The University of the State of New York

The State Education Department
State Review Officer
www.sro.nysed.gov

No. 21-156

Application of the NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION for review of a determination of a hearing officer relating to the provision of educational services to a student with a disability

Appearances:
Judy Nathan, Interim Acting General Counsel, attorneys for petitioner, by Brian J. Reimels, Esq.

Brain Injury Rights Group, Ltd., attorneys for respondents, by John Henry Olthoff, Esq.

DECISION

I. Introduction

This proceeding arises under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. §§ 1400-1482) and Article 89 of the New York State Education Law. Petitioner (the district) appeals from a decision of an impartial hearing officer (IHO) which ordered the district to provide the student with assistive technology devices and services at the student's unilateral placement. The appeal must be sustained.

II. Overview—Administrative Procedures

When a student in New York is eligible for special education services, the IDEA calls for the creation of an individualized education program (IEP), which is delegated to a local Committee on Special Education (CSE) that includes, but is not limited to, parents, teachers, a school psychologist, and a district representative (Educ. Law § 4402; see 20 U.S.C. § 1414[d][1][A]-[B]; 34 CFR 300.320, 300.321; 8 NYCRR 200.3, 200.4[d][2]). If disputes occur between parents and school districts, incorporated among the procedural protections is the opportunity to engage in mediation, present State complaints, and initiate an impartial due process hearing (20 U.S.C. §§ 1221e-3, 1415[e]-[f]; Educ. Law § 4404[1]; 34 CFR 300.151-300.152, 300.506, 300.511; 8 NYCRR 200.5[h]-[*l*]).

New York State has implemented a two-tiered system of administrative review to address disputed matters between parents and school districts regarding "any matter relating to the identification, evaluation or educational placement of a student with a disability, or a student suspected of having a disability, or the provision of a free appropriate public education to such student" (8 NYCRR 200.5[i][1]; see 20 U.S.C. § 1415[b][6]-[7]; 34 CFR 300.503[a][1]-[2], 300.507[a][1]). First, after an opportunity to engage in a resolution process, the parties appear at an impartial hearing conducted at the local level before an IHO (Educ. Law § 4404[1][a]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[j]). An IHO typically conducts a trial-type hearing regarding the matters in dispute in which the parties have the right to be accompanied and advised by counsel and certain other individuals with special knowledge or training; present evidence and confront, cross-examine, and compel the attendance of witnesses; prohibit the introduction of any evidence at the hearing that has not been disclosed five business days before the hearing; and obtain a verbatim record of the proceeding (20 U.S.C. § 1415[f][2][A], [h][1]-[3]; 34 CFR 300.512[a][1]-[4]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[j][3][v], [vii], [xii]). The IHO must render and transmit a final written decision in the matter to the parties not later than 45 days after the expiration period or adjusted period for the resolution process (34 CFR 300.510[b][2], [c], 300.515[a]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[j][5]). A party may seek a specific extension of time of the 45-day timeline, which the IHO may grant in accordance with State and federal regulations (34 CFR 300.515[c]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[j][5]). The decision of the IHO is binding upon both parties unless appealed (Educ. Law § 4404[1]).

A party aggrieved by the decision of an IHO may subsequently appeal to a State Review Officer (SRO) (Educ. Law § 4404[2]; see 20 U.S.C. § 1415[g][1]; 34 CFR 300.514[b][1]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[k]). The appealing party or parties must identify the findings, conclusions, and orders of the IHO with which they disagree and indicate the relief that they would like the SRO to grant (8 NYCRR 279.4). The opposing party is entitled to respond to an appeal or cross-appeal in an answer (8 NYCRR 279.5). The SRO conducts an impartial review of the IHO's findings, conclusions, and decision and is required to examine the entire hearing record; ensure that the procedures at the hearing were consistent with the requirements of due process; seek additional evidence if necessary; and render an independent decision based upon the hearing record (34 CFR 300.514[b][2]; 8 NYCRR 279.12[a]). The SRO must ensure that a final decision is reached in the review and that a copy of the decision is mailed to each of the parties not later than 30 days after the receipt of a request for a review, except that a party may seek a specific extension of time of the 30-day timeline, which the SRO may grant in accordance with State and federal regulations (34 CFR 300.515[b], [c]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[k][2]).

III. Facts and Procedural History

Due to the limited scope of this matter, a full recitation of the procedural history and the student's educational background is not necessary, and the parties' familiarity with the facts of this case is presumed. Briefly, the student in this appeal was parentally placed at the International Institute for the Brain (iBrain) for the 2020-21 school year (Parent Ex. C at p. 1; Dist. Ex. 4 at p. 1). The CSE convened on June 12, 2020 to create the student's IEP for the 2020-21 school year (Dist. Ex. 4 at p. 27). In an August 5, 2020 letter, the parents provided the district with notice of their unilateral placement of the student at iBrain and informed the district that they intended to seek public funding for that placement (Parent Ex. H at p. 1).

A. Due Process Complaint Notice

In a July 6, 2020 due process complaint notice, the parents asserted that the district failed to provide the student with a free appropriate public education (FAPE) for the 2020-21 extended school year, and relevant to this appeal, asserted that the CSE "unjustifiably indicated the [district] would not actually provide any recommended devices and services" to the student, and for relief requested in relevant part "[a]n order compelling the [district] to provide Assistive Technology Services and Devices and AAC to assist [the] Student with communication" (Parent Ex. A at pp. 1, 4, 6).[1]

B. Impartial Hearing Officer Decision

A five-day impartial hearing convened on March 4, 2021 and concluded on May 13, 2021 (Tr. pp. 1-255). In a June 4, 2021 decision, the IHO found that the district failed to offer the student a FAPE when it produced an IEP with a start date of July 6, 2020, rather than July 1, 2020, the start of the extended school year, and when it failed to timely provide the parents with prior written notice and a school location letter (IHO Decision at pp. 5-6).[2] The IHO did not reach the substantive appropriateness of the district's recommended program and placement (see id. at pp. 1-11). The IHO also determined that the parents' choice of iBrain was an appropriate unilateral placement for the student for the 2020-21 extended school year (id. at p. 10). Relevant to this appeal, the IHO noted that all of the students in this student's class at iBrain used assistive technology to communicate (id. at p. 9). Finally, the IHO determined that equitable considerations favored the parents' request for tuition reimbursement (id. at p. 11).

For relief, the IHO ordered the district to directly fund the cost of the student's placement at iBrain, including nursing, related services, and transportation costs for the 2020-21 school year, which the IHO noted that the district did not oppose (IHO Decision at p. 11). The IHO also ordered the district to "provide Assistive Technology Services and Devices and AAC to assist [the] Student with communication [within] two weeks of receipt of this order" (id.).

IV. Appeal for State-Level Review

The district appeals, asserting that the IHO erred in ordering the district to provide the student with assistive technology devices and services, and AAC. Specifically, the district asserts: that the parents "essentially abandoned this claim at hearing"; the district was not obligated to provide the student with equipment or services after the parents unilaterally placed the student at iBrain; iBrain already provides the student with assistive technology and services as part of the program; and the IHO's order would necessarily apply to the following 2021-22 school year, making the award a compensatory services award, which is outside the scope of the due process complaint notice. The district does not appeal the IHO's determinations that it failed to offer the student a FAPE for the 2020-21 school year, that iBrain was an appropriate unilateral placement,

[1] AAC is an acronym for augmentative and alternative communication.

[2] The IHO decision is not fully paginated; for the purposes of this decision, the pages will be cited by reference to their consecutive page numbers with the cover page counted as page 1 (see IHO Decision at pp. 1-14).

and that equitable considerations favored an award of direct tuition payments to iBrain for the student's tuition, related services, and transportation costs for the 2020-21 extended school year.[3]

In their answer, the parents deny the district's assertions, and argue that as the district has not appealed the IHO's FAPE, unilateral placement, and equitable consideration determinations, those findings are final and binding on the parties. The parents assert that contrary to the district's claims, the issue of assistive technology devices and services and AAC was raised in the due process complaint notice; the issue was not abandoned; the district is responsible for providing mandated services at unilateral placements through Education Law Section 3602-c; and, had the district not delayed in providing for timely adjudication of the parents' due process complaint notice, the award of assistive technology services would not have gone into the next school year, thus making the relief "akin" to a compensatory education award.

V. Applicable Standards

Two purposes of the IDEA (20 U.S.C. §§ 1400-1482) are (1) to ensure that students with disabilities have available to them a FAPE that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living; and (2) to ensure that the rights of students with disabilities and parents of such students are protected (20 U.S.C. § 1400[d][1][A]-[B]; see generally Forest Grove Sch. Dist. v. T.A., 557 U.S. 230, 239 [2009]; Bd. of Educ. of Hendrick Hudson Cent. Sch. Dist. v. Rowley, 458 U.S. 176, 206-07 [1982]).

A FAPE is offered to a student when (a) the board of education complies with the procedural requirements set forth in the IDEA, and (b) the IEP developed by its CSE through the IDEA's procedures is reasonably calculated to enable the student to receive educational benefits (Rowley, 458 U.S. at 206-07; T.M. v. Cornwall Cent. Sch. Dist., 752 F.3d 145, 151, 160 [2d Cir. 2014]; R.E. v. New York City Dep't of Educ., 694 F.3d 167, 189-90 [2d Cir. 2012]; M.H. v. New York City Dep't of Educ., 685 F.3d 217, 245 [2d Cir. 2012]; Cerra v. Pawling Cent. Sch. Dist., 427 F.3d 186, 192 [2d Cir. 2005]). "'[A]dequate compliance with the procedures prescribed would in most cases assure much if not all of what Congress wished in the way of substantive content in an IEP'" (Walczak v. Fla. Union Free Sch. Dist., 142 F.3d 119, 129 [2d Cir. 1998], quoting Rowley, 458 U.S. at 206; see T.P. v. Mamaroneck Union Free Sch. Dist., 554 F.3d 247, 253 [2d Cir. 2009]). The Supreme Court has indicated that "[t]he IEP must aim to enable the child to make progress. After all, the essential function of an IEP is to set out a plan for pursuing academic and functional advancement" (Endrew F. v. Douglas Cty. Sch. Dist. RE-1, 580 U.S. __, 137 S. Ct. 988, 999 [2017]). While the Second Circuit has emphasized that school districts must comply with the checklist of procedures for developing a student's IEP and indicated that "[m]ultiple procedural violations may cumulatively result in the denial of a FAPE even if the violations considered individually do not" (R.E., 694 F.3d at 190-91), the Court has also explained that not all procedural errors render an IEP legally inadequate under the IDEA (M.H., 685 F.3d at 245; A.C. v. Bd. of Educ. of the Chappaqua Cent. Sch. Dist., 553 F.3d 165, 172 [2d Cir. 2009]; Grim v. Rhinebeck Cent. Sch. Dist., 346 F.3d 377, 381 [2d Cir. 2003]). Under the IDEA, if procedural violations are

[3] An impartial hearing officer's decision is final and binding upon the parties unless appealed to a State Review Officer (34 CFR 300.514[a]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[j][5][v]).

alleged, an administrative officer may find that a student did not receive a FAPE only if the procedural inadequacies (a) impeded the student's right to a FAPE, (b) significantly impeded the parents' opportunity to participate in the decision-making process regarding the provision of a FAPE to the student, or (c) caused a deprivation of educational benefits (20 U.S.C. § 1415[f][3][E][ii]; 34 CFR 300.513[a][2]; 8 NYCRR 200.5[j][4][ii]; Winkelman v. Parma City Sch. Dist., 550 U.S. 516, 525-26 [2007]; R.E., 694 F.3d at 190; M.H., 685 F.3d at 245).

The IDEA directs that, in general, an IHO's decision must be made on substantive grounds based on a determination of whether the student received a FAPE (20 U.S.C. § 1415[f][3][E][i]). A school district offers a FAPE "by providing personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit the child to benefit educationally from that instruction" (Rowley, 458 U.S. at 203). However, the "IDEA does not itself articulate any specific level of educational benefits that must be provided through an IEP" (Walczak, 142 F.3d at 130; see Rowley, 458 U.S. at 189). "The adequacy of a given IEP turns on the unique circumstances of the child for whom it was created" (Endrew F., 137 S. Ct. at 1001). The statute ensures an "appropriate" education, "not one that provides everything that might be thought desirable by loving parents" (Walczak, 142 F.3d at 132, quoting Tucker v. Bay Shore Union Free Sch. Dist., 873 F.2d 563, 567 [2d Cir. 1989] [citations omitted]; see Grim, 346 F.3d at 379). Additionally, school districts are not required to "maximize" the potential of students with disabilities (Rowley, 458 U.S. at 189, 199; Grim, 346 F.3d at 379; Walczak, 142 F.3d at 132). Nonetheless, a school district must provide "an IEP that is 'likely to produce progress, not regression,' and . . . affords the student with an opportunity greater than mere 'trivial advancement'" (Cerra, 427 F.3d at 195, quoting Walczak, 142 F.3d at 130 [citations omitted]; see T.P., 554 F.3d at 254; P. v. Newington Bd. of Educ., 546 F.3d 111, 118-19 [2d Cir. 2008]). The IEP must be "reasonably calculated to provide some 'meaningful' benefit" (Mrs. B. v. Milford Bd. of Educ., 103 F.3d 1114, 1120 [2d Cir. 1997]; see Endrew F., 137 S. Ct. at 1001 [holding that the IDEA "requires an educational program reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances"]; Rowley, 458 U.S. at 192). The student's recommended program must also be provided in the least restrictive environment (LRE) (20 U.S.C. § 1412[a][5][A]; 34 CFR 300.114[a][2][i], 300.116[a][2]; 8 NYCRR 200.1[cc], 200.6[a][1]; see Newington, 546 F.3d at 114; Gagliardo v. Arlington Cent. Sch. Dist., 489 F.3d 105, 108 [2d Cir. 2007]; Walczak, 142 F.3d at 132).

An appropriate educational program begins with an IEP that includes a statement of the student's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (see 34 CFR 300.320[a][1]; 8 NYCRR 200.4[d][2][i]), establishes annual goals designed to meet the student's needs resulting from the student's disability and enable him or her to make progress in the general education curriculum (see 34 CFR 300.320[a][2][i], [2][i][A]; 8 NYCRR 200.4[d][2][iii]), and provides for the use of appropriate special education services (see 34 CFR 300.320[a][4]; 8 NYCRR 200.4[d][2][v]).[4]

[4] The Supreme Court has stated that even if it is unreasonable to expect a student to attend a regular education setting and achieve on grade level, the educational program set forth in the student's IEP "must be appropriately ambitious in light of his [or her] circumstances, just as advancement from grade to grade is appropriately ambitious for most children in the regular classroom. The goals may differ, but every child should have the chance to meet challenging objectives" (Endrew F., 137 S. Ct. at 1000).

A board of education may be required to reimburse parents for their expenditures for private educational services obtained for a student by his or her parents, if the services offered by the board of education were inadequate or inappropriate, the services selected by the parents were appropriate, and equitable considerations support the parents' claim (Florence County Sch. Dist. Four v. Carter, 510 U.S. 7 [1993]; Sch. Comm. of Burlington v. Dep't of Educ., 471 U.S. 359, 369-70 [1985]; R.E., 694 F.3d at 184-85; T.P., 554 F.3d at 252). In Burlington, the Court found that Congress intended retroactive reimbursement to parents by school officials as an available remedy in a proper case under the IDEA (471 U.S. at 370-71; see Gagliardo, 489 F.3d at 111; Cerra, 427 F.3d at 192). "Reimbursement merely requires [a district] to belatedly pay expenses that it should have paid all along and would have borne in the first instance" had it offered the student a FAPE (Burlington, 471 U.S. at 370-71; see 20 U.S.C. § 1412[a][10][C][ii]; 34 CFR 300.148).

The burden of proof is on the school district during an impartial hearing, except that a parent seeking tuition reimbursement for a unilateral placement has the burden of proof regarding the appropriateness of such placement (Educ. Law § 4404[1][c]; see R.E., 694 F.3d at 184-85).

VI. Discussion – Assistive Technology Award

The district asserts that the IHO erred in ordering the district to provide the student with assistive technology devices and services, as well as AAC because the student received those services at iBrain and because the district was relieved of its obligation to do so once the parents removed the student from the district's school and unilaterally placed the student at iBrain.

As noted above, a board of education may be required to reimburse parents for their expenditures for private educational services obtained for a student by his or her parents where the unilateral placement has been determined to be "proper under the Act" (Carter, 510 U.S. at 12, 15; Burlington, 471 U.S. at 370), i.e., the private school must offer an educational program which appropriately addresses the student's special education needs (see Gagliardo, 489 F.3d at 112, 115; Walczak, 142 F.3d at 129). Parents seeking reimbursement "bear the burden of demonstrating that their private placement was appropriate, even if the IEP was inappropriate" (Gagliardo, 489 F.3d at 112; see M.S. v. Bd. of Educ. of the City Sch. Dist. of Yonkers, 231 F.3d 96, 104 [2d Cir. 2000]). A private placement is appropriate if it provides instruction specially designed to meet the unique needs of a student (20 U.S.C. § 1401[29]; Educ. Law § 4401[1]; 34 CFR 300.39[a][1]; 8 NYCRR 200.1[ww]; Hardison v. Bd. of Educ. of the Oneonta City Sch. Dist., 773 F.3d 372, 386 [2d Cir. 2014]; C.L. v. Scarsdale Union Free Sch. Dist., 744 F.3d 826, 836 [2d Cir. 2014]; Gagliardo, 489 F.3d at 114-15; Frank G., 459 F.3d at 365).

Another form of relief available for the denial of a FAPE is compensatory education, which is an equitable remedy tailored to meet the unique circumstances of each case (Wenger v. Canastota Cent. Sch. Dist., 979 F. Supp. 147 [N.D.N.Y. 1997]) The purpose of an award of compensatory education is to provide an appropriate remedy for a denial of a FAPE (see E.M. v. New York City Dep't of Educ., 758 F.3d 442, 451 [2d Cir. 2014] [holding that compensatory education is a remedy designed to "make up for" a denial of a FAPE]; Newington, 546 F.3d at 123 [stating that "[t]he IDEA allows a hearing officer to fashion an appropriate remedy, and . . . compensatory education is an available option under the Act to make up for denial of a [FAPE]"]; see also Doe v. E. Lyme Bd. of Educ., 790 F.3d 440, 456 [2d Cir. 2015]; Reid v. Dist. of Columbia, 401 F.3d 516, 524 [D.C. Cir. 2005] [holding that, in fashioning an appropriate compensatory

education remedy, "the inquiry must be fact-specific, and to accomplish IDEA's purposes, the ultimate award must be reasonably calculated to provide the educational benefits that likely would have accrued from special education services the school district should have supplied in the first place"]; Parents of Student W. v. Puyallup Sch. Dist., 31 F.3d 1489, 1497 [9th Cir. 1994]). Accordingly, an award of compensatory education should aim to place the student in the position he or she would have been in had the district complied with its obligations under the IDEA (see Newington, 546 F.3d at 123 [holding that compensatory education awards should be designed so as to "appropriately address [] the problems with the IEP"]; see also Draper v. Atlanta Indep. Sch. Sys., 518 F.3d 1275, 1289 [11th Cir. 2008] [holding that "[c]ompensatory awards should place children in the position they would have been in but for the violation of the Act"]; Bd. of Educ. of Fayette Cnty., Ky. v. L.M., 478 F.3d 307, 316 [6th Cir. 2007] [holding that "a flexible approach, rather than a rote hour-by-hour compensation award, is more likely to address [the student's] educational problems successfully"]; Reid, 401 F.3d at 518 [holding that compensatory education is a "replacement of educational services the child should have received in the first place" and that compensatory education awards "should aim to place disabled children in the same position they would have occupied but for the school district's violations of IDEA"]).

Some courts have held that compensatory education is not available as an additional or alternative remedy when reimbursement for the costs of a unilateral placement is also at issue for the same time period (see D.F. v. Collingswood Borough Bd. of Educ., 694 F.3d 488, 498 [3rd Cir. 2012] [holding that "[b]ecause compensatory education is at issue only when tuition reimbursement is not, it is implicated only where parents could not afford to 'front' the costs of a child's education"]; P.P. v. West Chester Area Sch. Dist., 585 F.3d 727, 739 [3rd Cir. 2009] [holding that "compensatory education is not an available remedy when a student has been unilaterally enrolled in private school"]; but see I.T. v. Dep't of Educ., State of Hawaii, 2013 WL 6665459, at *7-*8 [D. Haw. Dec. 17, 2013] [finding that the student was entitled to compensatory education for services the student received at the nonpublic school]). The Second Circuit Court of Appeals has not directly addressed this question and, generally, appears to have adopted a broader reading of the purposes of compensatory education than the Third Circuit (compare P.P., 585 F.3d at 739 [finding that "[t]he right to compensatory education arises not from the denial of an appropriate IEP, but from the denial of appropriate education"], with E. Lyme, 790 F.3d at 456-57 [treating compensatory education as an available equitable remedy for a denial of a FAPE so as to effectuate the purposes of the IDEA and put a student in the same position he or she would have been in had the denial of a FAPE not occurred]). Accordingly, unlike the Third Circuit, the Second Circuit's approach to compensatory education may leave room for unique circumstances where an award of compensatory education may be warranted, for example, when a student has been unilaterally placed but the parent's request for tuition reimbursement is denied under a Burlington/Carter analysis (see Application of a Student with a Disability, Appeal No. 16-050). However, if permitted, it would be the rare case where a unilateral placement is deemed to provide instruction specially designed to meet the student's unique needs, but the student is also deemed entitled to compensatory education to fill gaps in the services provided by such unilateral placement.

Here, there is no dispute that the student requires the use of assistive technology devices and services and AAC, and according to the evidence in the hearing record, iBrain provided those services and devices to the student during the 2020-21 school year (Parent Ex. C at pp. 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 31, 38; see Tr. pp. 226). With respect to relief, the IHO found that the parents were entitled

to tuition reimbursement for the district's denial of a FAPE to the student for the 2020-21 school year and ordered the district to fund the costs associated with the student's unilateral placement at iBrain, which included the related services that iBrain provided (IHO Decision at p. 11). Accordingly, the IHO's order that the district must directly provide the student with assistive technology services, devices and AAC while he was enrolled at iBrain initially presents as the type of compensatory education award that is not available as relief to a student who already has been awarded tuition reimbursement for an appropriate unilateral placement. However, upon closer inspection, even when viewed through a compensatory education lens, this is not a situation where the parents, in effect, seek district funding to remedy gaps in the putatively appropriate program offered by the unilateral placement. Rather, the hearing record supports a finding that appropriate assistive technology services and devices for the student were part and parcel of the overall program and placement offered by iBrain and any additional award of assistive technology services and devices to be provided directly by the district would be unnecessarily duplicative. Indeed, given that a tuition reimbursement remedy generally requires a district to belatedly pay expenses that it should have paid all along had it offered the student a FAPE (see Burlington, 471 U.S. at 370-71; see 20 U.S.C. § 1412[a][10][C][ii]; 34 CFR 300.148), it is unclear why the IHO treated assistive technology services and devices as distinct from the tuition and other related services costs that she determined the district must fund.

VII. Conclusion

Based on the above, I find that the IHO erred in ordering the district to provide the student with assistive technology devices and services, as well as AAC.

THE APPEAL IS SUSTAINED.

IT IS ORDERED that that portion of the IHO's decision dated June 4, 2021 which ordered the district to "provide Assistive Technology Services and Devices and AAC to assist Student with communication [within] two weeks of receipt of this order" is reversed.

Dated: **Albany, New York**
August 11, 2021

CAROL H. HAUGE
STATE REVIEW OFFICER