



PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND



RE: State Complaint No. 018-024 Letter of Decision

LETTER OF DECISION

I KOCEDOM KI	2 Drienence Citz				
On	, the State Complaint Office (SCO) of the Office of the State Superintendent of				
Education (OS	SSE), Division of Systems and	Supports, K-12 received a State complaint from			
	(complainant or paren	t) against Publ	ic		
Charter School	PCS) alle	eging violations in the special education program	ı of		
	(Student ID #	hereinafter "student" or "child."			
The complain	ant alleged that	PCS violated certain provisions of the			
Individuals wi	th Disabilities Education Act	(IDEA), 20 U.S.C. §1400 et seq. and regulations			
promulgated	at 34 CFR Part 300, specifical	lly, failure to respond to an initial evaluation requ	uest.		
The SCO for C	SSE has completed its invest	igation of the State complaint. During the course	e of		
the investigat	tion OSSE determined that	PCS has complied with its obligation	tions		
related to init	ial evaluations. This Letter of	Decision is the report of the final results of OSSI	E's		
investigation.					

COMPLAINT ISSUES

The allegation raised in the complaint, further clarified by a review of documents and interviews revealed in the course of the investigation, raised the following issue under the jurisdiction of the OSSE SCO:

- 1. Initial evaluation requirements at 34 CFR §300.301 and D.C. Official Code §38-2561.02(a)
 - a. Failure to conduct a full and individual initial evaluation to determine if the child is a child with a disability, upon receipt of parent's request for an initial

evaluation.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURE

The investigation included interviews with the following individuals:

1.	Complainant		
2.		PCS	

The investigation also included review of the following documents which were either submitted by the complainant, submitted by PCS, or accessible via the Special Education Data System (SEDS):



GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The student has not yet been determined to be a child with a disability as defined by 34 CFR §300.8.
- 2. The student's LEA is PCS.

ONE: INITIAL EVALUATION

Findings of Fact

1. On PCS held a meeting with the parent to review and discuss the student's Section 504 plan.

a. The parent alleges that at this meeting requested additional testing in order for the student to have supports in place for the start of the school year, but the school told that he did not meet the timeframe guidelines for testing.

b. PCS asserts that the parent did not request additional testing or a special education evaluation at this meeting.

2. From PCS communicated

¹ The parent's letter requesting a special education evaluation was dated reported that he letter was provided to the school on which is confirmed by a email confirming receipt of the letter.

	via email, phone, and in-person to discuss development of a BIP for the student.	
3.	a. These communications contain no request for a special education evaluation. On the parent submitted a written request for evaluation.	
3. 4.	On PCS and the parent met to review existing student	
7.	data.	
E	 The parent and school agreed to complete a comprehensive psychological evaluation and functional behavioral assessment (FBA) and the parent signed consent to evaluate. 	
5.	On the student was determined eligible for special education services.	
6.	The 60-day timeline to complete the evaluation was	
Discus	sion/Conclusion	
2564.6	PCS has complied with 34 CFR §300.301 and D.C. Official Code §38-	
2561.0	2(a), because there is no evidence that it ignored a request from the parent on to evaluate.	
days of the standard conserve evaluate 2561.0	nt to 34 CFR §300.301, initial special education evaluations must be conducted within 60 receiving parental consent for the evaluation or within the timeframe established by the tea. The District of Columbia requires LEAs to make reasonable efforts to obtain parent at for evaluation within 30 days of the date of referral and to complete the initial cion within 60 days from the date the parent provides consent. (D.C. Official Code §38-2(a)(2)(A)). The complainant alleges that requested an initial evaluation for the tat the meeting to review the Section 504 plan and the school took not at the section 504 plan and the school took not be to the section 504 plan and the school took not be the secti	
addition sch testing specia	education evaluation at this meeting. From PCS communicated via email, phone, and in-person to discuss development for the student. These communications contain no request for a special education	
assess evalua educa compl OSSE f	the parent submitted a written request for evaluation. On PCS and the parent met to review existing data. The parent and school to complete a comprehensive psychological evaluation and functional behavioral nent and the parent signed consent to evaluate. The 60-day timeline to complete the sion ended on The student was determined eligible to receive special on services on The student was determined eligible to receive special on services on The student was determined eligible to receive special on services on The student was made at the The student was mad	

Therefore, PCS has complied with 34 CFR §300.301 and D.C. Official Code §38-2561.02(a).

CONCLUSION

1. PCS has complied with 34 CFR §300.301 and D.C. Official Code §38-2561.02(a), because there is no evidence that it ignored a request from the parent to evaluate.

If you have any questions regarding this decision, please contact me at <u>Victoria.Glick@dc.gov</u> or 202-724-7860.

Sincerely,

Victoria Glick

State Complaints Manager, Division of Systems and Supports, K-12

cc: , Complainant