

**ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
IMPARTIAL DUE PROCESS HEARING**

██████████ ESD ██████

Petitioner/District,

v.

█████, by and through his/her Parent(s),

Respondent/Student.

Case No. 2026-DP-0099

Mary Jo Strusz

Impartial Hearing Officer

FINAL DETERMINATION AND ORDER

JURISDICTION.

The undersigned has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S. C. §1400 et seq., and the Illinois School Code, 105 ILCS 5/148.02a et seq.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.

On December 4, 2025, the Petitioner (District) filed a due process complaint (Complaint) against the Mother.¹ Student's Parents are divorced; Mother and Father acknowledged on the record that they share equal authority in educational decision-making for Student. The Student was found eligible for an IEP on January 10, 2023, under the classification of other health impairment ("OHI").² On December 1, 2025, Mother sent an email to the District entitled Formal Request for Independent Educational Evaluation ("IEE") indicating she disagreed with the District's November 2025 reevaluation of Student and requesting an Independent Education Evaluation at public expense pursuant to 34 CFR §300.502 in the following areas: Neuropsychological; Autism; Educational assessment (academic Achievement, executive functioning, written expression, math reasoning); speech-language; occupational therapy, and Psychological evaluation.³ The District denied the Mother's request for an IEE, and on December 4, 2025, filed a Due Process Complaint to defend Student's reevaluation.⁴

¹ IHO Ex. 1.

² IHO Ex. 15.

³ IHO Ex. 12.

⁴ IHO Ex. 1.

Courtney Stillman of Himes Petrarca & Fester represented the District. The Mother proceeded *pro se*. The Father did not participate in the preliminary portion of this case but was invited to all conferences and provided copies of all documents issued by the Hearing Officer. The Father testified at the hearing but did not present any evidence.

On December 5, 2025, the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) appointed the undersigned as the Impartial Hearing Officer (IHO) in this case.⁵ On December 8, 2025, the undersigned issued a Preliminary Order, Rights of Parties, Hearing Process Guidelines, and a Standing Order.⁶ The Mother filed her Response to the Complaint on December 12, 2025.⁷

The first status conference call occurred, via telephone, on December 16, 2025.⁸ The parties agreed to waive the resolution meeting on December 19, 2025, and did not participate in mediation.⁹

The second status conference call occurred on December 19, 2023.¹⁰ The Prehearing Conference was set for December 30, 2025. The notice of the Prehearing Conference was issued on December 19, 2025.¹¹

The parties' prehearing disclosures were received on December 26, 2025.¹² A Prehearing Conference was held on December 30, 2025.¹³ Hearing dates were agreed upon.¹⁴ The Final Prehearing Report and Order was issued on January 12, 2026.¹⁵

On March 4, 2026, the District filed its document list, joint exhibit list, and witness list.¹⁶ The Mother failed to file her 5-day business disclosures at 5:00 p.m., and the exhibit disclosures were sent at 5:02 p.m.¹⁷ At a recorded Zoom conference held on March 5, 2026, the Parent was informed that her 5-day business disclosures would be available for her use during the second day of the hearing.¹⁸

⁵ IHO Ex.2.

⁶ IHO Ex. 3.

⁷ IHO Ex. 4.

⁸ IHO Ex.5.

⁹ IHO Ex. 6, 12.

¹⁰ IHO Ex 7.

¹¹ IHO Ex. 7.

¹² IHO Ex. 8,9.

¹³ IHO Ex. 15.

¹⁴ IHO Ex. 15.

¹⁵ IHO Ex.12.

¹⁶ IHO Ex. 14.

¹⁷ IHO Ex. 15.

¹⁸ IHO Ex. 23.

On March 6, 2026, the Parties filed six stipulations, which are incorporated herein.¹⁹

The District filed its objections to the Mother's exhibits on March 9, 2026.²⁰ The Mother filed a response to the objections.²¹ At a status conference on March 10, 2026, IHO found the District's objections justified and ruled several of the Mother's exhibits inadmissible. The hearing took place on March 11 and 12, 2026, via Zoom.

The District called six witnesses to testify. The Parent testified and called three witnesses. Seven exhibits, designated as D1-7, were admitted for the District. Parent's Exhibit 14 was admitted, and Joint Exhibits 1, 5-12 were admitted. The District provided courtesy copies of its case law and regulations to the IHO and the Parent.

The IHO's decision is due within 10 calendar days of the conclusion of the hearing, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and state holidays.²² As such, the IHO did not have access to a transcript. This decision is based on the IHO's personal notes and recollection of the testimony provided at the hearing. In rendering this decision, the IHO carefully considered all the documents admitted into evidence and the testimony of the witnesses, whether specifically referred to or cited, when making her final determination. The IHO also considered the parties' closing arguments, the District's suggested case law and statutes, as well as the IHO's own independent research. This decision was issued as required by Illinois law.²³

ISSUE AND REQUESTED REMEDIES

The District's issues to be determined are as follows:

District Issue One: Whether the District's December 2025 three-year re-evaluation of the Student is appropriate, such that no Independent Educational Evaluation (IEE) is required to be provided at public expense.

District Issue Two: If the December 2025 three-year re-evaluation is determined not to be appropriate, is the Student entitled to an independent education evaluation at public expense in only one or all areas requested by the Mother: Neuropsychological, Autism evaluation²⁴; Educational assessment (academic achievement, executive functioning, written expression, math

¹⁹ IHO Ex. 19

²⁰ IHO Ex. 20.

²¹ IHO Ex. 21.

²² 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(g55)(5).

²³ 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(g55)(5).

²⁴ -----

reasoning); speech-language evaluation (including pragmatics/social communication); Occupational therapy evaluation (including sensory processing); and Psychological evaluation?

The District’s remedies are as follows:

- a. A finding that Student’s 2025 re-evaluation was appropriately administered, complied with the procedural requirements of IDEA, and Student is not entitled to an Independent Education Evaluation at public expense, and the District is not required to fund an IEE at public expense. , and a finding that the 2023 was appropriate, and the Mother’s request for an IEE based on this evaluation is outside the statute of limitations.²⁵
- b. Find that the Mother’s request for an IEE based on the District’s 2023 Autism evaluation is outside the statute of limitations, or that the evaluation was appropriate and the District is not required to fund an IEE at the public expense.²⁶

The Mother’s remedies are as follows:

- a. Order the District to fund an independent education evaluation in all areas requested.²⁷

JOINT STIPULATIONS OF FACT.²⁸

1. [Student] is a sixth-grade student attending [REDACTED] School District No [REDACTED] (“District”).
2. [Student] was initially determined eligible for special education and related services on January 10, 2023, under the category of Other Health Impairment (OHI).
3. A Domain Meeting for [Student]’s three-year reevaluation was held on October 21, 2025.
4. [Parent][Student’s] mother signed consent for the reevaluation on October 21, 2025.
5. On December 1, 2025, Parent requested an Independent Educational Evaluation (IEE) at public expense.

²⁵ IHO Ex. 12.

²⁶ IHO Ex. 12.

²⁷ IHO Ex. 1.

²⁸ IHO Ex. 18.

6. On December 4, 2025, the District filed a due process complaint notice and requested appointment of an Impartial Hearing Officer.

FINDINGS OF FACT.

After considering all of the evidence as well as the arguments of the parties, the IHO's Findings of Fact are as follows:

A. BACKGROUND

1. Student was adopted as an infant.²⁹ Student is creative and enjoys art. Student frequently self-advocates. Student has a medical diagnosis of Celiac Disease (contact and ingestion), Anxiety, and Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD). Student also has a dairy intolerance. Student received a medical diagnosis of Autism on November 10, 2022.³⁰ Student's December 2025 placement was inside the general education classroom 80% or more of the day.³¹ Student has access to a classroom aide.³² Student receives 60 minutes of social work services monthly.³³ Student does not like being pulled from the classroom.³⁴
2. Student's Parents are divorced. The Parents share legal custody and educational decision-making rights.³⁵ Parents are both experienced teachers.³⁶ The Father did not participate in and disagrees with the request for IEEs.³⁷
3. Student sees a private therapist and has done extensive private testing.³⁸

B. DOMAIN MEETING

4. On October 21, 2026, the IEP team held a domain meeting to discuss Student's three-year reevaluation.³⁹ Procedural Safeguards were provided to Parents.⁴⁰ The three-day draft with copies of all written materials was provided to Parents on September 24, 2025.⁴¹ All

²⁹ Mother testimony and D2-85.

³⁰ Mother testimony and D2-52.

³¹ D2-49, D2-68-69.

³² D2-68

³³ D2-54, D2-68

³⁴ Psychologist, Mother, Father, Principal, SW testimony.

³⁵ Father's testimony.

³⁶ Mother (closing) and Father testimony.

³⁷ Father testimony.

³⁸ Father testimony.

³⁹ Stipulations, JE5-6.

⁴⁰ JE5-7, JE5-12.

⁴¹ JE5-8.

required participants, including both Parents attended the meeting.⁴² The District Speech Language Pathologist (“SLP”) was not originally invited to the meeting.⁴³

5. During the meeting, Student’s suspected disabilities were discussed.⁴⁴
 - a. Prior to the meeting, no one, including Student’s teachers or Parents, had expressed a concern about the Student’s social-pragmatic language skills. During the meeting, Mother expressed concerns about Student’s pragmatic language skills, indicating that Student prefers to tap her on the shoulder rather than initiate a verbal conversation.⁴⁵ The team sent for the SLP, who joined the meeting approximately halfway through.⁴⁶ Student’s actions were discussed, and the team determined that the SLP would complete a social pragmatic assessment to further understand Student’s social language skills relative to her same-age peers.⁴⁷ Parents did not express any additional concerns in this area.⁴⁸ During the meeting, SLP suggested completing the Social Language Development Test (SLDT-E: NU), described the testing to the team, and the team determined it was appropriate. Parents did not object or request other testing.⁴⁹
 - b. Student’s academic performance was discussed, garnered from input obtained through teacher surveys, Aimsweb scores for Spring and Fall 2025, and current grades.⁵⁰
 - i. The team then determined that additional evaluation data was needed in the area of Academic assessments (reading, math, and written expression),
 - ii. Psychologist will complete the assessments.⁵¹
 - iii. Neither Parent requested any additional academic assessments.⁵²
 - c. General intelligence (cognitive performance) was discussed. Teachers did not express any cognitive or intelligence concerns.⁵³ Mother stated that she had concerns about Student’s memory. To address this concern, the team determined that Student would receive an evaluation in the areas of working memory and processing speed.⁵⁴ Parents did not request a full cognitive battery during the meeting.⁵⁵
 - d. Health was reviewed based on IEP paperwork dated December 10, 2024.⁵⁶ This portion of the domain was completed by the school Social Worker (“SW”).⁵⁷

⁴² JE5-7

⁴³ SLP testimony.

⁴⁴ SW testimony.

⁴⁵ JE5-15 and SLP testimony.

⁴⁶ SLP testimony.

⁴⁷ JE5-15.

⁴⁸ SLP testimony.

⁴⁹ SLP testimony.

⁵⁰ JE5-14-15 and Psychologist testimony.

⁵¹ JE5-15 and Psychologist testimony.

⁵² Psychologist testimony.

⁵³ Psychologist testimony.

⁵⁴ JE5-15 and Psychologist testimony.

⁵⁵ Psychologist testimony.

⁵⁶ JE5-15.

⁵⁷ SW testimony.

Neither Parent nor any team members requested or recommended doing any autism testing.⁵⁸

- e. Social/emotional status was reviewed through existing information obtained from the input of Student's teachers, Parents and SW's work with Student.⁵⁹ Based on the information SW provided, the team determined that additional social work evaluations were necessary.⁶⁰ During the additional evaluation, observations were to be conducted in Student's core classes. There were no requests for observations in other school environments.⁶¹ SW identified two assessments, which were approved by the team:
 - i. BRIEF rating scales to determine time on task in each core class.
 - ii. Conners-4
6. Mother signed the consent to evaluate.⁶²

IEE REQUEST-DECEMBER 1, 2025

7. A draft of the evaluation was sent to the Parents on November 21, 2025.⁶³ The draft was incomplete because it lacked data on cognitive functioning and AIMSweb benchmarks.⁶⁴ After reviewing the draft and believing the evaluations were incomplete, Mother, on December 1, 2025, requested an IEE in the following areas: Neuropsychological, Autism evaluation; Educational assessment (academic achievement, executive functioning, written expression, math reasoning); speech-language evaluation (including pragmatics/social communication); Occupational therapy evaluation (including sensory processing); and Psychological.⁶⁵
8. Mother did not request a health IEE.⁶⁶
9. Mother did not discuss the request for an IEE with Father.⁶⁷

ELIGIBILITY MEETING DECEMBER 2, 2025

10. Student's eligibility meeting was convened on December 2, 2025.⁶⁸ The meeting was attended by the SW, Mother and Father, General Education Teacher, Case Worker ("CW"), Superintendent, SLP, Psychologist, Nurse, Assistant Principal, and LEA representative.⁶⁹ During this portion of the meeting, the evaluation results were discussed, and eligibility for special education was determined.⁷⁰ Student's Medical history was not discussed at this meeting.⁷¹

⁵⁸ Psychologist testimony.

⁵⁹ JE5-16-19.

⁶⁰ JE5-18.

⁶¹ SW testimony, JE5-18.

⁶² Stipulation 4 and JE5-12.

⁶³ SW testimony.

⁶⁴ P-14 and Mother testimony.

⁶⁵ Mother testimony.

⁶⁶ SW testimony.

⁶⁷ Father testimony.

⁶⁸ D2-49.

⁶⁹ D2-50, SW testimony.

⁷⁰ D2-71.

⁷¹ D2 and D2-109.

11. Credible testimony was provided by each evaluator who testified that they had adhered to the publisher’s individual protocols; the evaluators were trained and experienced in providing the assessments, followed the publisher’s instructions, and there was no racial, cultural or language bias toward Student.⁷²
12. SW reviewed the results of the Student’s social work evaluation. SW has ten (10) years of experience as a social worker for the Special Education Association that serves this District. SW holds a professional educator license (PEL) and has completed Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS) training, which equips professionals with skills to assess and diagnose autism spectrum disorders. SW’s current responsibilities include conducting social work evaluations. SW is familiar with Student; she completed Student’s 2023 social work evaluation and has been working with Student since she was in preschool. SW is responsible for providing Student’s social work minutes.⁷³ During her presentation, both Parents had an opportunity to ask questions about her observations, rating scales, and interviews, which SW answered.⁷⁴
 - a. As agreed during the Domain Meeting, SW completed the previously identified assessments- the Brief2 and Connors4. These are the same assessments used during Student’s 2023 evaluation. Repeating the same testing allows the team to track Student’s current behavior over time.⁷⁵
 - i. Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Function (BRIEF2) to evaluate Student. The BRIEF2 is the current edition of this rating scale. The BRIEF2 comprises three main areas: Behavior Regulation, Emotional Control, and Cognitive Regulation. It yields a Global Executive Composite, which indicates a student’s overall executive functioning ability. The BRIEF2 is not a test administered directly to a student; it is a ratings-based questionnaire that SW provided to 8 raters, including Parents, to assess how Student’s executive functioning skills appear across a wide variety of settings.⁷⁶
 1. The results of the BRIEF2 indicate that Student has executive functioning deficits that will need support for Student to be successful within the educational setting.⁷⁷
 2. SW’s assessed Student’s executive functioning deficits from a social perspective, and not a cognitive functioning perspective.⁷⁸
 - ii. The Connors4 is the current edition of this rating scale. This is an evidence-based assessment that allows a closer look at Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) symptoms, including inattention, hyperactivity, impulsivity, executive function, and some behavioral, emotional, and cognitive issues.⁷⁹ The Connors4 is not a test provided directly to students; like the BRIEF2, it is a ratings-based questionnaire and allows the responder to provide additional information in a narrative

⁷² SW, Psychologist, Psychologist 2, and SW testimony.

⁷³ Social Worker Testimony.

⁷⁴ SW testimony.

⁷⁵ SW testimony.

⁷⁶ D2-83, 87 and SW testimony.

⁷⁷ D2-87 and SW testimony.

⁷⁸ SW testimony.

⁷⁹ SW and Psychologist testimony.

form.⁸⁰ SW provided the Connors4 to eight raters, including Parents.⁸¹ The Connors4 assessment disclosed the following:

1. Student takes medication for ADHD symptoms.⁸²
 2. Student displays impulsivity and ADD/ADHD type behavior both within the school setting and the home setting.⁸³
 3. Mother stated Student may hide or avoid tasks to finish faster instead of completing them correctly.⁸⁴
 4. Mother and Father stated that Student's impulsivity was her biggest obstacle.⁸⁵
 5. The Case Worker noted that Student's school work is completed as fast as possible, resulting in errors.⁸⁶
- b. SW also completed the Behavioral Observation of Students in Schools (BOSS) assessment. SW followed the publisher's directions during her observations and data recording. This is a time-on-task observation assessment that consists of 30-minute observation intervals, recorded on the BOSS Excel spreadsheet, which tracks a student's time on- and off-task for comparison with peers. It also provides information on overall functioning.⁸⁷
- i. As part of the testing protocol, the BOSS requires the collection of data every 15 seconds reflecting whether a student is on or off task, and if off task, why. Student was found to be off task 14.58% of the time due to motor-driven behavior and 4.17% due to passive behavior.⁸⁸
 - ii. To ensure SW had a complete understanding of how Student performs and what her behavior looks like throughout the school day, SW gathered information on different days, in different classes, and during the morning and afternoon.⁸⁹
 - iii. SW determined Student's task behavior was generally appropriate. Student was found to be impulsive with a tendency to rush through assignments. Student was also found reluctant to accept help.⁹⁰
 - iv. Student's ADHD symptoms often present as quiet forgetfulness, disorganization, and difficulty with focus rather than hyperactivity.⁹¹
- c. The results of these assessments assisted in the development of Student's social work goals.⁹²
- d. During the assessments and while providing Student with her social work services, SW did not observe any Student behaviors consistent with Autism which

⁸⁰ D2-84-85 and SW testimony.

⁸¹ SW testimony.

⁸² SW testimony.

⁸³ D2-88-89 and SW testimony.

⁸⁴ D2-85.

⁸⁵ D2-88 and SW testimony.

⁸⁶ D2-85 and Case Worker testimony.

⁸⁷ D2-86 and SW testimony.

⁸⁸ SW testimony.

⁸⁹ D2-86, JE6-23-28 and SW testimony.

⁹⁰ D2-86 and SW testimony.

⁹¹ SW testimony.

⁹² SW testimony.

would require additional Autism testing. SW characterized Student's behavior as more consistent with a performance deficit rather than a skill deficit.⁹³

13. The team found Student continued to be eligible for special education services under the category of Other Health Impairment ("OHI").⁹⁴ The team determined Student's impulsiveness adversely impacts her ability to fully capture instruction in large-group settings and impacts her ability to access her education.⁹⁵
14. Psychologist has more than thirty (30) years of experience as a school psychologist, and has worked for the Special Education Association that serves this District for over five (5) years.⁹⁶ She is trained in administering the Autism ADOS and diagnosing educational autism in children. She has been a diagnostician in the area of autism for over twenty-five years.⁹⁷ Psychologist's current responsibilities include conducting evaluations and serving on the ADOS team.⁹⁸ Psychologist is familiar with Student from working with Student during her 2023 initial evaluation.⁹⁹ As part of her assessment, Psychologist conducted a review of the Student's academic evaluations. During her presentation, both Parents were given the opportunity to ask questions regarding her observations, rating scales, and interviews, which she addressed.¹⁰⁰
15. In accordance with the agreement reached at the Domain Meeting, Psychologist completed three assessments.
 - a. The Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Third Edition (KTEA-3), is designed to assess a student's overall academic performance to provide a comprehensive evaluation in mathematics, reading, and written expression. Psychologist administered this test to compare results from the 2023 assessment with those from the 2025 reevaluation. The nationally normed, average range for subtests on the KTEA3 is between 85 and 115 (16th-74th percent of the population for this age group).¹⁰¹
 - i. Two math skills subtests were chosen because they combine Math Concepts and Applications (problem solving) and Math computation (numerical operations). Student's math composite score was 82, slightly below average:
 1. The Concepts and applications subtest required Student to solve word problems based on questions stated verbally while looking at pictures on an iPad. Student's score was 84.
 2. The Math Computation subtest is an untimed test that looks at problem solving in the areas of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division. Student's score was 83.¹⁰²
 3. A third subtest, Math Fluency, was not provided, it is a supplemental math assessment to determine how quickly a student

⁹³ SW testimony.

⁹⁴ D2-104.

⁹⁵ D2-104.

⁹⁶ Psychologist testimony and D-5.

⁹⁷ Psychologist testimony and D5-118.

⁹⁸ D5-118

⁹⁹ Psychologist testimony.

¹⁰⁰ SW testimony.

¹⁰¹ Psychologist testimony.

¹⁰² Psychologist testimony.

- can complete computations. This subtest was not administered as there were no teacher complaints about math calculation speed.¹⁰³
- ii. Two reading skills subtests were chosen because they measure different reading skills. Student's reading composite score is 85.
 1. The Letter and Word recognition subtest measures how students attack words, how they approach sight words, high-frequency words, and decode unfamiliar words. Student's score was 91.
 2. The Reading Comprehension subtest includes asking the Student to independently read passages and answer questions about the passages. Student's score was 83.¹⁰⁴
 - iii. Two written language subtests were also chosen: spelling, which assesses spelling words in isolation, and written expression, which assesses the mechanics of writing. Student's written language composite on this test is 84.¹⁰⁵
 1. Student's Spelling score is 83.
 2. The Written Expression subtest includes writing a dictated sentence, editing a paragraph for punctuation and capitalization, combining two sentences, and writing a short essay. Student had difficulty using commas, quotation marks, and apostrophes, and with correct sentence structure, planning, and organization. Her score is 87.
 - iv. The authors of the KTEA3 allow for behavioral regulation of the child during testing. Student's behavioral observations are recorded to provide additional information on whether the testing is a valid measure of a student's academic functioning based on how they participated during testing. These were taken into account when the examiner determined Student's scores are an underestimate of Student's true ability:
 1. Student's testing occurred over 4 different test sessions, ranging between 20 and 50 minutes. To gain her full cooperation, Student was given input on when and where Student wanted to be tested.¹⁰⁶
 2. Student had some difficulty with sustaining attention and was impulsive when answering.¹⁰⁷
 3. Student answered questions before the question was completed.
 4. Student did not fully read passages during the reading test.
 5. During the final session, Student was angry and concerned about missing PE during one of the testing sessions.¹⁰⁸
 - b. EasyCBM is a nationally normed assessment that is taken independently. Student is told to read the instructions and complete the questions.¹⁰⁹ The Principal administered Student's exam, in her office, to avoid disrupting Student's

¹⁰³ Psychologist testimony.

¹⁰⁴ D2-79 and Psychologist testimony.

¹⁰⁵ D2-79.

¹⁰⁶ Psychologist testimony.

¹⁰⁷ Psychologist testimony.

¹⁰⁸ D2-80 and Psychologist testimony.

¹⁰⁹ Psychologist testimony.

schedule.¹¹⁰ Principal noted that Student completed the basic reading test in three minutes but took longer with math.¹¹¹

- i. Student's math score was in the 40th percentile, which is low risk.
 - ii. Student's basic reading was in the 12th percentile which is some risk and may need additional support.¹¹²
 - c. Psychologist administered portions of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, 5th Ed (WISC-V) to assess the Student's cognitive abilities.¹¹³
 - i. The Working Memory Index assesses both auditory and visual memory. The average standard score is 85-115. Student's working memory index is 88, placing Student in the low-average range.¹¹⁴
 - ii. The Processing Speed test measures speed and accuracy of visual identification, decision making, and decision implementation. Student's processing speed index was 103 which is in the average range.¹¹⁵
16. Student's academic scores between 2023 and 2026 were consistent, indicating parallel gains to children of the student's own age.¹¹⁶
17. Psychologist went over the results of the academic and cognitive testing during the eligibility meeting. The Parents had an opportunity to ask questions about the testing. Psychologist answered those questions. Psychologist credibly testified that she did appropriate testing and obtained valid and reliable results in her testing.¹¹⁷
18. SLP reviewed the results of the Student's social language development testing. SLP has a master's degree in speech-language pathology, a non-teaching professional educator license (PEL), and her Certificate of Clinical Competence (CCC-SLP). SLP has her license through the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation (2024). SLP has worked as a speech language pathologist for the Special Education Association that serves this District since August 2022. SLP provides speech-language assessments and social-pragmatic therapy.¹¹⁸ SLP credibly testified that Student did not meet the eligibility criteria for speech and language services. She based her conclusion on the testing results.¹¹⁹ The four assessments were:
 - a. The SLDT-E: NU (SLDT) is a test of social language skills and was administered to Student. SLDT consists of four (4) subtests, each focusing on different skills. The average scaled score for the subtests ranges from 8 to 12. The average index score range is 85 to 115.¹²⁰ These subtests include:
 - i. Making inferences measures how students make inferences about what a person is thinking based on nonverbal and context clues. There are two components to this assessment. Student received a scaled score of 14, which is (above average) on these components.

¹¹⁰ Principal testimony.

¹¹¹ D2-80 and Psychologist, Principal testimony.

¹¹² D2-80

¹¹³ Psychologist testimony.

¹¹⁴ D2-80 and Psychologist testimony.

¹¹⁵ D2-80 and Psychologist testimony.

¹¹⁶ Psychologist testimony.

¹¹⁷ Psychologist testimony.

¹¹⁸ D7-125 and SLP testimony.

¹¹⁹ SLP testimony.

¹²⁰ SLP testimony.

1. Expressing a Person’s thoughts through looking at pictures of a situation and verbally identifying what that person would be thinking.
 2. Stating Visual clues requires a verbal identification of a relevant visual clue to what a person is thinking.¹²¹
 - ii. The Interpersonal negotiation assessment, Student received a scaled score of 15, which is superior.¹²² This assessment expects three things from a student:
 1. When given a scenario, they must state what is the problem.
 2. State a solution to the problem.
 3. Identify why it would be beneficial to complete the solution they proposed.¹²³
 - iii. Multiple interpretations require a student to make logical inferences from a picture and think flexibly. Student received a scaled score of 12, which is average.¹²⁴
 - iv. Supporting Peers, assesses the ability to make a remark that will support/please a friend, Student received a scaled score of 12 which is average.¹²⁵
 - v. Student achieved a composite performance in the superior range.¹²⁶
19. Adaptive behavior has never been a concern for Student.
20. Student was found eligible for IEP services under the category of Other Health Impairment (“OHI”). Psychologist agrees with this finding because OHI is the best descriptor based on Student’s ADHD.¹²⁷ The testing informed the team what adverse educational effects Student suffered from her disability, which are consistent with OHI.
21. The meeting concluded prior to the development of Student’s IEP, and it was agreed to continue the meeting on December 16, 2026.¹²⁸
22. Father attended the meeting on December 16, 2026.¹²⁹ Mother declined to attend.¹³⁰ SW reviewed the Student’s health based on an interview with the Mother and Father, and the Student’s medical reports provided by the Mother.¹³¹ The team provided the student with three functional goals after reviewing the student’s Present Level of academic achievement and Functional Performance related to each goal.¹³²
- a. Student will seek and respond positively to classroom support, to complete tasks and assignments successfully.¹³³

¹²¹ D2-102 and SLP testimony.

¹²² D2-101 and SLP testimony.

¹²³ D2-102 and SLP testimony.

¹²⁴ D2-101,102 and SLP testimony.

¹²⁵ D2-103 and SLP testimony.

¹²⁶ D2-103 and SLP testimony.

¹²⁷ D2-104 and Psychologist testimony.

¹²⁸ D2-111

¹²⁹ D2-71.

¹³⁰ D2-109-110.

¹³¹ D2-52, D2-90 and SW testimony.

¹³² D2-56-62

¹³³ D2-56-57

- b. SLP recommended Student continue to work on foundational skills with her social worker.¹³⁴ Based on SLP's recommendation, the team drafted Student's IEP Goal #2, which states: "[Student] will improve her impulse control by using an appropriate social filter and managing her emotional responses as measured by teacher rating scales."¹³⁵
- c. Student will demonstrate improved focus, independence, and self-management during academic tasks by initiating work promptly, seeking clarification or support when needed, and maintaining concentration on assignments.¹³⁶

REQUEST FOR IEE FOR AUTISM BASED ON 2023 EVALUATION

- 23. During the course of Student's 2023 initial evaluation, the Parents provided an outside evaluation, which included assessments and a brain scan, that indicated a medical autism diagnosis.¹³⁷ The medical evaluation included a brain scan, a Zoom interview with Student, and a review of parents' intake questionnaires.¹³⁸
- 24. In response to receiving the evaluation, the education team took steps to determine how the medical diagnosis impacted Student within the educational setting.¹³⁹ The team amended the original domain and obtained consent to proceed with an initial autism assessment to determine whether there are signs that autism may be impacting Student's education and whether Student needed specially designed instruction to address autism-related educational needs.¹⁴⁰ A medical diagnosis of autism doesn't automatically qualify a student for special education services.¹⁴¹
- 25. SW administered the Autism Spectrum Rating Scale (ARS) to gather information and determine if the autism characteristics were being observed. SW was trained to administer and analyze this rating scale.¹⁴²
 - a. The Parents and two teachers completed the ARS.¹⁴³
 - b. Teachers and Mother ratings indicate Student displays behavioral characteristics that are elevated or very elevated in all areas questioned.¹⁴⁴
- 26. On January 10, 2023, Student's initial eligibility meeting took place. Student was found eligible to receive IEP services under the category of OHI.¹⁴⁵ During the meeting, the ARS results were reviewed, and the responses were confusing. Student's Teachers Reported that they were not seeing characteristics of autism which conflicted with their

¹³⁴ SLP testimony.

¹³⁵ D2-59 and SLP testimony.

¹³⁶ D2-61-62.

¹³⁷ JE8-33-35, JE1-1, and SW testimony.

¹³⁸ JE8-33 and SW testimony.

¹³⁹ Psychologist testimony.

¹⁴⁰ SW testimony.

¹⁴¹ Psychologist-2 testimony.

¹⁴² D1-31, and SW testimony.

¹⁴³ D1-39 and SW testimony.

¹⁴⁴ D1-39 and SW testimony.

¹⁴⁵ SW testimony.

- responses on the rating scales.¹⁴⁶ The team reopened the Student's domain and received the Parents' consent to complete an Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS).¹⁴⁷
27. Psychologist-2 is a licensed school psychologist. She has (20) years of experience as a school psychologist and has worked for the Special Education Association that serves this District for over six (6) years.¹⁴⁸ She is trained to administer the ADOS.¹⁴⁹ Her current responsibilities include conducting evaluations and providing consultations regarding the ADOS-2 to school psychologists and social workers.¹⁵⁰
28. Psychologist-2 facilitated an ADOS-2 assessment of Student on January 24, 2023. Another school psychologist and a school social worker observed the assessment. The observers were present to ensure the facilitator coded the behaviors accurately. The ADOS assessment includes four modules, each geared toward a specific group of students. Psychologist-2 selected module three, which is geared to older children and adolescents who are verbally fluent.¹⁵¹ During the testing the following were observed:
- Student appropriately used eye contact and verbalization.
 - Student's expressive language was appropriate for her age; she used complex and varied sentence structure with appropriate intonation.
 - Student did not show signs of echolalia.
 - Student spontaneously offered information about herself, and did not display difficulty with interpersonal interaction.
 - Student displayed interactions with the examiner and observers, linking verbal and nonverbal communication.
 - Student did display some hesitancy when talking about friendships. She avoided answering questions about the topic directly and instead drew her responses on a dry-erase board. Student demonstrated the ability to interact and engage in conversation; however, emotionally heavy topics were more difficult for Student to discuss. Student did not display any stereotypical autism characteristics. There were no unusual or repetitive motor movements, and Student did not perseverate on any topic. Psychologist-2 coded Student's behaviors and compared to the score protocol, it shows a low level of autism related symptoms consistent with a classification of non-spectrum.¹⁵²
29. Psychologist-2 provided credible testimony indicating that, according to the ADOS2 assessment, the Student did not exhibit behaviors associated with autism within the educational environment.¹⁵³
30. SW offered credible testimony stating that the ADOS2 evaluation did not reveal autism-related characteristics in the Student to an extent that would require specialized IEP instruction under the autism classification.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁶ D1-39-40 and SW testimony.

¹⁴⁷ SW testimony.

¹⁴⁸ D4-117 and Psychologist-2 testimony.

¹⁴⁹ D4-117 and Psychologist-2 testimony.

¹⁵⁰ Psychologist 2 testimony.

¹⁵¹ Psychologist 2 testimony.

¹⁵² JE1-1,2, D2-52, and Psychologist 2 testimony.

¹⁵³ SW testimony

¹⁵⁴ SW testimony.

31. The results of the ADOS2 evaluation was presented at an IEP meeting held on February 21, 2023.¹⁵⁵ Mother attended this meeting.¹⁵⁶ Psychologist 2 did not review her evaluation at an IEP meeting; Psychologist reviewed it.¹⁵⁷ After the team considered the results of the ADOS and teacher input, Student was provided with direct social skills instruction and a goal was written to address Student's social skills.¹⁵⁸ Mother approved the change to Student's IEP.¹⁵⁹

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUE

Under the IDEA, a school district is required to conduct a reevaluation at least once every three years unless the parent and school district agree that a reevaluation is not necessary.¹⁶⁰

Parents have a right to an independent educational evaluation (IEE) at their own expense.¹⁶¹ The parents also have the right to one IEE at public expense if they disagree with the school district's evaluation, unless the school district can show that its evaluation was appropriate.¹⁶²

The District bears the burden of proving the appropriateness of the reevaluation.¹⁶³ An appropriate evaluation complies with the pertinent federal and state regulations.¹⁶⁴ Under the Illinois School Code, the District has a statutory duty to present evidence that the District appropriately identified the Student's special education needs and proposed a special education program and related services which adequately and appropriately meets the Student's needs.¹⁶⁵ The label assigned to a particular assessment is less important than the skill areas it evaluates.¹⁶⁶

A district must conduct a comprehensive evaluation, using a variety of assessment tools and strategies to obtain relevant functional, developmental, and academic information about the student. In doing so, the public agency must ensure that each child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, as

¹⁵⁵ D1-6, D1-47 and Psychologist testimony.

¹⁵⁶ D1-47 and Psychologist testimony.

¹⁵⁷ Psychologist 2 and Psychologist testimony.

¹⁵⁸ D1-13-15 and Psychologist testimony.

¹⁵⁹ D1-47.

¹⁶⁰ 34 C.F.R. §300.303(b)(2).

¹⁶¹ 34 CFR § 300.502(a).

¹⁶² 34 CFR § 300.502(b).

¹⁶³ 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02b.

¹⁶⁴ *Krista P. v. Manhattan School District*, 38 IDELR 329 (N. D. Ill. 2003).

¹⁶⁵ 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(g-55).

¹⁶⁶ See *Avila v. Spokane Sch. Dist.* 81, 69 IDELR 204 (9th Cir. 2017).

appropriate, academic performance.¹⁶⁷ “There is no provision in the IDEA that gives a parent the right to dictate the specific areas that the public agency must assess as part of the comprehensive evaluation; the public agency is only required to assess the child in particular areas related to the child’s suspected disability as it determines appropriate.”¹⁶⁸ The school district must use “technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical and developmental factors.”¹⁶⁹

Moreover, under the IDEA, a school district must ensure that the assessments and the other evaluation materials used meet the following criteria:

- “(i) are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis;
- (ii) are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, unless it is not feasible to so provide or administer;
- (iii) are used for purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable;
- (iv) are administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel; and
- (v) are administered in accordance with any instructions provided by the producer of such assessments.”¹⁷⁰

The IDEA has additional requirements for reevaluations, which encompass a review of the existing evaluation data on the child, including evaluations and information provided by the parents, classroom-based observations, and observations by the student’s teachers and related service providers.¹⁷¹ Based upon this review, the IEP team needs to determine what additional data, if any, is needed to determine if the child continues to have such a disability and such educational needs, the present levels of academic achievement, whether the child continues to need special education and related services, the present levels of academic achievement, whether

¹⁶⁷ 34 CFR §300.304(b)(1)

¹⁶⁸ Letter to Unnerstall, 68 IDELR 22 (OSEP Apr. 25, 2016).

¹⁶⁹ 20 U.S.C. § 1414(b)(2)(C).

¹⁷⁰ 20 U.S.C. § 1414(b)(3)(A)(i)-(v).

¹⁷¹ 20 U.S.C. §1414(c)(1)(A)(i)-(iii).

there is a continuing need for special education and related services, and whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed to enable the child to meet the measurable annual goals and to participate in the general education curriculum.¹⁷² For a reevaluation, an IEP team is not required “to perform anew the full scope of testing properly included in a child’s initial evaluation.”¹⁷³

In *B. G. v. Bd. of Ed. Of City of Chicago*, 72 IDELR 231 (7th Cir. 2018), the Court determined minor deficiencies in the district’s evaluation do not justify public funding for the parents IEE.¹⁷⁴ The 7th Circuit reasoned that the district’s evaluators were qualified, that errors in test administration were harmless, that support for the recommended emotional disability classification was adequate, and that the evaluators considered the possibility of ADHD. In *Great Valley School District*, 114 LRP 49527 (PSEA 2014), the hearing officer found the school district’s evaluation complied with the requirements under the IDEA and explained that, whether conducted by a school district or a private practitioner, there are always additional tests that could have been chosen. The hearing officer further iterated that if a parent wishes to obtain additional information, the parent can seek a private evaluation, but not at the public expense, since the school district’s evaluation complied with the IDEA.¹⁷⁵

The Courts and hearing officers have routinely found school districts’ evaluations appropriate when they were based on a variety of assessment tools, including interviews and observations, a review of the child’s records and prior evaluations, and sound explanations for their choices.¹⁷⁶ The 7th Circuit has upheld a school district’s evaluation, finding that the evaluators were competent, well-trained, and performed comprehensive evaluations.¹⁷⁷ The 4th Circuit has held that a parent is not entitled to an IEE by only challenging the evaluator’s findings and could not show the evaluator’s methodologies were flawed.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷² 20 U.S.C. §1414(c)(1)(B)(i)-(iv).

¹⁷³ *Robert B. v. W. Chester Area Sch. Dist.*, 44 IDELR 123 (E.D.P.A. 2005).

¹⁷⁴ *B. G. v. Bd. of Ed. Of City of Chicago*, 72 IDELR 231 (7th Cir. 2018).

¹⁷⁵ *Great Valley School District*, 114 LRP 49527 (PSEA 2014).

¹⁷⁶ *Belvidere CUSD #100*, 114 LRP 22690 (ISEA, 2013). *E.P. v. Howard County Public School System*, 72 IDELR 114 (4th Cir. 2018). See also, *Blake B. v. Council Rock Sch Dist.*, 51 IDELR 100 (B.D. Pa. 2008), *Vernon Bd. Of Education*, 121 LRP 36211 (CSEA, 2021).

¹⁷⁷ *B. G. v. Bd. of Ed. Of City of Chicago*, 72 IDELR 231 (7th Cir. 2018).

¹⁷⁸ *E. P. v. Howard County Public School System*, 72 IDELR 114 (4th Cir. 2018).

In the instant case, the District’s 2025 reevaluation of Student met the IDEA requirements set forth under federal and state law. The Findings of Fact unequivocally show that the testing was administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel and in accordance with the test publisher’s instructions.¹⁷⁹ The most recent version of the assessment was administered, and the assessments used presented no racial, cultural, or language bias toward Student.¹⁸⁰ The evaluation did not rely on any single measure or assessment as the sole criterion.¹⁸¹ The credible testimony established that observations were made on multiple days, at different times, in different classes, with various instructors.¹⁸² Parent and teacher input was obtained through rating scales.¹⁸³ Student’s records and prior evaluation data were reviewed. Tests used in the initial evaluation were repeated in the reevaluation to allow the evaluators to consider Student’s progress over the preceding three years.¹⁸⁴ Based on the reevaluation, the team determined Student continued to qualify for special education and related services under the category of OHI.¹⁸⁵

Mother argued that the District did not assess Student in all areas of suspected disability and that additional assessments or subtests were not used during the reevaluation. The IEP team demonstrated that the reevaluation was comprehensive; Student was assessed in all areas of suspected disability.¹⁸⁶ It also addressed the social-pragmatic concerns raised by the Mother during the domain meeting, specifically regarding proximity and non-verbal communication, through the inclusion of speech-language evaluations—an aspect not initially considered at the outset of the domain meeting.¹⁸⁷ The Findings of Fact illustrate the reevaluation addressed all team member’s concerns raised at the Domain meeting. Additionally, the results of the reevaluation were consistent with the Student’s prior testing and classroom observations. Using

¹⁷⁹ FOF-11

¹⁸⁰ FOF -11

¹⁸¹ FOF 12, 15, 18

¹⁸² FOF 12,15,18

¹⁸³ FOF 12, 14, 22, 25

¹⁸⁴ FOF 12,14,15,16.

¹⁸⁵ FOF 13, 20.

¹⁸⁶ FOF 12,15,18

¹⁸⁷ FOF 18.

the results of the reevaluation, the IEP team determined that Student needed additional support in the areas of impulse control and emotional responses. The team wrote a new goal to address this need.¹⁸⁸

On December 1, 2025, Mother requested an Independent Educational Evaluation (IEE); her request was made before the December 2, 2025, eligibility meeting, which both Parents attended. Her request was based on an incomplete draft of the evaluation dated November 21, 2025, which was provided to her by the District. By submitting her request before the eligibility meeting, during which the evaluations were presented, reviewed, and discussed, the mother anticipated that the incomplete draft would result in an inadequate evaluation. Her IEE request was made prematurely and based on an assumption of insufficiency, rather than an actual decision based on the inadequacy of the evaluations after their review at the eligibility meeting.¹⁸⁹

The facts establish that, other than the Mother's opinion, no evidence was presented to support her allegation that the District did not evaluate Student in all areas of suspected disability or that the results were incomplete, inaccurate, based on improperly administered testing, or that the results were misinterpreted or incorrect. A parent's mere disagreement with an evaluator's finding or the belief that the evaluator could have done more will not generally open the door for the parent to receive a publicly funded IEE.¹⁹⁰

The Parent requested an occupational therapy IEE, which was an evaluation area that the District did not evaluate. Parent provided no evidence to support that an occupational therapy

¹⁸⁸ See, e.g., *Fulton County Sch. Dist.*, 9 GASLD 9, [115 LRP 51672](#) (SEA GA 2015); and *Vernon Bd. of Educ.* [121 LRP 36211](#) (SEA CT 10/13/21).

¹⁸⁹ Joint Stipulations 5 and FOF 7.

¹⁹⁰ See *Great Valley School District*, 114 LRP 49527 (PSEA 2014),

IEE was needed. I determined that no further discussion of whether an occupational therapy evaluation was needed.

Moreover, the results of the reevaluation were consistent with the Student's previous testing. Overall, the District's 2025 reevaluation was appropriate and comprehensive, and all regulatory requirements were met. The results of the evaluation were used to continue Student's eligibility and develop Student's current IEP, including goals to address Student's educational needs.

Included with the Mother's December 1, 2025, request for an IEE was a request for an Autism evaluation.¹⁹¹ Student's Autism evaluation was completed in January 2023.¹⁹² During closing, the District argued that the Mother's request is barred because of the two-year statute of limitations ("SOL"). The SOL is the amount of time a party has to seek relief for alleged violations of the IDEA, which specifies a complaint that sets forth an alleged violation [of the IDEA] which occurred not more than 2 years before the date the parent knew or should have known about the alleged action that forms the basis of the complaint.¹⁹³ The Parent's request for an IEE is not a formal "complaint", as was envisioned in the IDEA, and courts are split on whether a Parent forfeited the right to an IEE at public expense by waiting too long to request one.¹⁹⁴ The IDEA's statute of limitations is an affirmative defense and not a jurisdictional prerequisite.¹⁹⁵ As such, the school district has the burden of proving that the statute of

¹⁹¹ FOF 7.

¹⁹² FOF 28

¹⁹³ 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(6)

¹⁹⁴ See *Atlanta Pub. Schs.*, 51 IDELR 29 (SEA GA 2008), which found a request 3 years later untimely; and *D.S. v. Trumbull Bd. Of Educ.*, 77 IDELR 122 (2d Cir 2020) holding that parents do not need to file a due process complaint to request an IEE, and the two-year limitation period to request an IEE does not apply.)

¹⁹⁵ See, *Mosely v. Bd. of Ed. Of City of Chicago*, 434 F.3d 527 (7th Cir, 2006), *M. G. v. New York City Dept. of Ed.*, 15 F.Supp.3d 296 (S.D.N.Y. 2014).

limitations barred the parent's claims.¹⁹⁶ The District has not met this burden. The Hearing Officer therefore reaches the issue of whether the 2023 Autism evaluation met the IDEA requirements.

The Facts in this matter support the finding that Student's 2023 Autism evaluation met the IDEA requirements set forth under federal and state law.¹⁹⁷ Following receipt of the results of a medical diagnosis of autism, the evaluation team obtained Parent's consent to do an initial educational autism evaluation (ARS).¹⁹⁸ The results of this evaluation were discussed during Student's January 2023 IEP meeting (where Student was found eligible for IEP services under OHI), and the team agreed to additional Autism testing using the ADOS-2.¹⁹⁹ Both assessments were administered by trained, experienced, and knowledgeable professionals in accordance with the test publisher's instructions.²⁰⁰ The most recent version of both assessments were administered, and neither test presented a racial, cultural, or language bias toward Student.²⁰¹ The unchallenged testimony confirmed Parent and teacher input was obtained through rating scales prior to the ADOS2 testing.²⁰² The credible testimony of the District's witnesses establishes that while Student may have a medical autism diagnosis, the ADOS2 results did not indicate that Student's presentation is such that it interferes with her ability to access her education.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, it is hereby ordered:

¹⁹⁶ *K. H. v. New York City Dept. of Education*, 15 F.Supp.3d 296 (E.D.N.Y, 2014)

¹⁹⁷ FOF 25, 28, 29, 30.

¹⁹⁸ FOF 24.

¹⁹⁹ FOF 26.

²⁰⁰ FOF 24

²⁰¹ FOF 25,27,29

²⁰² FOF 11

1. The 2025 reevaluation of Student was comprehensive and appropriate and meets the IDEA requirements, and the District is not required to conduct any requested IEEs at public expense.
2. The 2023 Autism evaluation of Student was comprehensive and appropriate and meets the IDEA requirements, and the District is not required to conduct an Autism IEE at public expense.
3. All the relief sought by the Parent is hereby denied.

Dated: March 25, 2026

Mary Jo Strusz, Impartial Hearing Officer

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Mary Jo Strusz, certify that on March 25, 2026, a copy of this Final Determination was served upon the following persons in the manner indicated:

**Sent Electronically Via Email &
Certified Mail 9407111898765433104696**

**Sent Electronically Via Email &
Certified Mail #9407111898765433103132**

Parents:

District:

Courtney Stillman, Esq.
Himes Petrarca & Fester CHTD

_____@_____

**Sent Electronically Via Email &
Certified Mail 9407111898765433105259**

_____@_____

Dated: March 25, 2026

Mary Jo Strusz, Impartial Hearing Officer

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO REQUEST CLARIFICATION

Pursuant to 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(h), either party may request clarification of this decision by submitting a written request to the Hearing Officer within five (5) days of receipt of the decision. The request for clarification shall specify the portions of the decision for which clarification is sought. A copy of the request shall be mailed to all other parties and the Illinois State Board of Education, Program Compliance Division, 100 North First Street., Springfield, IL 62777. The right to request clarification does not permit a party to request reconsideration of the decision itself and the Hearing Officer is not authorized to entertain a request for reconsideration.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

This is the final administrative decision in this matter. According to 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(i), any party aggrieved by this Hearing Officer’s Determination may bring a civil action in any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a District Court of the United States without regard to the amount in controversy within one hundred and twenty (120) days from the date the decision is mailed to the party.

Dated: March 25, 2026

Mary Jo Strusz, Impartial Hearing Officer

EXHIBIT A

NAME	TITLE/DESCRIPTION	ACRONYM
██████████	MOTHER	MOTHER
██████████ ██████████	FATHER	FATHER
██████████	SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST WITH ██████████ ██	Psychologist
██████████ ██████████	SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKER WITH ██████ - ██████ ████████ ██████████ ██████████	SW
██████████ ██████████	SPEECH LANGUAGE PATHOLOGIST	SLP
██████████ ██████████	SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST WITH ██████ - ██████ ████████ ██████████ ██████████	Psychologist-2
██████████ ██████████	PRINCIPAL	Principal
██████████ ██████████	NURSE	
██████████ ██████████	CASE MANAGER	CM
██████████ ██████████	DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT	Superintendent