



OFFICE OF THE STATE
SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

December 18, 2025

VIA Electronic Mail

Public Charter School

RE: State Complaint No. 025-011 Letter of Decision

LETTER OF DECISION

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On [REDACTED], the State Complaint Office (SCO) of the Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE), Division of Strategic Funding for School Quality received a State complaint from [REDACTED] (complainant) against the [REDACTED] Public Charter School (PCS) alleging violations in the special education program of students with disabilities on the complainant's caseload at [REDACTED] PCS, hereinafter "students" or "children."

The complainant alleged that [REDACTED] PCS violated certain provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. §1400 et seq. and regulations promulgated at 34 CFR Part 300, specifically, failure to ensure all required individualized education program (IEP) Team members are present at IEP Team meetings, review IEPs no less than annually, educate children in the least restrictive environment and correct placement, and provide special education and related services in accordance with the children's IEPs.

The SCO for OSSE has completed its investigation of the State complaint. During the course of the investigation OSSE determined that while [REDACTED] PCS has complied with timely conducting annual reviews of student IEPs, it has not complied with ensuring all required IEP Team members are present for IEP meetings, transfer student procedures, educating student's in their least restrictive environment and in the correct placement, and providing special education services in accordance with the students' IEPs. This Letter of Decision is the report of the final results of OSSE's investigation.

COMPLAINT ISSUES

The allegations raised in the complaint, further clarified by a review of documents and interviews revealed in the course of the investigation, raised the following issues under the

jurisdiction of the OSSE SCO:

- 1. IEP Team requirements at 34 CFR §300.321**
 - a. Failure to ensure all required IEP Team members are present at the children’s IEP Team meetings.
- 2. IEP review requirements at 34 CFR §300.324(b)(1)(i)**
 - a. Failure to review the children's IEPs periodically, but not less than annually.
- 3. Transfer student procedures at 5-A DCMR § 3020.9**
 - a. Failure to adopt the existing IEP or to develop a new IEP for a student transferring from an LEA within the District of Columbia.
- 4. Placement requirements at 34 CFR §§300.114(a) and 300.116(b)(2)**
 - a. Failure to educate children in the least restrictive environment and ensure that the children’s placements are based on the children’s IEPs.
- 5. Requirement to provide IEP services at 34 CFR §300.323(c)(2)**
 - a. Failure to provide special education and related services, specifically with regard to children requiring specialized instruction.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURE

The investigation included interviews with the following individuals:

1. Complainant
2. [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED]

The investigation also included review of the following documents which were either submitted by the complainant, submitted by [REDACTED], or accessible via the Special Programs data system:

[REDACTED]



FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The students included in this investigation are children with disabilities as defined by 34 CFR §300.8.
2. The children’s local education agency during the [REDACTED] school year is [REDACTED] PCS.
3. 12 student files were reviewed by OSSE as part of the State complaint investigation. The included students were identified by the complainant in the initial State complaint filing and in subsequent communications. Since the State complaint filing, one of the 12 students has been withdrawn from [REDACTED] PCS due to not reaching Stage 5 enrollment.
4. The complainant was a math special education teacher at [REDACTED] PCS during the [REDACTED] school year and terminated their employment with the LEA on [REDACTED].
5. The first day of school at [REDACTED] PCS during the [REDACTED] school year was [REDACTED].
6. From [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], IEP Team meetings were convened for seven of the 12 students. Of the seven students who had IEP meetings, only one student had all required IEP Team members in attendance. The following table details the date of the children’s IEP Team meetings and participants.

Student #	Date of IEP Meeting	IEP Team Members	Participant Excusal Findings
Student #2	[REDACTED]	All required IEP Team members with the exception of the general education teacher and special education teacher were in attendance.	[REDACTED] PCS sent the participant excusal letter and obtained parent consent on [REDACTED], after the IEP Team meeting took place.
Student #3	[REDACTED]	All required IEP Team members with the exception of the general education teacher and special education teacher were in attendance.	[REDACTED] PCS sent the participant excusal letter and obtained written parent consent on [REDACTED], more than one month following the IEP Team meeting.

Student #5	██████████	All required IEP Team members were in attendance.	N/A
Student #6	██████████	All required IEP Team members with the exception of the general education teacher and special education teacher were in attendance.	██████████ PCS sent the participant excusal letter and obtained written parent consent on ██████████, more than one month following the IEP Team meeting.
Student #7	██████████	All required IEP Team members with the exception of the general education teacher were in attendance.	██████████ PCS did not send the participant excusal letter nor obtain parental consent to excuse the required IEP Team member.
	██████████	All required IEP Team members with the exception of the general education teacher were in attendance.	██████████ PCS sent the participant excusal letter and obtained written parent consent on ██████████, prior to the IEP Team meeting.
Student #10	██████████	All required IEP Team members with the exception of the general education teacher were in attendance.	██████████ PCS sent the participant excusal letter and obtained written parent consent on ██████████, after the IEP Team meeting occurred.
Student #11	██████████	All required IEP Team members with the exception of the general education teacher were in attendance.	██████████ PCS sent the participant excusal letter and obtained written parent consent on ██████████, more than one month following the IEP Team meeting.

--	--	--	--

7. From [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], four students were due for their annual IEP review meetings. All meetings were held timely.

Student #	Annual Review Due Date	Date Annual IEP Meeting Occurred
Student #2	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Student #7	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Student #10	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED] ¹
Student #11	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

8. Of the 12 students included in the investigation, three transferred from out-of-state schools, seven transferred from other District LEAs, and two attended [REDACTED] PCS during the [REDACTED] school year.

a. For the students who transferred from out-of-state schools:

- i. [REDACTED] PCS timely obtained Student #3’s school records from their prior LEA and developed a comparable services plan. It subsequently and appropriately developed a new IEP for the student.
- ii. [REDACTED] PCS made multiple efforts to obtain student records for Student #5 and Student #6. While there was a delay in receiving the records from the prior schools, [REDACTED] PCS promptly reviewed student data and developed new IEPs for the students.

b. For the students who transferred from District LEAs:

- i. [REDACTED] PCS timely developed an IEP for Student #7.
- ii. [REDACTED] PCS untimely adopted the IEPs for the remaining six students. [REDACTED] PCS did not begin formally adopting these students’ IEPs until [REDACTED] [REDACTED] when it began amending student IEPs in response to the State complaint filing.

9. For the students who transferred to [REDACTED] PCS for the [REDACTED] school year from District LEAs, [REDACTED] PCS received these student’s IEPs and other special education documents through Special Programs on the following dates:

¹ Student #10’s annual review meeting was initially scheduled for [REDACTED], but was rescheduled for [REDACTED]. While the meeting occurred on [REDACTED], the student’s IEP is incorrectly dated for [REDACTED].

Student #	Date Received
Student #1	[REDACTED]
Student #4	[REDACTED]
Student #7	[REDACTED]
Student #8	[REDACTED]
Student #9	[REDACTED]
Student #10	Unable to be Determined. ²
Student #12	[REDACTED]

10. Due to [REDACTED] PCS' career and technical programming, it is only able to provide a maximum of 15 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside the general education environment in core academic subjects.

11. The following table outlines the specialized instruction hours, and placement prescribed by each of the currently enrolled 11 students' IEPs.

Student #	IEP Date	Specialized Instruction Hours & Placement
Student #1	[REDACTED] IEP	25 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
Student #3	[REDACTED] Comparable Service Plan	20 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
	[REDACTED] IEP	20 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
	[REDACTED] IEP Amendment	15 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
Student #4	[REDACTED] IEP	27 hours and three minutes weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
	[REDACTED] IEP Amendment	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment
Student #5	[REDACTED] IEP	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment
Student #6	[REDACTED] IEP	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment
Student #7	[REDACTED] IEP	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment

² While this student transferred to [REDACTED] PCS at the beginning of the [REDACTED] school year, the District's special education database incorrectly identifies the student's transfer date as [REDACTED].

Student #8	██████████	23 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment ³
Student #9	██████████ IEP	35 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
	██████████ IEP Amendment	15 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
Student #10	██████████ IEP	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside the general education environment. Specifically, 4 hours in math and 6 hours in English. 4 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment. Specifically, 2 hours in math and 2 hours in English.
	██████████ IEP	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment
Student #11	██████████ IEP	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment. Specifically, 5 hours in math and 5 hours in English.
Student #12	██████████ IEP	25 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment. Specifically, 10 hours in math and 15 hours in English.
	██████████ IEP Amendment	10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment

12. An analysis of each student’s IEP and class schedule led to the following findings regarding service hour delivery, placement, and least restrictive environment:

Student #	Findings:
Student #1	From ██████████, to ██████████, the student received specialized instruction in the general education environment. On ██████████, the student’s schedule was adjusted, and the student began receiving 15 hours of specialized instruction weekly outside of the general education environment. The student’s current schedule is not in alignment with the student’s active IEP which prescribes 25 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside the general education environment.

³ On ██████████, ██████████ PCS obtained parental consent to amend Student #8’s IEP. The proposed amendment would change the student’s service hours to 15 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment. Due to a system error, ██████████ PCS has been unable to execute the IEP amendment as of ██████████. ██████████ PCS has escalated the issue to OSSE.

Student #3	From [REDACTED], to [REDACTED], the student received specialized instruction in the general education environment. On [REDACTED], the student's schedule was adjusted, and the student began receiving 15 hours of specialized instruction weekly outside of the general education environment. The student's schedule was not in alignment with the student's [REDACTED] comparable services plan and the [REDACTED] IEP which prescribed 20 hours of specialized instruction weekly outside of the general education environment. The student's IEP was amended on [REDACTED], and the student began receiving the correct amount of specialized instruction in the correct environment.
Student #4	From [REDACTED], to [REDACTED], the student received 15 hours weekly of specialized instruction outside the general education environment. On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] PCS moved the student to the general education environment at the parent's request but inappropriately did not amend the student's IEP. The student's IEP was amended on [REDACTED] to match the student's current schedule. Prior to [REDACTED], the student did not receive the correct amount of service hours nor educated in their least restrictive environment.
Student #5	The student is receiving the correct amount of specialized instruction hours in the correct placement.
Student #6	The student is receiving the correct amount of specialized instruction hours in the correct placement.
Student #7	The student is receiving the correct amount of specialized instruction hours in the correct placement.
Student #8	From [REDACTED] to present the student has received 15 hours of specialized instruction outside the general education environment, which was not in alignment with the student's IEP that prescribed 23 hours of specialized instruction. On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] PCS obtained parental consent to amend the student's IEP to prescribe 15 hours of specialized instruction outside the general education environment; however, the formal amendment has not yet been executed due to a system error.
Student #9	From the start of the school year, the student received specialized instruction in the general education environment at the parent's request to trial this environment. As this was a trial, [REDACTED] PCS did not amend the student's IEP to change the student's service hours, placement, or least restrictive environment. Based on the student's trial, the IEP Team determined the student's IEP should continue to prescribe the student receive specialized instruction outside the general education environment. On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] PCS amended the students IEP to reduce the student's service hours to

	15 hours of specialized instruction per week outside the general education environment.
Student #10	From [REDACTED], to present, the student received 10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment. While this is in alignment with the student's [REDACTED] IEP, it is not in alignment with the student's IEP that was in effect prior to this date. From [REDACTED], to [REDACTED], the student did not receive the full amount of specialized instruction hours prescribed by their IEP nor was the student educated in the correct placement and their least restrictive environment.
Student #11	The student is receiving the correct amount of specialized instruction hours in the correct placement.
Student #12	From [REDACTED], to present, the student received 10 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment. While this is in alignment with the student's [REDACTED] IEP amendment, the student was not receiving the correct amount of specialized instruction hours in the correct placement nor educated in their least restrictive environment prior to this date as the student's IEP had previously prescribed 25 total hours of specialized instruction outside the general education environment.

13. Student #12's IEP prescribes 10 hours per week of dedicated aide services inside the general education environment. Although the student's IEP transferred to [REDACTED] PCS on [REDACTED], via Special Programs, the student did not begin receiving this service until the end of [REDACTED].
14. There is currently a special education teacher vacancy in the inclusion math classes that the complainant previously taught. The students enrolled in these classes have not received specialized instruction in accordance with their IEPs since [REDACTED].

ISSUE ONE: IEP TEAM

[REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 34 CFR §300.321, because it did not timely and appropriately obtain parental consent to excuse mandatory IEP Team members for six student IEP Team meetings.

Pursuant to 34 CFR §300.321, the public agency must ensure that the IEP Team for each child with a disability includes the parents of the child, not less than one general education teacher if the child is or may be participating in the regular education environment, not less than one special education teacher, a representative of the public agency, an individual who can interpret the evaluation results, other individuals who may have knowledge or expertise related to the child, and the child if appropriate. A mandatory IEP Team member is not required to attend an IEP Team meeting if the parent and public agency agree in writing that the member's attendance is not necessary because the member's area of curriculum or related services is not

being modified or discussed in the meeting.⁴ A member of the IEP Team may be excused from attending an IEP Team meeting when the meeting involves a modification to or discussion of the member's area of curriculum or related services if the parent and public agency consent in writing to the excusal and the member submits in writing input into the development of the IEP prior to the meeting.⁵ The complainant alleges that [REDACTED] PCS did not ensure all required IEP Team members were present for at least one student's IEP Team meeting during the [REDACTED] school year.

Discussion

In a review of 12 student files, it was determined that seven students had IEP meetings from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. Of the seven students, only one student had all required IEP Team members in attendance. For the remaining six students, a general education teacher was not in attendance at the IEP Team meetings, and, in some cases, a special education teacher was not in attendance as well. When a required IEP Team member is unable to attend an IEP Team meeting, an LEA shall obtain written parental consent to proceed with the meeting without the required IEP Team member. The excusal of a mandatory IEP Team member must be documented using the Participant Excusal Form.⁶ The form shall be provided to the parent prior to the IEP Team meeting and in no case fewer than five days before the meeting.⁷ [REDACTED] PCS utilized the Participant Excusal Form for all but one IEP Team meeting. It did not obtain parental consent at any point for the IEP Team meeting in which there was no Participant Excusal Form. In all instances where the form was utilized, it was not provided to the parent timely. Additionally, in most cases, [REDACTED] PCS did not obtain written parental consent to excuse a mandatory IEP Team member until after the meeting.

In [REDACTED] PCS' [REDACTED] Response to the State Complaint, it stated that it will establish procedures to schedule IEP Team meetings earlier in an effort to ensure all required IEP Team members are present.

Therefore, [REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 34 CFR §300.321.

ISSUE TWO: IEP REVIEW

[REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 5-A DCMR §3020.9 but has complied with 34 CFR §300.324(b)(1)(i), because while it timely held annual IEP review meetings, it did not timely follow transfer student procedures.

Pursuant to 34 CFR §300.324(b)(1)(i), a public agency shall review a child's IEP periodically, but

⁴ 34 CFR §300.321(e)(1)

⁵ 34 CFR §300.321(e)(2)

⁶ [OSSE Special Education Handbook](#) p. 7, [REDACTED] School Year

⁷ [OSSE Special Education Handbook](#) p. 7, [REDACTED] School Year

not less than annually. Pursuant to 5-A DCMR §3020.9, if a child transfers from an LEA within the District of Columbia, the new LEA shall determine whether to adopt the existing IEP or develop a new IEP within 30 days of enrollment. If the LEA determined the existing IEP is appropriate, the LEA shall document adoption of the IEP within 30 days of enrollment. If the LEA determines that the existing IEP is not appropriate, it shall develop and finalize a new IEP within 60 calendar days of enrollment. The complainant alleges that [REDACTED] PCS did not timely conduct annual reviews for at least two students.

Discussion

In the review of 12 student files, only four students were due for their annual IEP Team meetings during the timeframe reviewed by the SCO. All four students had their IEP Team meetings held timely.

In the complainant's State complaint filing, they alleged that two specific students did not have their annual review IEP Team meetings held timely. However, both students transferred from schools outside of the District. Therefore, while the IEPs in Special Programs appeared to be expired, it was not the students' most recent special education records. [REDACTED] PCS took multiple steps to obtain the students' records from the out-of-state schools and received the documentation on or around [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] PCS promptly developed new IEPs for these students once it conducted a review of all student data. Notably, there was a third student who transferred from an out-of-state school which [REDACTED] PCS also followed appropriate out-of-state transfer student procedures.

While [REDACTED] PCS followed the appropriate procedures for interstate transfer students, it did not do so for six out of seven students who transferred from District LEAs. With the exception of Student #7, [REDACTED] PCS did not timely adopt nor develop a new IEP for the remaining six intrastate transfer students. Each of the six student records indicate [REDACTED] PCS did not formally adopt IEPs for these students until [REDACTED], when it began to execute IEP amendments in response to the State complaint filing. For students who transfer within the District, the new LEA shall adopt the student's existing IEP within 30 calendar days if the existing IEP is determined appropriate. If the new LEA determines the existing IEP to not be appropriate, it shall develop and finalized a new IEP within 60 days of enrollment.⁸ In these six cases, [REDACTED] PCS did not formally adopt student IEPs until more than 60 days following enrollment.

In an email from the [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED] on [REDACTED], it was expressed that if an intrastate transfer student's IEP is deemed appropriate, [REDACTED] PCS would not formally adopt the student's IEP until the annual IEP review meeting. In the aforementioned email, the [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED] further stated that in response to the State complaint filing, it has established a new IEP review process

⁸ 5-A DCMR §3020.9

to ensure student IEPs are timely adopted if deemed appropriate or that a new IEP is timely developed if the existing IEP is deemed inappropriate. [REDACTED] PCS' efforts towards establishing written procedures to improve special education processes is acknowledged in the corrective action ordered in this State complaint.

Therefore, while [REDACTED] PCS has complied with 34 CFR §300.324(b)(1)(i), but has not complied with 5-A DCMR §3020.9.

ISSUES THREE AND FOUR: PLACEMENT & IEP SERVICES

[REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 34 CFR §§300.114(a), 300.116(b)(2), and 300.323(c)(2), because it did not appropriately educate multiple students in the least restrictive environment and correct placement as well as provide the correct amount of IEP services. Pursuant to 34 CFR §§300.114(a) and 300.116(b)(2), each public agency must ensure to the maximum extent possible that children with disabilities are educated with children without disabilities and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of students with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature and severity of the disability is such that education in the regular class environment with the use of supplementary services and aids cannot be achieved satisfactorily.⁹ A child with a disability's placement should be based on the child's IEP.¹⁰ Pursuant to 34 CFR §300.323(c)(2), each public agency must ensure as soon as possible following development of the IEP, special education and related services are made available to a child with a disability in accordance with the child's IEP. The complainant alleges that [REDACTED] PCS has not provided specialized instruction and in the correct environment to multiple students.

Discussion

In the State complaint filing, the complainant alleges that multiple students on their caseload are not receiving the correct amount of specialized instruction hours in the correct placement based on the children's IEPs. OSSE finds that seven of the 11 currently enrolled students have not received specialized instruction in accordance with their IEPs for at least part of the [REDACTED] school year. Additionally, multiple students have not been educated in their least restrictive environment and in the correct placement. Since the State complaint filing, [REDACTED] PCS has amended multiple student IEPs to correct some of the noncompliance. Based on OSSE's review of student records and interviews, the noncompliance identified regarding receipt of IEP services, placement, and least restrictive environment for these seven students is largely due to [REDACTED] PCS not following appropriate transfer student procedures as well as not timely amending student IEPs. While [REDACTED] PCS is only able to provide a certain amount of specialized instruction hours for core academic classes because of its career and technical programming, multiple

⁹ 34 CFR §300.114(a)

¹⁰ 34 CFR §300.116(b)(2)

students' IEPs which have been and continue to be in effect prescribe more than 15 hours of specialized instruction.

Additionally, the complainant alleges that Student #12 has not received dedicated aide services in accordance with the student's IEP. The student's IEP prescribed 10 hours of dedicated aide services inside the general education environment per week. The student began to receive dedicated aide services towards the end of [REDACTED], though [REDACTED] PCS is unable to identify the exact date. While [REDACTED] PCS did not begin implementing these services earlier, Student #12 did transfer from a District LEA and, therefore, transfer student procedures apply. As noted under Issue Two, [REDACTED] PCS did not appropriately follow transfer student procedures leading to multiple student IEPs not being formally adopted until [REDACTED]. As such, while [REDACTED] PCS did not follow the appropriate procedure to adopt this student's IEP timely, had it did so, OSSE finds that dedicated aide services began to be provided within 30 days of Student #12's enrollment.

During the course of the investigation, it was discovered that the complainant terminated their employment at [REDACTED] PCS on [REDACTED]. As of [REDACTED], the complainant's former position remained vacant; however, the hiring process was ongoing. Due to this teaching vacancy, some students enrolled in the complainant's former math inclusion classes are not receiving specialized instruction in accordance with their IEPs. While [REDACTED] PCS asserts that student case managers are checking in with the general education teacher to ensure that students are receiving accommodations, this does not constitute as specialized instruction as there is not a special education teacher present in the classroom during the full class period.

Therefore, [REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 34 CFR §§300.114(a), 300.116(b)(2), and 300.323(c)(2).

COMPLAINT FINDINGS

1. [REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 34 CFR §300.321, because it did not timely and appropriately obtain parental consent to excuse mandatory IEP Team members for six student IEP Team meetings.
2. [REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 5-A DCMR §3020.9 but has complied with 34 CFR §300.324(b)(1)(i), because while it timely held annual IEP review meetings, it did not timely follow transfer student procedures.
3. [REDACTED] PCS has not complied with 34 CFR §§300.114(a), 300.116(b)(2), and 300.323(c)(2), because it did not appropriately educate multiple students in the least restrictive environment and correct placement as well as provide the correct amount of IEP services.

CORRECTIVE ACTION

IDEA requires that State complaint procedures include those for effective implementation of decisions made as a result of a State complaint investigation, including corrective actions to achieve compliance.¹¹ Accordingly, the SCO has established reasonable time frames below to ensure that noncompliance is corrected in a timely manner. The SCO will follow up with the public agency to ensure that it completes the required actions and provides the documentation of the completion of the corrective actions listed below.

In order to correct the noncompliance with 34 CFR §§300.321, 300.114(a), 300.116(b)(2), and 300.323(c)(2), as well as 5-A DCMR §3020.9, [REDACTED] PCS must do the following:

Corrective Action	Documentation Required to Demonstrate Compliance	Action Shall Be Completed No Later Than:
<p>1a. Train relevant school staff members on the procedural requirements regarding transfer students and IEP Team member meetings.</p>	<p>[REDACTED] PCS shall submit training materials (i.e. slideshow) <u>prior</u> to conducting the training for approval.</p> <p>Following approval and completion of training, [REDACTED] PCS shall provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A sign-in sheet, list, or email documenting required staff completed the training. 	<p>Training materials shall be submitted to OSSE for approval within 20 school days of this letter of decision.</p> <p>Documentation of the completion of the training shall be provided to OSSE within 15 school days of approval of training materials.</p>
<p>1b. Develop, or if applicable, revise written LEA policies and procedures regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling IEP Team meetings, which includes processes in instances where not all required IEP Team members are able to be in attendance 	<p>[REDACTED] PCS shall provide the following to the SCO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A memorandum summarizing the actions it took for ensuring appropriate policies and procedures are established and disseminated to relevant staff members, AND, 	<p>Documentation of the completion of this action shall be provided to the SCO within 90 school days of this letter of decision.</p>

¹¹ 34 CFR §300.152

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing, adopting, and/or developing IEPs for transfer students • Ensuring student IEPs and class schedules are in alignment with regard to service hours and placement • Updating and maintaining accurate student special education records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of the new or revised written policies and procedures 	
<p>1c. Conduct a student record audit for current ninth grade students with disabilities. This audit should review and make determinations on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current status of the student’s IEP (i.e. if the student’s existing IEP has been adopted by or developed by [REDACTED] PCS) • If the student’s IEP service hours are being fully implemented • If the student’s class schedule aligns with the student’s IEP placement and LRE <p>In instances where the audit finds that a student’s IEP has not be adopted or implemented, [REDACTED] PCS should take the appropriate</p>	<p>[REDACTED] PCS shall provide the following to the SCO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A spreadsheet or other written document that identifies each student’s USI and summarizes individual student findings, and, if appropriate, actions [REDACTED] PCS took to correct the student’s record 	<p>Documentation of the completion of this action shall be provided to the SCO within 60 school days of this letter of decision.</p>

<p>steps to correct the student file.</p>		
<p>1d. Convene IEP Team meetings for all students impacted by the current math inclusion teacher vacancy to review student data and make a determination on if compensatory education is warranted.</p>	<p>████ PCS shall provide the following to the SCO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A copy of each student’s PWN identifying the compensatory education decision; and, • If compensatory education is warranted, a monthly log shall be submitted; and, • A completed service log for each applicable student <p>All service logs provided shall include the date, the duration, and a brief description of the service.</p>	<p>Documentation of the completion of this action shall be provided to OSSE as follows:</p> <p>████ PCS shall provide prior written notice documentation for each applicable student within 90 school days of this letter of decision.</p> <p>████ PCS shall provide a monthly log tracking receipt of compensatory education for each applicable student to the OSSE State Complaint Investigator on the first of each month until the completion of services.</p> <p>████ PCS shall provide a copy of the completed service log for each applicable student within 10 school days of the completion of all services.</p>

All corrective actions must be completed by the date specified above, but in no case later than one year from the date of this letter. Failure by the LEA to meet any of the timelines set forth above may adversely affect the agency’s annual determination under the IDEA and subject the LEA to enforcement action by OSSE.

CONCLUSION

The Decision of the SCO is final and is not subject to further agency administrative review.

Pursuant to 5-A DCMR §3048.6, if an issue is still in dispute, the parent or LEA may, to the extent permitted under IDEA, request mediation or file a due process complaint on the issue with which the party disagrees. This Decision shall become final as dated by the signature of the undersigned. If you have any questions regarding this decision, please contact me at Kirstin.Hansen@dc.gov or 202-741-0274.

Sincerely,

Kirstin Hansen

Kirstin Hansen
State Complaints Manager
Office of Special Education