). Baseline: 3 of 10 trials. (S-20 at 3).

    b. Student will demonstrate understanding of spatial concepts by accurately identifying or manipulating objects in response to directions in 8 of 10 trials. (S-7 at 4). Baseline: 5 of 10 trials. (S-20 at 3).

    c. Student will demonstrate understanding and correct use of pronouns by accurately identifying pictures or objects in response to prompts in 8 of 10 trials. (S-7 at 4). Baseline: 3 of 10 trials. (S-20 at 4).

    d. While using the AAC device, Student will communicate feelings, wants, and needs in response to prompts in 8 of 10 trials. (S-7 at 4). Baseline: 5 of 10 trials. (S-20 at 4).

52. Student began in-person OT on March 13, 2026 (S-7 at 1,5). Student's OT annual IEP goals assessed Student's ability to ability to zipper a coat with 80% accuracy, and ability to print Student's name using uppercase letters in 5 of 5 letters using 1 inch boxes. (S-7 at 5).

53. On March 31, 2026, Charter School secured O&M services for Student. (P-2). Student's first in home O&M session was on April 24, 2026. (S-7 at 1, 6). An annual IEP goal had not yet been created. (S-7 at 6).

54. In home Vision Support began on April 24, 2026. (S-7 at 1, 7). An annual IEP goal had not yet been created. (S-7 at 6).

55. PT began for Student on April 7, 2026, offering virtual support. (S-7 at 1). A few PT sessions were not completed due to unavailability of the family. (S-7 at 2-3).
56. Student's progress report on annual IEP goals indicated progress in Student's identification of letter or letter sounds, ability to read 20 Dolch Sight Words, ability to place 8 items in pattern order, and ability to count 20 items. (J-15 at 2; S-20 at 1-2).
57. On May 7, 2026, the Charter School issued an offer to supplement missed related service minutes specifically including 360 minutes of PT, 300 minutes of Speech and Language Therapy, 180 minutes of OT, 270 minutes of O&M support, and 360 minutes of Vision support. (S-7 at 8; N.T. at 205-06).

Witness Credibility

Special education hearing officers must make credibility determinations of witnesses called to testify before them. I find that all witnesses called to testify did so credibly. All witnesses testified truthfully based on their understanding of the events relevant to this matter. Specifically, Student's teachers testified clearly regarding the format of their classes, and how virtual instruction is implemented within Charter School. Student's teachers also truthfully testified regarding their knowledge of Student's needs. However, Student's teachers had only been working with Student in a virtual setting since February of 2026. Similarly, Parent testified extensively regarding Student's educational history, medical diagnoses, and medical needs. However, inconsistent information was provided regarding the implementation of Charter School's program. Due weight was afforded to each witness.

Legal Principles

The Burden of Proof

In an administrative due process hearing, the burden of proof encompasses the burden of production and the burden of persuasion. The party seeking relief bears the burden of persuasion. *Schaffer v. Weast,* 546 U.S. 49, 62 (2005); *L.E. v. Ramsey Bd. of Educ*, 435 F.3d, 384, 392 (3rd Cir. 2006). Accordingly, the burden of persuasion rests with the filing party, in this case the Parents. For reasons set forth below, I find that Parents have not met their burden of persuasion regarding whether Student was offered comparable services, whether Charter school timely enrolled Student, whether Student is entitled to a prospective placement, and whether Student is entitled to compensatory education.

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

Children with disabilities are entitled a free and appropriate public education which provides them with special education and related services "designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living." 20 USC § 1400(d)(1)(A). Generally, FAPE must be afforded to all children with disabilities "between the ages of 3 and 21 inclusive." 20 U.S.C. §1412(a)(1)(A).

The IDEA requires the state to provide FAPE "to all children residing in the State." 20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(1)(A). FAPE requires an educational program that is "reasonably calculated to enable the child to receive educational benefits.'" *Endrew F. ex rel. Joseph F. v. Douglas Cty. Sch. Dist*, 137 S.Ct. 988, 995-96 (2017) (quoting *Bd. of Educ., Etc. v. Rowley*, 458 U.S. 176, 207). (1982). Further, a student receives FAPE when "personalized instruction is being provided with sufficient supportive services to permit the child to benefit from the instruction" the student is receiving FAPE. *Rowley*, 458 U.S. at 189.

FAPE requires specially designed instruction (SDI) that will assist the child. *Id*. at 201. The student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) must be designed to "enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum and meet each of the child's other educational needs…" 20 U.S.C § 1414(d)(1)(A)(i)(II). *Endrew* emphasized that the IEP "must be 'specially designed' to meet a child's 'unique needs' through an individualized education program.'" 137 S.Ct. at 999. *Endrew* rejected the "more than de minimis" test and instead requires the student to "have the chance to meet challenging objectives." *Id.* at 1000. Applying a "more than de minimis" standard to students with disabilities does not provide "education for all." *Id*. at 1001.

The IEP process is the "central vehicle" for collaboration regarding Student's needs and programming. *Schaffer*, 546 U.S. at 53. The IDEA's procedural safeguards protect and empower the parent in the IEP process. *Id*. The IDEA strongly supports and encourages parent participation in the IEP process. 22 U.S.C § 1400(c)(5)B,(d)(3); 22 U.S.C §1414(d); 34 C.F.R. § 300.322; *Endrew* 137 S.Ct. at 994, 999; *Rowley*, 458 U.S. a 208.

When a student transfers from one public school to another within the same state, the LEA shall provide FAPE to the student "including services comparable to those described in the previously held IEP, in consultation with the parents until such time as the [LEA] adopts the previously held IEP or develops, adopts, and implements a new IEP that is consistent with Federal and State law." 20 U.S.C § 1414(d)(1)(C)(i)(I); 34 C.F.R 300.323(e).

Evaluation Reports

To be appropriate, the evaluation must assess the student in "all areas of suspected disability." §1414(b)(1)(3)(C). In assessing the student's areas of suspected need, the evaluation report must contain

(A) a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional and developmental information, including information provided by the parent that may assist in determining (i) whether the child is a child with a disability, and (ii) the content of the child's [IEP], including information related to enabling the child to be involved and progress in the general education curriculum…

(B) not a single procedure or assessment as the sole criterion for determining whether a child is a child with a disability or determining an appropriate educational program for the child; and

(C) use of technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in additional to physical or developmental factors." § 1414(b)(2).

The assessments and evaluation materials must be administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel who administer the materials in accordance with instructions provided, must address all areas of suspected disability in a student, and must provide relevant information that directly contributes to the determination of the student's educational need. § 1414(b)(3).

A reevaluation report must also include existing data of the student, present levels of academic performance, identify additional data, if needed, and must assess whether the student continues to qualify for special education services, and whether the student's special education services require additions or modifications. §1414(c)(1). In cases where additional data is not required, the reevaluation must identify the reason and the right of the parent to request an assessment. §1414(c)(4).

Prospective Placement

Under the IDEA, an available remedy to address denial of FAPE includes publicly funded private school placements. *Forest Grove Sch. Dist*. v. T.A., 557 U.S. 230, 238 (2009). To determine whether a student is

entitled to a prospective private placement, the parent must meet all elements of the *Burlington-Carter* test established by the Supreme Court of the United States. *Forest Grove Sch Dist,* 557 U.S. at 246-47; *Florence County Sch. Dist Four v. Carter*, 510 U.S. 7, (1993); *Sch. Comm. Of Burlington v. Department of Ed. Of Mass*., 471 U.S. 359 (1985). The *Burling-Carter* test requires the Parent to prove that (1) the student's IEP is inappropriate; (2) the student demonstrates that the private placement is proper; and (3) the equities favor student's prospective placement. *Forest Grove Sch. Dist*., 557 U.S. at 246-47; *Lauren W. v. Deflaminis*, 480 F.3d 259, 276-78 (3rd Cir. 2007).

A private placement is proper if it "provides 'significant learning' and confers 'meaningful benefit'" and is "provided in the least restrictive environment." *Deflaminis*, 480 F.3d at 276 (internal citations omitted). A hearing officer must also examine all relevant factors to determine whether tuition costs to a private school at public expense are warranted. *Forest Grove Sch Dist,* 557 U.S. at 487. Factors include notice by the parent and a district's opportunity to evaluate the student. *Id*.

Compensatory Education

When a district "knows or should know" that their student has an insufficient IEP or is not receiving FAPE, that student is entitled to compensatory education. *M.C. v. Central Regional Sch. Dist*., 81 F.3d 389, 391-92 (1996). When there is a finding that a student has been denied FAPE, compensatory education is owed "for a period equal to the period of deprivation, excluding only the time reasonably required for the school district to rectify the problem." *Id*. at 392. Compensatory education stands for the principal that districts must "'belatedly pay expenses that [they] should have paid all along.'" *Id*. at 395 (*quoting Sch. Comm. Of Town of Burlington, Mass. v. Dep't of Educ. Of Mass*., 471 U.S. 359, 370-71 (1985)).

A parent is not responsible for supporting the cost of FAPE. *M.C.*, 81 F.3d at 395.

Discussion

Parents contend that Charter School denied Student a FAPE by (1) failure to timely enroll Student; (2) failure to provide comparable educational services; (3) failure to appropriately provide related services; (4) failure to appropriately provide academic instruction; and (6) failure to provide nursing services for Student. To remedy the alleged denial of FAPE, Parents request that Student be prospectively placed in an Approved Private School (APS) that can fully meet Student's needs and award compensatory education commensurate with the full period of denial. For the reasons extensively set forth herein, the record is preponderant that Charter School timely enrolled Student; Charter School offered comparable services to Student's December 2025 IEP; Student is not entitled to nursing services provided by Charter School; Student is not entitled to a prospective private placement; and Student is not entitled to compensatory education.

Student presents with unique and complex medical needs, that limit Student in almost every area of general functioning. For the 2024-2025 school year through January of 2026, Student attended bricks and mortar learning within Home District but accrued significant absences due to the unavailability of transportation and/or nursing support. (J-1 at 11, 24; J-4 at 1; S-1 at 12;N.T. at 378). Student had not received any educational instruction from December 5, 2025, until Student's completed enrollment at Charter School on February 2, 2026. (J-4 at 2-9, J-9 at 7; S-3 at 3-6; S-6; N.T. at 184-86; N.T. at 281-82).

Charter School promptly issued a NOREP offering comparable services in Student's December 2025 IEP (J-8). Parents rejected Charter School's recommendation. (J-8 at 3; N.T. at 290-91). Charter School, then, proposed their own IEP on February 27, 2026, offering full-time Life Skills with Speech

and Language Therapy, PT, OT. O&M Support and Vision Support, which was also rejected by Parents. (J-10; N.T. at 224-25). Parents filed for due process on March 17, 2026, about 7 weeks after Student was enrolled.

Therefore, record is premature and lacks comprehensive information regarding Student's specific educational needs. Pursuant to 34 C.F.R 300.502(d), the appropriate equitable remedy is an order for the completion of an Independent Educational Evaluation (IEE) at public expense, for the purpose of identifying what special education, related services, and supplementary aids and support Student requires to receive a FAPE.

Student's Transition to Charter School

Parents argue that Student was denied FAPE because Charter School untimely enrolled Student, and Charter School failed to offer a comparable program, as offered in Student's December 2025 IEP. Student had not attended bricks and mortar programming within Home District since December 5, 2026 due to discrepancies in the interpretation of nursing orders. (J-3 at 1; N.T. at 273-76). Prior to December 5, 2026, Student had 52 medically excused absences from October 2024 to June 2025, and 11 medically excused absences from August 2025 to November 2025. (J-4 at 1; J-18).

Pennsylvania prohibits a habitually truant student from transferring, during a school year, "to a cyber charter school unless a judge determined that the transfer is in the best interest of the child." 34 P.S. §13.1333(c.1). On January 14, 2026, Charter School learned that Student's Home School had not marked Student absences after December 5, 2026 as excused. (J-4 at 1). Charter School engaged in their due diligence to seek additional information regarding Student's attendance, to stay in compliance with Pennsylvania law.

Parents contend that they clarified the reason for Student's absence immediately. Therefore, the dispute should have been resolved, and Student

promptly enrolled. However, Student's Home District had not confirmed Student's absences as excused until January 22, 2026. (J-4 at 10). Whereas Parents made every effort to rectify Student's absences, it is not unreasonable for Charter School to confirm with Student's Home District. Had Student been deemed truant, Charter School could not have accepted Student. The delay of Student's enrollment was at no fault of Charter School or Parents. Student's completion of enrollment relied on the information from a third party.

Student began Charter School's onboarding process on January 28, 2026. (J-6 at 2). Charter School issued a NOREP on January 30, 2026 (J-8 at 3). Student began classes on February 2, 2026. (J-9 at 7; S-6). In light of the circumstances, after Student's enrollment requirements were completed, Charter School promptly enrolled Student. Therefore, Student's enrollment was timely.

Parents also contend that Charter School's offered program was not comparable to Student's December 2025 IEP. On January 30, 2026, Charter School issued a NOREP proposing "to accept [Student's] current IEP for 45-60 days and to provide comparable services as listed in the IEP." (J-8 at 2). Charter School offered Full-Time Life Skills (*Id*). According to Parents, Student's class schedule, offering two hours of synchronous classes a week and asynchronous instruction for the remainder of the week, and Student's related services were not comparable.

Student's December 2025 IEP offered Full-Time Multiple Disabilities Support with Speech and Language Therapy, Vision Service, O&M Services, PT, OT, Specialized Transportation, and individual nursing support. (J-1 at 1, 59, 70-71). In addition, Student received specially designed instruction including use of a slant board, [redacted], large print materials, access to VOCA device, explicit sentence expansion, 1:1 instruction when presenting

new skills, and small group instruction when practicing targeted IEP skills. (J-1 at 57-58).

Regarding academics, Parent argues that Charter School offered very little functional academic programming. In Student's December 2025 IEP, Student would receive 1:1 instruction when presenting new skills. (J-1 at 57-58). Student was enrolled in the following supports, courses and related services: Life Skills Social Studies/ Science, Life Skills Language Arts, Life Skills Math, Life Skills 1, Life Skills Support, Adaptive Art, Speech and Language Therapy, OT, Physical Therapy, O&M Support, and Vision Support, an opportunity a general education course, and participate in Health, Safety, and PE. (J-9 at 7). Student also received three 1:1 sessions with Student's case manager a week. (J-9 at 27; J-11; N.T. at 106-08).

Charter School's Life Skills classes contain about 4 students, and utilize a variety of curriculum and support tools to meet a student's needs. This includes ABC Mouse, TeachTown, Raz-Plus, Get Epic (a book library), IXL, BoomCards, SplashLearn, and Edmark. (J-15 at 1; S-11; S-12; S-13; S-14;S-15; S-16;S-17; S-18. N.T at 56-57, 63, 70-71, 81, 99-100, 122, 156-57, 208-09, 212-16, 230-336). Whereas Student was not enrolled within Full-Time Multi-Disabilities Support, the Charter School offered an academic program that functioned similarly. The only dispute is whether Student received functionally the same time of academic instruction as provided in the December 2025 Home District. However, Parents have not provided any information to indicate that what Student's schedule was at the Home District. The record shows that Charter School took the information provided to them and created a comparable program within their cyber educational environment.

Comparable does not mean identical, but rather similar. When evaluating whether Charter School's programming was comparable, it is important to recognize the distinction between Student's IEP developed in a

bricks and mortar setting versus a cyber program, which permits education to occur in the home. Yet, Parents' contentions fail to reasonably identify this key academic change in venue and expected the Charter School to implement the exact program as provided in Student's Home District.

Regarding Student's related services, the record indicates that Charter School offered comparable related services, which can be substantiated by a simple comparison of Student's December 2025 IEP and February 2026 IEP. First, Student received 30 minutes a week of O&M Support in both the December 2025 and February 2026 IEPs. (J-1 at 59; J-9 at 47). Student received 180 minutes a month (offered in the December 2025 IEP), which equates to 45 minutes a week of PT, which is offered in the February 2025 IEP. (*Id*.). Similarly, Student received 45 minutes a week of Vision Support and OT in both the December 2025 and February 2026 IEP. (*Id*.)

The only notable difference in the services is that PT has been offered virtually for Student by Charter School. However, Charter School has offered in-person services, once available. Also, Student's Speech and Language support was offered for 180 minutes group, and 100 minutes of individual support a month in the December 2025 IEP (J-1 at 59). The February 2026 IEP offered 75 minutes of Speech and Language a week, in the home, which is more time than offered in the December 2025 IEP. (J-9 at 47). This is a comparable service given the different venues in which the support is provided. Student is the only student in the home in need of this service, whereas at Home District, Student was in a physical school with other students. Therefore, Charter School's offer of related services is legally comparable.

However, Student did not receive any related service until March of 2026, after Charter School proposed the February 2026 IEP. (J-9; S-7 at 1). Charter School has made an appropriate offer to remedy Student's denial of related services. (S-7 at 8; N.T. at 205-06). Parents provided no evidence

suggesting Charter School's offer is not appropriate or incorrectly calculated minutes owed. Therefore, I find that Charter School's May 7, 2026 offer supplementing missed related service minutes is appropriate and remedies Student's denial of related services.

Finally, regarding nursing support, Parents contend that Charter School failed to offer nursing services and therefore failed to offer comparable services. According to Student's December 2025 IEP Student received nursing services which included [redacted]. (J-1 at 24, 59; N.T. at 278). Nursing support was also provided during transportation. (J-1 at 59). Charter School would not be expected to provide Student with specialized transportation with a lift van to and from school. Similarly, Charter School is not obligated to provide nursing support, because these services were specific to the bricks and mortar school setting. The primary purpose of nursing in Student's December 2025 IEP was to support Student's complex medical needs in the school building because Home District staff were not equipped to manage Student's needs, and Student required support beyond what a typical school nurse could offer.

The absence of nursing support often resulted in Student's absences from school during the 2024-2025 school year through Student's enrollment at Charter School. The December 2025 IEP specifically stated that in the event Student's nurse is unavailable, "the IEP team has determined that [Student] cannot safely attend school due to… medical needs." (J-1 at 24). Therefore, the record is clear that Student's nursing services were unique to bricks and mortar school attendance. Charter School offers cyber instruction. Student is home during instruction and is not transported to any physical location. The Charter School is not responsible to provide nursing services in Parents' home.

Overall, Student's enrollment within Charter School was timely, and based upon when all enrollment requirements were met. Charter School also

offered comparable services in light of Student's transition from a bricks and mortar learning environment to a cyber environment. Student's academic instruction was in a small-group setting with highly individualized supports and services, Student's related services are primarily offered in the home with comparable hours as offered in the December 2025 IEP, and Charter School is not required to offer educational services that were unique to the bricks and mortar learning environment, including nursing services.

Charter School's Proposed February 2026 IEP

It has been determined that Charter School offered comparable services to Student, as provided in Student's December 2025 IEP. However, it must also be determined whether Student's February 2026 IEP provides Student a FAPE. Student's educational record primarily consists of teacher and service provider input with anecdotal information and basic progress monitoring. The record is premature. Therefore, a comprehensive evaluation is necessary to provide Charter School sufficient information to develop a program for Student that meets Student's unique educational needs and provides Student a FAPE. Parents contend that Student's academic instruction is inappropriate because Student receives insufficient instruction time during the week, and Student requires research-based curriculums that support Student's unique needs.

Student was last evaluated on December 12, 2024 by Student's Home District. (S-1). The 2024 RR merely contained parent, teacher, and related service provider input, a minimally descriptive observation, the WPPSI-IV, scale of intelligence, the WIAT-4 individual achievement test, the Bracken Concept Scale, and ABAS-III rating scales. (*Id*). Student's Speech and Language "evaluation" only contained a language sampling and analysis, observations, and parent and teacher input. (S-1 at 5-7). A comprehensive Speech and Language evaluation does not exist in the record, which is concerning, given the complexity and severity of Student's communication

needs. Further, Student's functional low vision evaluation was last completed in November of 2024. (S-1 at 8-9). However, Student's needs have changed now that Student is in a virtual learning environment. Student's educational needs differ from that when Student was in bricks and mortar learning.

The record does not contain any evidence that Student's social-skills, sensory, PT, OT, O&M, communication, academic, executive functioning, or assistive technology needs have ever been comprehensively assessed. There is no data to suggest whether Student has difficulty to attend to task, or what functional level of instruction Student should receive. Student's December 2025 IEP largely adopts the information from the December 2024 RR with the addition of progress monitoring and anecdotal information. (J-1). Student's annual IEP goals suggest that Student was learning letter identification and sounds, premier sight words, counting money, and grouping items up to 25. (J-1 at 38-43).

For a Student with significant and unique needs, Student's December 2025 IEP lists minimal SDIs, mostly provided by related service providers, that give very little information regarding Student's supports and services within Home District. (J-1 at 57-58). Due to Students medical needs, Student was absent 63 times from October 2024 to December 2025. (J-4 at 1). Further, Student did not receive any education from December 5, 2025 until February 2, 2026. Student began instruction at Charter School without comprehensive information regarding Student's needs.

However, at the time of the due process hearing, the record lacked any indication that Charter School had proposed to evaluate Student. The February 2026 IEP indicated that Student's Home School issued a PTRE in December of 2025, and that Charter School "discussed that a reevaluation can be completed for [Student] if requested by the parent." (J-9 at 10). After review of Student's educational record, and due to Student's significant change in educational venue, Charter School had a legal obligation to

comprehensively reevaluate student, notwithstanding initial request from Parents.

Significant concerns have been raised by Parents regarding whether Student's instruction is appropriate and sufficient to meet Student's needs. A comprehensive evaluation would include observations of Student interacting with the curriculum and would determine whether Student's programming meets Student's unique needs, whether Student receives sufficient instruction, whether Student requires additional 1:1 support, whether Student's related services are appropriate, and generally whether Charter School can appropriately program for student.

For the reasons extensively discussed above, the record is premature and does not contain a comprehensive review of Student's unique needs, which is essential in the provision of FAPE. The appropriate equitable remedy is to order the completion of an IEE at public expense. 34 C.F.R. 300.502(d). The purpose of the IEE is to comprehensively assess Student in all areas of suspected disability including Student's Speech and Language, O&M, PT, OT, and Vision needs.

Student is Not Entitled to a Prospective Placement

For the reasons described above, a premature record prevents a full analysis to determine whether Student's February 2026 IEP provides Student a FAPE through the end of the 2025-2026 school year. However, even assuming that Parents can meet prong one of the *Burlington-Carter* Test, Parents failed to meet their burden of proof that an APS is appropriate, that the equities are in their favor, and that Charter School is required to fund tuition at an APS at public expense. *Forest Grove Sch. Dist.*, 557 U.S. at 246-47; *Deflaminis*, 480 F.3d at 276-78.

Parents contend that Student requires highly specialized curriculums, direct instruction, highly specialized therapies, and individualized programming, which the Charter School is unable to provide. This argument

fails because Parents have not given the Charter School any functional opportunity to program for Student. Within weeks of Student's enrollment, Parents filed for Due Process requesting Student be prospectively placed in an APS. As submitted, the evidence does not suggest that Charter School cannot provide a FAPE for Student.

Further Parents have not offered any evidence to suggest that an APS is appropriate for Student. Parents did not request placement at a specific APS, but rather an order for referrals to multiple APS programs. Parents have not offered any information about what placement is appropriate, what the supports and services are offered, and how that placement can meet Student's needs. Parents request a blank script to tour and research private schools at public expense. This not only fails to meet Parents' burden of proof for the second prong of the *Burlington-Carter* test, but this request is not equitable.

The Supreme Court requires a Hearing Officer to "consider all relevant factors" when evaluating the equity in ordering that a student be placed at an APS. *Forest Grove Sch Dist,* 557 U.S. at 487. This includes whether the LEA had an opportunity to evaluate, assess and address Student's needs. *Id*. The equities are in favor of the Charter School because Charter School has been unable to functionally work with Student, assess and address Student's needs. Parents have not identified an APS, or offered any input regarding how the APS can meet Student's needs. Therefore, Charter School has been denied any opportunity to compare programs and respond.

Therefore, Student is not entitled to a prospective placement at an APS. Parents have been unable to meet any prong the *Burlington-Carter* Test. Parents have failed to prove that an APS is appropriate. Parents offer an illusory APS with no specifics regarding programming, support, or services. Further, the equities weigh in great favor for the Charter School.

Therefore, Student is not entitled to a prospective placement at an APS at public expense.

Compensatory Education

For the reasons detailed above, Parents have failed to show, by preponderance of the evidence, that Student has been denied FAPE from January 14, 2026 through the 2025-2026 School year. Student is not entitled to compensatory education. The Charter School timely enrolled Student after all enrollment requirements were completed. Charter School is not at fault for Student's Home School's delay in confirming Student's medically excused absences from December 5, 2025, until Student's enrollment at Charter School. Further, Student's programming offered by the Charter School is comparable to Student's December 2025 IEP.

However, due to the circumstances of Student's medical needs, Student's transition to Charter School, and prompt filing of this Due Process Complaint, the record is premature. Whereas Charter School was legally obligated to offer a comprehensive evaluation of Student, regardless of Parental request, this denial of FAPE does not amount to compensatory education. The record does not support that the Charter School definitively denied Student a FAPE. Student's IEP would not have been completed until the end of the school year.

Finally, whereas Charter School failed to fully provide Student related services until the end of April 2026, Charter School has made an offer to supplement Student's missed related service minutes from Student's enrollment until the provision of the service started. This offer has been deemed appropriate. The Charter School does not owe compensatory education beyond the minutes offered to Parent on May 7, 2026. (S-7 at 8; N.T. at 205-06). For the foregoing reasons, Student is not owed compensatory education from January 14, 2026, though the end of the 2025-2026 school year.

Summary and Conclusions of Law

For the reasons set forth in the above Discussion and Application of Law and Fact, Charter School did not fail to timely enroll Student, and Charter School provided comparable services listed in Student's December 2025 IEP upon Student's transfer to Charter School. Student is not entitled to nursing services provided by Charter School because the nursing services were specific to the bricks and mortar setting. Even though Charter School failed to timely begin and provide related services to Student until the end of April 2026, Charter School offered to supplement missed related service minutes on May 7, 2026. Charter School's offer was appropriate, and further compensatory education is not owed.

Finally, the record is premature and lacks comprehensive and specific information and data regarding Student's unique educational needs. Therefore, pursuant to 34 C.F.R. 300.502(d), an IEE is an appropriate equitable remedy. An order of an IEE is purposed to assess Student's cognitive, academic, social-emotional, social skills, communication, PT, OT, O&M, vision, executive functioning, adaptive functioning, and assistive technology needs. The IEE is required to determine which special education, related service, and supplementary aids and services are appropriate to provide Student a FAPE. An appropriate Order follows.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 15th day of July, 2026 in accordance with the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Charter School did not fail to timely enroll Student;
2. Charter School's offered comparable services to Student upon enrollment, including related services, and Charter School's offer to supplement missed related service minutes is appropriate;

3. Student is not entitled to nursing support provided by Charter School;
4. Student is not entitled to a prospective private placement;
5. Student is not entitled to compensatory education;
6. The Charter School is ordered to provide an Independent Educational Evaluation at public expense for the purpose of determining Student's current educational needs and to assess what special education, related service, and supplementary aids and services Student requires to receive FAPE and;
7. The Parties shall agree in writing as to which evaluator or evaluators shall conduct the IEE or IEEs as required by this Order.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that any claim not specifically addressed in this Order is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED**. With issuance of this final decision, jurisdiction over this matter is hereby **RELINQUISHED**.



Savannah L. Murphy, Esquire.
Special Education Hearing Officer
ODR File Number 32787-25-26