

Special Education Due Process

Hearing Decision

"Bangor v. Parent"

February 7, 2000

CASE NO. #99.254

COUNSEL FOR THE PARENT: Parent represents self (parent is an attorney)

COUNSEL FOR SCHOOL: Peter Lowe

HEARING OFFICER: Stephen G. Ulman

THIS HEARING WAS HELD AND THE DECISION WRITTEN PURSUANT TO TITLE 20-A @ 7207, et. seq., 20 USC, @ 1415 et. seq., AND IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.

On November 23, 1999, the Department of Education received a request for a Due Process Hearing from the Bangor School Department (BSD).

The Pre-hearing Conference was conducted on January 12, 2000, by telephone conference call. The Hearing convened on January 18 & 19 & 25, 2000, in Bangor. All documents were entered into the record and numbered.

Eight witnesses gave testimony at the hearing. The Hearing was closed on January 25 except being held open for submission of written closing statements. The record was closed on February 2, 2000.

I. Preliminary Statement

The student was born dob and was adopted by her parents as an infant. PW-4 She first attended school in Bar Harbor and was identified as a student in need of special educational services early in her education because of issues around her language skills. PW-4 She was identified as Speech and Language or Learning Disabled at various times during her tenure at Bar Harbor. PW-4, SW-1 At the time she and her mother relocated to Bangor, the student was identified as, and receiving Individualized Educational Programming (IEP) for a Learning Disability (LD). PW-4, SW-1 Upon entering the Bangor School Department (BSD) she was re-identified as Speech and Language Disabled and an IEP was developed by BSD at that time. SW-1, PW-4 The IEP developed by BSD called for the student to compete in the regular educational classroom the majority of the time and she was grouped with the heterogeneous classroom grouping for 8th grade students in place at BSD. SW-1 The 8th grade year was successful and the student moved on to 9th grade with no remarkable difficulty. PW-4, SW-1

In 9th grade, BSD moves to a homogeneous grouping with approximately five levels of competitive difficulty from which students may chose. SW-1 The student choose, with the help of her parents and teachers, to compete in “College Level I” with support from a regular education support program called FOCUS. PW-4, SW-1 The FOCUS program is designed to provide extra study support for motivated college bound students who need additional help with organization and study skills. PW-4, SW-1 The student did reasonably well in the College Level I with FOCUS through the first semester, but began to have difficulty in the second semester, most noticeably from March 1999 until the end of the year. PW-4 The school was conducting the triennial assessments with the student and the parents were providing private tutoring at home. PW-4, SW-1 The student earned 5 and a fraction credits for the 9th grade year; however, she failed several semester and final examinations and received passing grades on the strength of her class participation and homework. PW-4, SW-1, S-29, P-9 In spite of these test taking difficulties, and parent known eating and sleeping problem, the mother wrote the school in the spring of 1999 thanking the school for their part in what the mother felt was a successful 9th grade year. PW-4, SW-1, S-27 The eating and sleeping problems were not reported to the school.

SW-1, PW-4

During the summer of 1999 the student attended, at parent expense, a summer program at Landmark School in Prides Crossing, Massachusetts. PW-4, PW-3, PW-1, PW-2 The Landmark School is for students who have a language based learning disability and provides small class size and individual help. PW-1, PW-2 The summer program was a success and both the students self confidence and the parents confidence in education were much improved at the beginning of the 1999-2000 school year. PW-1,2,3,4

The student returned to BSD in the fall of 1999 to begin her 10th grade year in the College I Group without the FOCUS program, which is only available to 9th grade students. PW-4, SW-1 She was also to receive some modification to the regular education program, which were outlined in her 1999-2000 school year IEP. PW-4, SW-1, S-25, S-31, S-43, S-44

In September of 1999 events happened quickly. After a few days of school it was clear to the parents that school was not going well for the student and that the IEP modifications to the regular education program were not enough, even with home tutoring, to provide the student with the needed support for her to be successful at BSD in her College Level I placement. PW-4, S-30 The parents notified the school and the school invited the parents to visit the school and monitor the resource room and other less competitive placements including College Level II classes. After their school visit the parents were concerned the resource room students were performing at a significantly lower level than their daughter and that many of the College Level II students were not well motivated. PW-4 The BSD Special Education Department also reconvened the Pupil Evaluation Team (PET) and additional testing was called for to see if the student qualified for programming as Learning Disabled. PW-4, SW-1, S-39, S-43

Because the parents and the school were concerned that reprogramming take place quickly, the testing was put on the fast track. SW-1, S-31

At the end of September 1999, after about 20 days of the school year had passed and before the PET had reviewed the additional testing, the parents became so concerned about their daughter that they unilaterally withdrew her from BSD and placed her at the Landmark School in Prides Crossing, Massachusetts. PW-4

The school continued with the PET process and developed a revised 1999-2000 IEP. SW-1, S-39, S-43, S-44, S-47, S-48

On November 23, 1999 the school filed for a Due Process Hearing, which was postponed due to school vacation, court appearances by the father, who is an attorney, and the father's severe case of the flu. SW-1, PW-3

II. Issue for Hearing

- Whether the student's Individual Education Plans (IEP) of IEP implemented 9/99 and November 18, 1999 were reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting.
- Whether the student's unilateral parental placement at the Landmark School was reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting.

If the hearing officer finds that the Landmark placement was not reasonably calculated to provide education benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting, it shall not be necessary to address additional issues.

- Whether the parents are entitled to any reasonable reimbursement for the costs associated with the Landmark placement.
- An assessment of the appropriate IEP for the student, which is reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting.

- **Finding of Fact and Stipulations**

Stipulations

- There are no residency issues.
- There are no special education eligibility issues.
- BSD will have Alice Frati available to give testimony.
- Documents will be accepted until close of work on Friday, January 14, 2000.

Page 5
#99.254

Facts

- The student is currently identified as Speech and Language Disabled.

SW-1

- The student transitioned from Mount Desert Island (MDI) with an Individualized Educational Program (IEP), which identified a Learning Disability (LD) as the handicapping condition. SW-1, S-5
- Bangor School Department (BSD) at the 10/6/97 IEP changed the identification to Speech and Language Impaired. SW-1, S-7
- The student does not show a significant difference between achievement and aptitude. SW-1, P-2 @ pg. 7
- The Bangor School Department's (BSD's) I.E.P. increased total per week special education time from the MDI I.E.P. SW-1, P-3, S-8
- Achievement testing was within the average range. SW-1
- The first evaluation at BSD did not reveal Learning Disability or Speech and Language difficulty. SW-1, S-17, S-18, S-19
- Later speech and language testing was done which qualified the student for identification as Speech and Language Impaired. SW-1, S-24, S-22, S-23
- The student received passing grades in regular classes with regular grading at BSD during the 8th (1997-98) grade. SW-1, S-9
- Achievement testing done in grade 8-showed achievement in the average range. SW-1, S-6
- The student was enrolled in the FOCUS Program in 9th grade, which provided college bound students with special study help. SW-1
- FOCUS is a program for highly motivated college bound level 1 students who need extra support in high school. PW-4
- BSD has several levels of competitiveness at the high school level. SW-1
- The student attended the Landmark 6-week summer program during 1999. PW-1
- There are different definitions of learning disabilities. Some more, some less restrictive. PW-1
- The student returned to Landmark Sept. 30, 1999. PW-1
- A definition of Landmark is found in the record at P-24. PW-1
- At Landmark the student received 45 minutes per day direct one on one tutorial. PW-2
- At Landmark the student class size is about 6 students. PW-2
- The student receives no speech and language therapy at Landmark, because Landmark does not feel the student needs speech and language therapy. PW-2
- The student should not take a foreign language until she can master English. PW-1, PW-2

Page 6
#99.254

- The student is doing well at Landmark both socially and academically. PW-1, PW-2, P-23-25
- All students at Landmark have special learning disabilities. PW-1, PW-2, P-24
- Landmark does not screen for speech and language therapy needs. PW-2

- Massachusetts has a “maximize potential” standard, which is higher standard than the national standard, which is “reasonably calculated to be of educational benefit”. PW-1, PW-2
- Instructional program at Bangor High School (BHS) consist of Advance Placement, Honors Classes, Level 1 College, Level 2 College, Level 3. SW-1
- College Level 1 includes FOCUS programming, which provides extra help for college bound students. SW-1
- The student was in College Level 1 with special help from the FOCUS program. SW-1
- The student earned 5 5/6 high school credits during her 9th grade year. SW-1, P-9
- The student earned 4 C’s and 1 B in the first semester of her 9th grade year. SW-1, S-29
- The student earned 3 C’s, 1 D, 1 B, and 1 A in the second semester of her 9th grade year. SW-1, S-29
- The student’s disability makes it difficult for her to recall information needed to be successful in semester testing. SW-1
- The student scored poorly on several semester examinations, but was able to earn passing grades because of her classroom and homework performance. SW-1
- When the student moved from middle to high school she moved from heterogeneous to homogeneous grouping, which made her classes more competitive. SW-1
- When the students total testing scores for the past three years are plotted on a bell curve 129 scores were between 0 and minus 1.5 standard deviation (SD) below the mean, 8 were below 1.5 SD and 8 above OSD. SW-1, S-49
- Most of the student’s scores were between -.5 & -.75 SD below the mean, which indicates she should be successful in regular education College Level 2 with special education support. SW-1
- The student needs extra time and help reading, testing, a calculator for math and resource room support for testing. SW-1
- The student’s mother wrote at the end of 9th grade thanking the school for helping the student have a successful 9th grade year. SW-1, S-27
- Following the student’s attendance at the Landmark summer program, the student’s mother wrote asking for another PET early in the 10th grade year (1999-2000). SW-1, S-30

Page 7
#99.254

- At the parents request (September 16, 1999) a PET notice was sent September 17, 1999 and a PET was held September 22, 1999. SW-1, S-30, S-31
- At the September 22, 1999 PET the school asked for additional evaluations prior to planning interventions. SW-1, S-31

- A Psycho-Educational Evaluation was done September 27, 1999. SW-1, S-32
- The student chose four level 1 and one level 2 classes for her 10th grade year. SW-1, S-33
- This was changed by the PET process to include a level 2 math class. SW-1, S-34
- The student attended BHS for about 20 days prior to being placed by her parents at Landmark in late September 1999. SW-1
- At the time the student was placed at Landmark by her parents, she was expected to have a successful 10th grade year at BHS by her BHS teachers given accommodations in some classes. SW-1, S-35-38
- A PET was held November 3, 1999 in which new goals and objectives were designed and intensive intervention was recommended including 200 min. per day in resource room, 100 min. of speech therapy per week, and the evaluator was to continue as on consultant, these changes were made based on parents report of student stress and issues identified in the new evaluation, and to encourage the student to return to BHS. SW-1, S-43, S-32
- The IEP implemented fall of 1999 was too difficult for the student and the IEP proposed in November of 1999 was not challenging enough. SW-1
- BHS has many choices of classes and includes classes, which are appropriate for the student. SW-1
- The student has not received direct speech and language therapy at BHS. SW-1
- Students must be identified under one of the handicapping conditions to qualify for special education services. SW-1
- The student has dropped in scores in the last two years. SW-1
- Students with disabilities often drop in standard scores over time. SW-1
- The Metropolitan Achievement Test found the student to have dropped some points between her grade 4 and grade 8. SW-1, S1, S6
- The student may well qualify under the new regulations as SLD 3.11; however, information gained from a non-verbal test of intelligence would be necessary before the PET decides the issue. SW-1
- The Metropolitan Achievement Test placed the student at a score of 36.17 in the 8th grade, and 26.09 in the 9th grade. PW-3, S-1, S6
- The student received a lot of in class support at Bar Harbor. PW-4
- The student received 30 min. of speech therapy, resource room support for spelling and a classroom aide, who helped as needed. PW-4

Page 8
#99.254

- The student never saw a speech and language therapist all the time she was in BSD, but received monitoring and teacher consultation. PW-4
- The student's direct service received in BSD was study hall resource room support with homework and test taking support. PW-4
- The student received educational benefit from her 8th grade year at BSD. SW-1, PW-4
- The student was adopted as an infant. PW-4

- FOCUS is a program for highly motivated college bound level 1 students who need extra support in high school. PW-4
- The student's parents hired a tutor in both 8th and 9th grade to help at home with homework. PW-4
- The student's goals and objectives were filled out showing "teacher/clinician observation" however the student never saw the speech therapist. PW-4
- The parent will not return the student to BSD during the 99-00 school year. PW-4
- The parents will pay \$37,800 for the students' 99-00 school year. PW-4
- The BSD invited the parents to visit guidance, teams, and other programs during November of 1999 as a way reprogramming the student's 99-00 school year. PW-4, P61-62
- The student's mother did not mention the student's emotional difficulty at home to school personnel. PW-4
- The parents wrote letter of intent September 16, 1999. PW-4, P30
- The parents withdrew student September 29, 1999. PW-4
- A PET was held September 22, 1999, which did not offer an IEP, but scheduled additional testing. PW-4, S-31
- The school requested testing be done quickly after the letter from parents, which was written 9/16/99. SW-1, PW-4
- The testing was completed and the report written on 9/27/99. SW-2, S-32
- No significant discrepancy was found between the student's achievement and ability. SW-2, S-32 pg. 10
- The student had no FOCUS program in 10th grade. PW-4
- By September 1999 the parent had no confidence in the school ability to program for the student. PW-4
- The student has a language deficit which impacts on her overall performance. SW-2, S-32, PW-5
- Whenever language came into play it created difficulty for the student. SW-2

Page 9
#99.254

- A PET was held on November 3, 1999 and speech and language was reaffirmed as the handicapping condition. SW-2, S-43
- The special education consultant made class recommendation for regular education placement during the 1999-2000 school year. SW-2, S-48
- Level III classes are too low for the student. SW-2, S-48
- Level I and II English classes are too difficult and too fast paced. SW-3
- At no time has testing shown significant differences between ability and achievement. SW-2, P-2, S-32

- Based on the student's reading comprehension, unsupported regular class placement would not be appropriate. SW-2, P17 pg. 58
- The Bar Harbor record did not clearly document the identification decision. PW-5
- The student was showing adverse educational effect in May 1998. PW-5, S-12, S-15, S-20
- The student demonstrated a 1.5 SD in several sub tests on the 1999 triennials. S-19, PW-5, P2
- The three keys, adverse effect, cognitive, and achievement are needed to identify as LD and they were not available until 9/99. PW-5
- The student exhibits more difficulty than just speech and language because of the student's reading difficulty. PW-5
- The student's full scale I.Q. of 102 (3/18/96). PW-6, S-20 pg. 2
- The May 1999 IEP was not appropriate to support the student in the college level 1 or 2 at BHS. PW-6
- The student's standard scores dropped in most of the broad measures between 1996 and 1999. PW-6
- The 9/17/99 IEP called for individualized tutoring and instruction. PW-6

IV. Conclusion

It is the opinion of this hearing officer that two factors play a major role in creating the issues contested in this hearing. They are: 1) homogeneous versus heterogeneous student grouping and 2) the differences between the two educational standards of "education benefit in the least restrictive educational environment" and "maximizing student educational potential".

Throughout the first eight years of public education the student was competing in heterogeneous grouped classes. SW-1, PW-4 With all ability levels present a hard working student of average ability, with compensatory skills to help mediate

Page 10
#99.254

language based learning problems, could consistently compete in the average to above average range. In 9th grade the competition became much more competitive. SW-1 The student no longer had the non-college bound classmates, or even the reportedly less motivated College Level II student, to moderate the competitive level. In spite of this greatly increased competition the student successfully completed all 9th grade credits attempted with minimal modifications to the regular education program. PW-4, SW-1, S-28, S-13

The school is required by law and regulation MSER 11.1 to provide only the least amount of special education modification to the regular education program necessary to insure educational benefit. SW-1

The summer program at Landmark School once again changed both the competitiveness of the grouping and the level of support and educational modification provided. For the first time in her educational career the student was competing against and learning with students who have language based learning disabilities. Unlike the so-called “real world” where the student has an uphill struggle when competing against students with normal language skills, all the students at Landmark have the same or similar learning difficulties. When the educational standard is increased from “benefit” to “maximize potential” the change in the learning environment would be very significant. Class size at Landmark is smaller than BSD and Landmark provides a great deal more individual one on one support. PW-1,2,4, S-24

Parents do not have to consider Least Restrictive Educational Environment (LRE) when unilaterally placing a student. PW-3 Such is not the case for BSD, who must by law and regulation MSER 11.2 provide only that level of support necessary to provide educational benefit and progression toward graduation. SW-1

It can be argued at length whether Speech and Language Disorder or Learning Disabilities was the correct identification at any given time. It is clear in the record that sufficient documentation did not accompany the student at the time of transfer from Bar Harbor to BSD to make identification of LD. PW-5 It is possible that an LD identification could have been made under the November 1999 Special Education Regulation or even under the “old” regulation during the second semester of 1998-1999 school year. PW-5, S-12, S-15, S-20 The significance of such a reclassification from Speech and Language to LD is questionable because the student was clearly benefiting from her education and progressing toward graduation even though her special education intervention was minimal. SW-1, P-9

Page 11
#99.254

In the fall of 1999 the parents, and the student, had enjoyed a positive summer experience in a far more restrictive educational environment then BSD would be permitted by law and regulation to provide and although BSD was moving more quickly then regulations require to complete testing and consider programming changes, the parents placed the student at Landmark before the PET had an opportunity to modify the 1999-2000 IEP.

Issue #1

Whether the student's Individual Education Plans, IEP's implemented 9/99 and November 18, 1999 reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting?

The IEP which was developed and amended for the 1999-2000 school year is reasonably calculated to be of benefit based on past school performance of the student. Certainly the BSD could have predicted some of the student's difficulties, however, educational benefit is a moving target and the BSD had made regular education modifications with FOCUS and was acting responsively to changing educational needs in 10th grade. Unlike unilateral parental placement at Landmark the BSD must always provide its intervention in the least restrictive educational placement.

Issue #2

Whether the student's unilateral parental placement at the Landmark School was reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting.

The unilateral parental placement at Landmark certainly provides education benefit, even maximized potential, however, the Landmark placement is a far more restrictive placement than called for in the 1999-2000 IEP and skips over many levels of intervention available between the BSD's placement and Landmark.

If the hearing officer finds that the Landmark placement was not reasonably calculated to provide education benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting, it shall not be necessary to address additional issues.

**Page 12
#99.254**

Issue #3

Whether the parents are entitled to any reasonable reimbursement for the costs associated with the Landmark placement.

The parents are not entitled to reimbursement for the unilateral Landmark placement because the placement is not in keeping with the principles of Least Restrictive Educational Environment which is an educational principle provided the student by Maine Special Education Regulation MSER 11.1.

Issue #4

An assessment of the appropriate IEP for the student, which is reasonably calculated to provide educational benefit to the student in the least restrictive setting.

The IEP implemented in September 1999 and later amended is reasonably calculated to be of educational benefit in the least restrictive environment.

V. Order

The BSD will continue to make available to the student the IEP developed and amended by the PET for the 1999-2000 school year. Once each year, beginning this year, the BSD will notify the parents and student at the last best-known address of the availability of their right to a free and appropriate public education until such time as the student graduates, ages out of eligibility, or moves from the BSD.

**WITNESS LIST
BANGOR SCHOOL DEPARTMENT**

SW-1	Murray Shulman	Special Education Director Bangor School Department
SW-2	Alice L. Frati	licensed Education Specialist/Consultant
	Ms. Parent	Teacher (Fundamental Geometry)
	Louise Linder-Hall	Teacher (Support Study Hall)
	Valerie Larson	Teacher (Spanish)
	Joyce Harrison	Teacher (Biology)
	Adam Leach	Teacher (World History II)
	Carol Farthing	Teacher (English)

**Page 13
#99.254**

George Brissette	Special Education Coordinator
Mr. Emory	Teacher
Faith DeRaps	Special Education Teacher
Ms. Byther	Special Language Clinician
Barbara Wais	Speech Pathologist
Mary Lyn Littefield	Speech Pathologist
Mother	Parent
Father	Parent
Any Witnesses Listed By the Family	

**WITNESS LIST
PARENTS'**

PW-1	Stephen Krom	Public School Liaison, Landmark School
PW-2	George Clement	Case Manager, Landmark School
PW-3	Stepfather	Stepfather
PW-4	Mother	Mother
PW-5	Susan Holinger	School Psychologist
PW-6	Cynthia Towne Johnson	Learning Disabilities expert
	Alice Frati	Educational testing expert
	Alta Chase, Ph.D	Psychologist
	Hannah Lynch	Student

EXHIBIT LIST

S.1 Fourth Grade Maine Educational Assessment of student (dated 2/94)
S.2 School Union #98 Individualized Education Plan for student (dated 5/7/97)
S.3 School Union #98 P.E.T. meeting minutes (dated 5/8/97)
S.4 Bangor Public Schools Public Registration Form (dated 8/28/97)
S.5 Office of Pupil Services Receipt and Continuation of I.E.P. (dated 9/17/97)
S.6 Eight Grade Maine Education Assessment of student (dated 10/97)
S.7 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 10/6/97)
S.8 Individual Education Plan for student (dated 10/6/97)

**Page 14
#99.254**

S.9 Garland Street Middle School activity record for student (dated 1997-1998)
S.10 Handwritten note from Karen Bagley, student's 8th grade teacher (no date)
S.11 Metropolitan Achievement Tests Individual Report for student (dated 3/98)
S.12 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 5/19/98)
S.13 Individual Education Plan for student (dated 5/19/98)
S.14 Handwritten note from Mrs. Murray, student's science teacher, including grades by quarter (dated 5/19/98)
S.15 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 1/4/99)
S.16 Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and results (dated 2/17/99)
S.17 Speech/Language Reevaluation Report (dated 2/24-3/11/99)

- S.18 Classroom Observation (dated 3/3/99)
- S.19 Educational Evaluation (dated 3/18/99)
- S.20 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 3/30/99)
- S.21 Metropolitan Achievement Tests Individual Report for student (dated 3/99)
- S.22 Classroom Observation (dated 4/5/99)
- S.23 Speech/Language Reevaluation Report (dated 4/1-5/99)
- S.24 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 5/28/99)
- S.25 Individual Education Plan (dated 5/28/99)
- S.26 Quarterly Monitor Status Report (most current report dated 6/3/99)
- S.27 Letter to George Brissette, Bangor HS from parent (dated 6/14/99)
- S.28 Letter to George Brissette from parent (dated 6/14/99) S.29 Student's 9th grade academic record (1998-1999)
- S.30 Letter to George Brissette from parent (dated 9/16/99)
- S.31 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 9/22/99)
- S.32 Psycho-Educational Evaluation (dated 9/27/99)
- S.33 Student's 10th grade course selection (no date) and Add/Drop sheet (dated 9/30/99)
- S.34 Documentation by Adam Leach, student's World History II teacher (dated 9/30/99)
- S.35 Documentation by Joyce Harrison, student's Biology teacher (dated 10/1/99)
- S.36 Documentation by Valerie Larson, student's Spanish teacher (dated 10/1/99)
- S.37 Documentation by Louise Linder-Hall, student's Support Study Hall teacher (dated 10/1/99)
- S.38 Documentation by Ms. Parent, student's Geometry teacher (dated 10/1/99)

Page 15
#99.254

- S.39 Notification of P.E.T. Meeting (dated 10/7/99)
- S.40 Letter to Murray Shulman, Director of Pupil Services in Bangor, from parent (dated 10/26/99)
- S.41 Letter to parent from Murray Shulman (dated 10/28/99)
- S.42 Letter to Murray Shulman from parent (dated 11/3/99)
- S.43 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 11/3/99)
- S.43 Pupil Evaluation Team Meeting Minutes (dated 11/3/99)
- S.44 Individual Education Plan for student (dated 11/3/99)
- S.45 Letter to Murray Shulman from parent (dated 11/30/99)
- S.46 Letter to parent from Murray Shulman (dated 12/8/99)
- S.47 Notification of P.E.T. Meeting (dated 12/8/99)
- S.48 Letter to Dr. Murray Shulman from Alice Frati, CAS Ed., PRSE re observations and suggestions of student's course load (dated 12/16/99)

- P.1 WISC-III, 2/26/93
- P.2 Triennial Testing Reports – spring 1996, Speech Language – 5/96, Woodcock Johnson, TOWL-2, WISC III, Evaluation Report
- P.3 IEP, 5/30/96
- P.4 Grade 9 teacher progress reports
- P.5 Description of Evaluations with parental input, 12/14/98
- P.6 Correspondence to Mr. Brissette, 1/4/99
- P.7 Correspondence to Ms. Loukes, 3/18/99
- P.8 Correspondence to Mr. Brissette, 3/29/99
- P.9 Grade 9 Rank card
- P.10 Student's report written for grade 9, health class
- P.11 IEP, version B, on 6/98 forms
- P.12 Landmark Evaluations, August 1999
- P.13 Correspondence to Mr. Brissette, September 9, 1999
- P.14 Sample of student's preparation for test, September 1999
- P.15 Teacher comments, September 1999
- P.16 Correspondence to Mr. Shulman, 10/26/99
- P.17 PET meeting transcription, 11/3/99
- P.18 Parent's concern for student's education, 11/3/99
- P.19 Correspondence to parent, 11/10/99
- P.20 Visitation Schedule for November 23, 1999-placement, Nov. 4, 1999
IEP
- P.21 Words copied during visitation decoded and read by student, 11/24/99
- P.22 Student's interview report written for grade 10 Language Arts, 11/99
- P.23 Landmark evaluations, November 1999
- P.24 Overview of Landmark

Page 16
#99.254

- P.25 Student's Landmark transcript
- P.26 Landmark invoices
- P.27 Frat test protocols, September 1999