



OFFICE OF THE STATE
SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

July 20, 2026

VIA Electronic Mail

Public Charter School

RE: State Complaint No. 025-045 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] (parent or complainant) against the [REDACTED] Public Charter School (PCS) alleging violations in the special education program of [REDACTED] child, [REDACTED] (Student ID # [REDACTED] hereinafter “student” or “child.”

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 appropriately revise the child’s individualized education program (IEP) to address the child’s needs and information provided by the parent.

The SCO for OSSE has completed its investigation of the State complaint. During the course of the investigation OSSE determined that [REDACTED] PCS has complied with its obligation to review and revise the child’s IEP to address the child’s needs and information provided by the parent. This Letter of Decision is the report of the final results of OSSE’s investigation.

COMPLAINT ISSUE

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 revision at 34 CFR §300.324(b)**
 - a. Failure to revise the child’s IEP as appropriate to address the child’s anticipated needs and information provided by the child’s parent.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURE

The investigation included interviews with the following individuals:

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

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

[REDACTED]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The student is [REDACTED] years old and qualifies for special education and related services under the primary classification of Autism and a secondary classification of Specific Learning Disability as defined by 34 CFR §300.8.
2. The student's local education agency during the [REDACTED] school year was [REDACTED] PCS.
3. The child's IEP team convened on [REDACTED] for the child's annual review meeting.
4. The child's [REDACTED] IEP prescribes the following special education and related services:

[REDACTED] IEP Services	
→	15 hours weekly of specialized instruction inside the general education environment
→	Five hours weekly of specialized instruction outside of the general education environment
→	Two hours monthly of behavioral support services inside the general education environment
→	Two hours monthly of behavioral support services outside of the general education environment
→	20 minutes monthly of consultation services – occupational therapy

5. At the child's IEP meeting, the complainant requested the child be assigned a dedicated aide, which the IEP team considered and ultimately declined. The IEP meeting notes include the following thoughts shared by IEP team members regarding the parent's request for a dedicated aide:
- "[A [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED]] shares [the student] is very independent doing [their] work. I think [the least restrictive environment] would be without a [dedicated aide]. The only time we are seeing elopement is outside of academics, mainly transitions, a lot of improvement on elopement without an adult following [them] around. I wonder too if a dedicated aide could frustrate [the student]."
 - "[The [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED]] notes that having a check for the behavior impact on learning does not equate to a dedicated aide."
 - "[A [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED] shares that what we see in reading, when [the student] is doing [their] work, there are times even if you come over and try to see what is going on and what help is, [the child] gets nervous, doesn't want you to see that it's not complete and we'll talk through it and calm down. I think the added adult in a room for [the student] will make it seem like you are constantly watching [them] and [the child] is very independent and is very smart and [the student] believes [they are] the smartest person in the room and I think an additional person would be a stressor that is not needed and that is why we aren't pushing for a dedicated [aide]."
6. At the child's IEP meeting, the IEP team discussed the student's medical condition and what support and strategies staff have been implementing to support the child. The IEP meeting notes state from the child's teacher, "We have a community game to make sure [they have] gotten enough water and we do a water walk. [The child] will move around, get water, more often I ask [them] to go the bathroom and last week [the child] made a connection between how [their] stomach feels and how [they] feels/acts about [their] classmates and we made affirmations and the hand sign to help with that."
7. The [REDACTED] PWN captures that the IEP team rejected the parent's request for a dedicated aide as well as that the IEP team discussed and continues to consider the child's medical condition. Regarding the child's medical condition, the PWN states, "The IEP will reflect the need for bathroom access, increased hydration ("water walks"), and communication between home and school regarding any GI issues."
8. The child's [REDACTED] IEP includes information regarding the child's medical condition under the Special Considerations as well as Other Classroom Aids and Services section.

9. The IEP team developed a support plan focused on addressing (1) the child's internal state, emotions, and health; (2) how the classroom and the schedule are set up for the child; and (3) how the child learns and connects with others.
10. The child's [REDACTED] amended IEP, which was in effect until the [REDACTED] IEP was developed, includes information on the child's medical condition.
11. The child's progress reports from the [REDACTED] school year indicate the child has been progressing toward meeting their IEP goals.

ISSUE: IEP REVISION

[REDACTED] PCS has complied with 34 CFR §300.324(b), because it appropriately considered the child's needs and information provided by the parent.

Pursuant to 34 CFR §300.324(b)(1), a public agency must ensure the child's IEP is revised appropriately to address any lack of progress towards IEP goals and in the general education curriculum, information provided by the child's parents, the child's anticipated needs, and recent evaluation data. The complainant alleges that [REDACTED] PCS did not appropriately consider the child's needs related to the parent's request for dedicated aide services and the child's medical condition.

Discussion

The child's IEP team convened on [REDACTED], for the annual review meeting. During the meeting, the parent requested that the child receive dedicated aide support to address behavioral and academic needs. The IEP team discussed the request and ultimately declined to add dedicated aide services. According to the meeting notes, multiple team members indicated that the child demonstrates a high level of independence and can become distressed when closely monitored by an adult. Additionally, the team reported that the child continues to make positive progress despite increased environmental and curricular stressors. Based on these considerations, the IEP team determined that assigning a dedicated aide would be unnecessarily restrictive for the child and would not provide educational benefit. An IEP team is required to consider requests made by a parent; however, the team is not obligated to adopt every request. Decisions must be made through team consensus. Accordingly, the SCO finds that [REDACTED] PCS properly considered the parent's request for dedicated aide services.

The parent also raised concerns regarding whether the IEP sufficiently addresses the child's needs related to a medical diagnosis. During the interview, the parent explained that the child's medical condition can affect the child's behavior and cited a few instances in which the child's medical needs were not fully supported at school. The parent further stated that medical

documentation was offered but that [REDACTED] PCS stated it was unnecessary. At the [REDACTED] IEP meeting, the team discussed the child's medical condition with the parent, reviewed supports already in place to assist the child in managing the condition, and outlined supports that would continue to be provided. Information about the child's medical condition and corresponding supports are documented in the [REDACTED] IEP, the [REDACTED] PWN, and the student support plan developed by [REDACTED] PCS. Furthermore, the child's medical condition was documented on the [REDACTED] amended IEP, which was in effect until the [REDACTED] IEP meeting. Regarding the parent's concern about medical documentation, the [REDACTED] PCS [REDACTED] reported no knowledge of any conversation in which medical documentation was described as unnecessary. Parents may provide medical documentation for IEP team consideration at any time; however, such documentation is not required for the team to consider a child's medical condition. As such, the SCO finds that the IEP team appropriately considered and incorporated information regarding the child's medical condition into the child's IEP. If the parent wishes to submit medical documentation for further consideration by the IEP team, the parent may do so, although it is not required.

Therefore, [REDACTED] PCS has complied with 34 CFR §300.324(b).

COMPLIANCE FINDING

1. [REDACTED] PCS has complied with 34 CFR §300.324(b), because it appropriately considered the child's needs and information provided by the parent.

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

cc: [REDACTED], Complainant

OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

1050 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20002

(202) 727-6436 TTY: 711 | osse.dc.gov