

SOAH Docket No. 701-25-04897.IDEA
TEA Docket No. 079-SE-1124

Before the
State Office of Administrative
Hearings

FILED

ACCEPTED

701-25-04897
11/7/2025 12:46 PM
STATE OFFICE OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
Carol Hale, CLERK

701-25-04897
11/7/2025 1:29:42 pm
STATE OFFICE OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
Carol Hale, CLERK

**Student, by next friends Parents,
Petitioner**

v.

**Great Hearts Texas,
Respondent**

FINAL DECISION

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Student (Student), by next friends Parents (Parents¹ or, collectively, Petitioner), brings this action against Great Hearts Texas (Respondent

¹***. When references are made to a singular "Parent," the reference is to Student's Parent.

or the District) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400-1482, and its implementing state and federal regulations.

The main issue in this case is whether the District failed to provide Student with a free, appropriate public education (FAPE) during the relevant time period. The Administrative Law Judge (Judge) concludes the District provided Student a FAPE in student least restrictive environment.

II. DUE PROCESS HEARING

The due process hearing was conducted September 11-12, 2025. The hearing was recorded and transcribed by a certified court reporter. Petitioner was represented by their attorney, Karen Dalglish Seal from the Law Offices of Karen Dalglish Seal. Parents also attended the due process hearing. Respondent was represented by Alyssa Sandersen and Chris Schultz with Schulman, Lopez, Hoffer, & Adelstein. In addition, ***, the Executive Director of Special Education for the District, attended the hearing as the party representative. Both parties filed thorough written closing briefs in a timely manner on October 24, 2025. The Decision in this case is due on November 7, 2025.

The Judge admitted Respondent Exhibits 1-48 and Joint Exhibits 1-62 without objection. The Judge also admitted Petitioner's Exhibits 1, 5, 6, and 7 over objection. Four witnesses testified on the first day of the hearing during Petitioner's case in chief:

1. Parent testified about parent experience with Student's educational needs.

2. *** testified as an expert in special education. She testified about Student's needs from her perspective as an expert and also someone who had served as an advocate for Petitioner prior to Petitioner's obtaining an attorney.
3. *** testified as a classroom teacher of Student.
4. *** testified as the headmaster of Student's school in the District who also has direct knowledge of Student and student needs.

On the second day of the hearing, the following people testified during Respondent's case in chief:

1. *** is the regional special services coordinator for the District. She testified as someone who conducts trainings and manages special education coordinators in the District.
2. ***, who had testified the day prior, was recalled for additional testimony.
3. *** testified as the main classroom teacher of Student.

III. ISSUES

A. PETITIONER'S ISSUES

Petitioner identified the relevant timeframe as the 2024-2025 school year and raised the following IDEA issues for decision in this case:

FAPE

1. Whether the District failed to provide Student with a FAPE during the relevant timeframe;

2. Whether the District failed to develop an appropriate individual education program (IEP) for Student;
3. Whether the District failed to properly implement Student's IEP;
4. Whether Student was educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE): and

Training

5. Whether the District failed to properly train staff on the appropriate way to provide special education services to Student.

B. RESPONDENT'S LEGAL POSITION AND ADDITIONAL ISSUES

Respondent generally denies the factual allegations stated in the Complaint. Respondent contends that it provided Student with a FAPE during the relevant time period, that it can continue to do so, and that Petitioner is not entitled to any of the requested relief.

IV. REQUESTED RELIEF

A. PETITIONER'S REQUESTED RELIEF

Petitioner requested the following items of relief:

1. Pay for Student to attend private school at a suitable location for the 2025-2026 school year or, in the alternative, provide an appropriate education for Student within the current placement in general education;
2. Keep Student at student current campus with appropriate supports and training for staff;
3. Reimburse the parents for the lost time, wages, and ancillary costs;
4. Order the District to provide compensatory educational services;

5. Provide extended school year (ESY) services for Student;
6. Keep accurate data on Student's progress; and
7. Provide social interaction and facilitation in an after-school program weekly through the next school year.

V. FINDINGS OF FACT

Background Information

1. Student is *** years old and currently receives special education and related services as a child with an intellectual disability ("ID"), other health impairment ("OHI") for down syndrome and ***, and speech impairment. Student lives with student's parents and student's *** in a supportive home environment. Student enjoys playing ukelele and the keyboard, dancing, student's teddy bear, attending church with student's family, reading, and playing ball. Student is in *** grade in the District.²

Evaluations of Student

2. Two months after Student was born in ***, Student began receiving early childhood intervention services through *** for speech and occupational therapy. Student initially qualified for special education and related services after an evaluation as a ***-old during the 2015-16 school year when student was a student enrolled in the *** Independent School District. Student initially qualified for special education as a student with a speech impairment.³
3. At the end of the 2020-21 school year, while Student was in *** grade in the *** Independent School District, Student was reevaluated. In every academic category, including written language, written expression, math, reading comprehension, reading fluency, and other areas. Student tested "*** insufficient." Student language and speech

² Joint Stipulations of Fact (JSF), Transcript (Tr.) 34-35, 117.

³ JSF; Respondent's Exhibit (R) 10 at 2, 14.

scores ranked student in the lowest ***% when compared to same-age peers. Student also tested *** in self-care and community access skills.⁴

4. The evaluation recommended Student be served as a student with an intellectual disability, speech impairment, and other health impairment. Since then, those have been Student's eligibility categories.⁵
5. Before the beginning of the 2022-23 school year, Student transferred into *** on its *** campus. Student spent student's *** grade and *** grade years at ***. Student transferred into the District before the start of the 2024-25 school year.⁶
6. While Student was attending ***, *** conducted a review of existing evaluation data (REED) in December 2023. This is the most recent evaluation of Student. At the time of the evaluation, Student was functioning at a *** level in math and a "****" level in reading. Student was well below the level of student's same-age peers in all categories of functioning.⁷
7. Student can become *** when faced with tasks or transitions. Student also engages in *** and has difficulty maintaining *** Some of the evaluation's recommendations included keeping distractions and transitions to a minimum, considering alternative learning activities from those in which student classmates are engaged, explicitly teaching life skills for daily living and self-care, and creating a structured and predictable environment.⁸

Student's Experience in the ***

8. During the 2022-23 school year, Student's ARD Committee at *** in the *** tried to place Student in special

⁴ R. 11, at 3-4, 15, 26.

⁵ JSF; R. 11, at 31.

⁶ JSF; Tr. 82-83.

⁷ R. 12, at 13.

⁸ R11, at 13-14.

education classes for most of Student's classes. Petitioner filed a request for a due process hearing. In response, the admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) Committee placed Student in general education classes for all courses except math and reading. At the end of the school year, Student's ARD Committee at *** proposed placing Student in a special education setting for more of student's classes once again. Petitioner filed a second request for a due process hearing in May 2023 due to the proposed placement. The parties settled the dispute. As a result of the settlement to avoid litigation, the ARD Committee agreed to keep Student primarily in mainstream classes during the 2023-24 school year when Student was in *** grade. Student only went to a special education setting for math, half of student's science time, and reading. Student was also pulled out for social skills 30 minutes a day. For the remainder of student's schedule, Student was in a general education setting.⁹

9. Student received speech and language therapy *** minutes a day twice a week, occupational therapy *** minutes two times every nine weeks and school psychology consult services twice every nine weeks for *** minutes.¹⁰
10. At ***, Student struggled behaviorally. Student had near-daily behavioral incidents involving refusal to work or ***. For example, on October ***, 2023, Student ***. The next day, Student refused to attend class and ***. Incidents like this took place nearly daily.¹¹

Student's Experience in the District

11. When Student transferred into the District at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year as student was entering *** grade, the District explained that District is different from ***. The District's school is a "classical" school based on the Socratic method where classes are intensive. Students are

⁹ Tr. 84-85; Joint Exhibit (J)7, at 2; R19.

¹⁰ R12, at 41-42.

¹¹ R12, at 10.

referred to as “scholars” and Latin names are given to activities, such as *** being referred to as “Lyceum.” The school day is also slightly shorter than it was in student’s previous school district. The special education coordinator explained this to Parent prior to Student’s arrival. Nevertheless, the District replicated Student’s schedule of services as well as it could in its own design.¹²

12. Upon arrival in the District, Student’s behavioral struggles continued. When Student was faced with a transition to a new class or with a nonpreferred task, Student exhibited ***. Student ** teachers and exhibited other forms of ***, which were particularly acute in general education or other less structured settings. Student also continued to exhibit *** behavior.¹³
13. In September 2024, the District convened an initial ARD Committee meeting. Parents were in attendance with their advocate. The ARD Committee proposed that Student continue to receive all related services in the identical amounts student had previously received in ***. The District has a shorter school day, so a ten-minute block of daily reading exercise was removed.¹⁴
14. Additionally, the District proposed a number of goals for Student. Student had a measurable goal to increase student’s reading level to a mid-*** level, a measurable language arts goal of forming essays with appropriate punctuation, a measurable math goal, two adaptive behavior goals, a *** goal, and then goals for student’s related services of speech therapy and occupational therapy. All goals were measurable and constructed based on Student’s present levels.¹⁵
15. When Student is in general education classes, because Student is *** to *** grade levels behind student’s peers, student is given worksheets at student’s level while the rest of the class is working on grade-level work. Parent disagrees with giving Student worksheets as Parent wants student to work with student’s peers. At Parent’s request, Student’s teachers have tried to allow Student to work with student’s peers without

¹² Tr. 280-83; J13;

¹³ J8, at 44.

¹⁴ J8, at 38.

¹⁵ J8, at 14-21.

worksheets. Instead of engaging, Student would sit alone and play with student squishy toy as student was not able to understand the work.¹⁶

16. Because of Student's behavioral struggles and student low level of academic functioning, the District proposed placing Student in a special education setting for more classes than student had experienced at ***. The District proposed a special education setting for reading, math, science, and***.¹⁷
17. During the September 2024 ARD Committee meeting, Parent agreed with the goals and related services proposed. The District, like ***, has a behavior intervention plan (BIP) with which Parent agreed. The only area of disagreement was placement. Parent wanted Student in a general education setting for science and *** while the District wanted student in a special education setting for those classes. Parent also wants Student to spend at least half of student reading and math time in general education as well. The meeting ended in disagreement and reconvened twice in October 2024. Again, Parent disagreed due solely to the placement issue and not the other services provided. Shortly after, Petitioner filed this request for a due process hearing. Due to stay put, Student never attended special education classes for science and history.¹⁸
18. When Student was not in special education classes, student still had opportunities to interact with peers who did not have disabilities. Student had breakfast, lunch, ***, ***, elective classes, and other activities like field trips and literature celebrations with peers in general education.¹⁹
19. Student's *** has significantly improved since the Complaint was filed in November 2024. Student is exhibiting almost no instances of ***. Student is showing refusal to transition or do student work, but student has stopped the *** behavior. Student has not begun engaging in student general education classes. Student continues to work on separate

¹⁶ Tr. 56-57, 364-65, 373, 376.

¹⁷ J8, at 44; Tr. 300-01, 357-58.

¹⁸ J8, J9, Tr. 47-48, 143.

¹⁹ Tr. 302; J8, at 38.

worksheets or, when student is not given that option, *** on student own when in general education.²⁰

20. All of Student's teachers in the District were trained in behavior management and de-escalation. All of them were also trained in IEP development and IEP implementation. Staff were also trained in a wide variety of topics by District staff and outside trainers.²¹

VI. DISCUSSION

A. DUTY TO PROVIDE A FAPE

The purpose of the IDEA is to ensure that all children 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. 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d). The district has a duty to provide a FAPE to all children with disabilities ages 3-21 in its jurisdiction. 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.101(a), 300.201; Tex. Educ. Code § 29.001.

The District is responsible for providing Student with specially designed personalized instruction with sufficient support services to meet Student's unique needs in order to receive an educational benefit. The instruction and services must be provided at public expense and comport with Student's IEP. 20 U.S.C. § 1401(9); *Bd. of Educ. of Hendrick Hudson Cent. Sch. Dist. v. Rowley*, 458 U.S. 176, 188-89, 200-01, 203-04 (1982). The basic inquiry is whether the IEP implemented by the school district "was reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in

²⁰ Tr. 364-65, 373, 376.

²¹ Tr. 234-37.

light of the child's circumstances." *Endrew F. ex rel. Joseph F. v. Douglas Cty. Sch. Dist. RE-1*, 580 U.S. 386, 403 (2017).

B. BURDEN OF PROOF

The burden of proof in a due process hearing is on the party challenging the proposed IEP and placement.²² *Schaffer ex rel. Schaffer v. Weast*, 546 U.S. 49, 62 (2005). The burden of proof in this case is on Petitioner to show the District failed to provide Student with a FAPE and to offer a program that is reasonably calculated to provide Student with the requisite educational benefit. *Id.*; *Endrew F.*, 580 U.S. at 403.

C. APPROPRIATE PROGRAM

A judge applies a four-factor test to determine whether a Texas school district's program meets IDEA requirements. Those factors are:

1. Whether the program is individualized on the basis of the student's assessment and performance;
2. Whether the program is administered in the least restrictive environment;
3. Whether the services are provided in a coordinated, collaborative manner by the key stakeholders; and
4. Whether positive academic and non-academic benefits are demonstrated.

Cypress-Fairbanks Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Michael F. by Barry F., 118 F.3d 245, 253 (5th Cir. 1997); *E.R. ex rel. E.R. v. Spring Branch Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 909 F.3d 754, 765-66 (5th Cir. 2018).

²² There is no distinction between the burden of proof in an administrative hearing or in a judicial proceeding. *Richardson Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Michael Z.*, 580 F.3d 286, 292 n.4 (5th Cir. 2009).

These four factors need not be accorded any particular weight nor be applied in any particular way. Instead, they are merely indicators of an appropriate program and intended to guide the fact-intensive inquiry required in evaluating the school district's educational program. *Michael Z.*, 580 F.3d at 294.

1. Individualized on the Basis of Assessment and Performance

In meeting the obligation to provide a FAPE, the school district must have in effect an IEP at the beginning of each school year. An IEP is more than simply a written statement of annual goals and objectives and how they will be measured. Instead, the IEP must include a description of the related services, supplementary supports and services, the instructional arrangement, program modifications, supports for school personnel, designated staff to provide the services, the duration and frequency of the services, and the location where the services will be provided. 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.22, 300.320, 300.323(a). While the IEP need not be the best possible one nor must it be designed to maximize Student's potential, the District must nevertheless provide Student with a meaningful educational benefit—one that is likely to produce progress, not regression or trivial advancement. *Houston Indep. Sch. Dist. v. V.P. ex rel. Juan P.*, 582 F.3d 576, 583 (5th Cir. 2009).

The District's obligation when developing Student's IEP and BIP is to consider student strengths, student parent's concerns for enhancing student education, results of the most recent evaluation data, and student academic, developmental, and functional needs. 34 C.F.R. § 300.324(a)(1). For Student, whose behavior impedes student learning

and that of others, the District must also consider positive behavioral interventions and supports and other behavioral strategies when developing student IEP and BIP. 34

C.F.R. § 300.324(a)(2)(i); *R.P. ex rel. R.P. v. Alamo Heights Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 703 F.3d 801, 813 (5th Cir.2012).

In this case, the District attempted to provide Student education based on student present levels and observations of student teachers. According to all conducted evaluations, Student functions well below the level of student same-age peers. Student also has behavior issues that lead to *** and ***. Therefore, the District proposed a more restrictive placement. The District provided Student work at student level within student general education classes and related services as recommended by previous evaluators. The District formed eight IEP goals based on Student's present levels and the goals were measurable. Petitioner did not disagree with Student's goals.

Petitioner asserts that Student benefits from being in the same classroom as peers without disabilities even if not working on their level. However, the evidence indicates that Student is given worksheets several grade levels below student same-age peers to work on by student. And, when the District incorporates Parent's request of not giving student worksheets, Student sits by student with student toy and does not engage. Therefore, based on what the District is observing and based on Student's assessments, the District is meeting Student's needs by proposing a more restrictive setting. Petitioner did not meet their burden on this prong of the *Michael F.* factors.

2. Least Restrictive Environment

The IDEA requires a student with a disability to be educated with peers without disabilities to the maximum extent appropriate and that special classes, separate schooling and other removal from the regular education environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. This provision is known as the “least restrictive environment requirement.” 34 C.F.R. § 300.114(a)(2)(i-ii). State regulations require a school district’s continuum of instructional arrangements be based on students’ individual needs and IEPs and include a continuum of educational settings, including mainstream, homebound, hospital class, resource room/services, self-contained – regular campus (mild, moderate, or severe), non-public day school, or residential treatment facility. 19 Tex. Admin. Code § 89.1005(c).

To determine whether a school district is educating a student with a disability in the LRE, consideration must be given to:

1. Whether the student with a disability can be satisfactorily educated in general education settings with the use of supplemental aids and services; and
2. If not, whether the school district mainstreamed the student to the maximum extent appropriate.

Daniel R.R. v. State Bd. of Educ., 874 F.2d 1036, 1048 (5th Cir. 1989).

The determination of whether a student with a disability can be educated in general education settings requires an examination of the nature and severity of the student’s disability, the student’s needs and abilities, and the school district’s response to the student’s needs. *Id.* This determination requires an examination of:

1. a school district's efforts to provide the student with supplemental aids and services in the general education setting;
2. a school district's efforts to modify the general education curriculum to meet the student's individual needs;
3. the educational benefit a student is receiving while placed in the general education setting; and
4. the impact the presence of the student with a disability has on the general education setting and the education of the other students in the setting. *Id.*

Petitioner did not meet their burden on this point. As early as 2022, *** was recommending a curriculum for Student involving special education classes for science, ***, reading, and math. A settlement agreement pursuant to a special education due process complaint prevented that placement for science and *** in the 2023-24 school year. However, it does show that both Student's previous school district and student current one observed the same thing: that Student struggles in general education classes and receives more benefit in a more restrictive environment.

Presently, the District is essentially creating a separate class within a general education classroom for Student. The District is providing student separate assignments and separate work within the same room as student peers without disabilities. The assignments are approximately five to six grade levels below the level of student peers. The IDEA does not require a school district to create an alternative curriculum or offer a "classroom within a classroom" in order to comply with the IDEA's LRE requirement. *Brillon v. Klein Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 100 Fed. App'x. 309, 313 (5th Cir. 2004). To accommodate Student's learning level and inability

to focus or perform undesirable tasks, creating a “classroom within a classroom” is what the District is being forced to do in this instance. *See Id.*

The District is also providing student all the supplementary aids and services student was receiving in student previous school district. Student’s *** has a negative effect on student peers and teachers. Under the *Daniel R.R.* test, Student is in student least restrictive environment when in a special education classroom for math, ***, reading, and science as the District proposed where student can work on skills and assignments at student own level. Student still has access to peers without disabilities for breakfast, lunch, ***, ***, and other activities. Therefore, Petitioner did not meet their burden on this point.

3. Services Provided in a Coordinated, Collaborative Manner by Key Stakeholders

The IDEA contemplates a collaborative process between the school district and the parents. *E.R.* 909 F.3d at 754. The IDEA does not require a school district, in collaborating with a student’s parents, to accede to a parent’s demands. *Blackmon ex rel. Blackmon v. Springfield R-XII Sch. Dist.*, 198 F.3d 648, 658 (8th Cir. 1999). The right to meaningful input does not mean a student’s parents have the right to dictate an outcome, because parents do not possess “veto power” over a school district’s decisions. *White ex rel. White v. Ascension Parish Sch. Bd.*, 343 F.3d 373, 380 (5th Cir. 2003). Absent bad faith exclusion of a student’s parents or refusal to listen to them, a school district must be deemed to have met the IDEA’s requirements regarding collaborating with a student’s parents. *Id.*

The District worked collaboratively with key stakeholders. Special education staff began working with Parent prior to Student even starting the school year. The District held several ARD Committee meetings in the fall of 2024 in an effort to reach consensus with Parent. Parent agreed with all aspects of Student's IEP other than the proposed placement. The District explained to Parent why it recommended Student's placement. While it did not defer to Parent's opinion, the District did hear and value the input and did not act in bad faith in any manner to exclude Parents. The District recognized Parent is an educator and has valuable input. Further, in order to try to accommodate Parent's suggestions, the District tried to avoid giving Student separate assignments in the general education environment. The District found Student *** alone and did not engage but they tried it in an effort to work with Parent. Petitioner did not meet their burden in showing the District failed to work with key stakeholders.

4. Academic and Non-Academic Benefits

Whether a Student received academic and non-academic benefit is one of the most critical factors in any analysis as to whether a Student has received a FAPE. *R.P.*, 703 F.3d at 813-14. In this matter, Student was in the District for a short time before the due process Complaint was filed. Consequently, it is difficult to measure the amount of benefit Student actually received. However, the IEP was designed to provide Student academic and non-academic benefit. Student had opportunities to interact with peers and make friends. *See Marc V. v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 455 F.Supp.2d 577, 596 (W.D. Tex. 2006) (noting making friends is a key non-academic benefit). The IEP was designed with related services and a schedule of services designed to maximize Student's benefit. It included goals that were measurable,

based on Student's present levels, and designed to challenge Student. Therefore, Petitioner did not meet their burden on this prong.

5. FAPE Conclusion

In summary, the District provided Student an education based on student present levels and input from student teachers. Considering Student's present levels, the District has proposed educating Student in student least restrictive environment. The District has included Parent in all decisions and made student an active part of the ARD Committee process. And, while this case was filed prior to an opportunity to evaluate Student's benefit fully, the IEP was developed to give Student an opportunity to receive academic and non-academic benefit. Therefore, Petitioner has not met their burden of demonstrating the District failed to provide Student a FAPE.

D. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IEP

Petitioner also alleges that the District did not implement Student's IEP. To prevail on a claim under the IDEA, the party challenging implementation of the IEP must show more than a de minimis failure to implement all elements of that IEP, and, instead, must demonstrate that the school district failed to implement substantial or significant provisions of the IEP. This approach affords school districts some flexibility in implementing IEPs while also holding them accountable for material failures and for providing each student with a disability a FAPE. *Bobby R.*, 200 F. 3d at 349. Failure to implement a "material" portion of an IEP violates the IDEA, but failure to execute an IEP perfectly does not amount to denial of FAPE. *See Sumter Cty. Sch. Dist. 17 v. Heffernan ex rel. T.H.*, 642 F.3d 478, 484 (4th Cir. 2011).

In this case, Petitioner did not demonstrate a “material” way in which the District failed to implement Student’s IEP. When Student transferred into the District from *** at the beginning of the 2024-25 school year, the District implemented a substantially similar program. The District uses a shorter school day and could not provide Student’s ten daily minutes of reading instruction as a result. However, the District implemented all student related services, a substantially similar placement, and maintained student accommodations. Petitioner did not present evidence that what was written in the IEP was not actually provided. Petitioner also did not present evidence that the ten minutes of reading instruction Student could not receive in the District due to scheduling was a “material” part of the IEP. Therefore, Petitioner did not meet their burden.

E. TRAINING OF STAFF

Petitioner raised the issue of staff training in their Complaint. The IDEA requires that special education and related services be provided by “qualified personnel” who are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained, and who possess the content knowledge and skills to serve children with disabilities. 34 C.F.R. § 300.156(a). Petitioner alleges the District failed to provide appropriate training to its teachers, staff, and administrators in meeting Student’s individual needs. Petitioner, however, failed to present evidence to support this claim. The District presented evidence that their staff who work with Student are trained in behavior management, IEP development, and other relevant topics. Petitioner did not counter with any evidence to contradict that. Therefore, Petitioner did not meet their burden in demonstrating staff were insufficiently trained.

F. PRIVATE PLACEMENT

Petitioner requested private placement as a potential element of relief. Petitioner must meet a two-part test in order to secure reimbursement from the District for Student's private placement. First, Petitioner must prove the District's proposed program was not appropriate under the IDEA. Second, Petitioner must prove private placement is appropriate. *Burlington Sch. Comm. v. Dep't of Educ.*, 471 U.S. 359, 370 (1985); *Florence Cnty. v. Carter*, 510 U.S. 7 (1993). Petitioner failed to meet the burden of proving the District's program was not appropriate under the IDEA. Petitioner also did not present evidence that a particular private placement would be appropriate for Student. Therefore, Petitioner is not entitled to private placement at District expense.

VII. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The burden of proof is on Petitioner as the party challenging the IEP. *Schaffer ex rel. Schaffer v. Weast*, 546 U.S. 49, 62 (2005).
2. The District provided Student a FAPE during the relevant time period with an IEP reasonably calculated to address student needs in light of student unique circumstances. *Bd. of Educ. of Hendrick Hudson Cent. Sch. Dist. v. Rowley*, 458 U.S. 176, 188, 203-04 (1982); *Endrew F. ex rel. Joseph F. v. Douglas Cty. Sch. Dist. RE-1*, 580 U.S. 386, 403 (2017); *Michael F.*, 118 F.3d at 253.
3. The District implemented Student's IEP appropriately. *Bobby R.*, 200 F. 3d at 349; *Heffernan ex rel. T.H.*, 642 F.3d at 484.
4. Student is not entitled to private placement. *Burlington Sch. Comm. v. Dep't of Educ.*, 471 U.S. 359, 370 (1985); *Florence Cnty. v. Carter*, 510 U.S. 7 (1993).
5. The District trained staff who worked with Student appropriately. 34 C.F.R. § 300.156(a).

ORDER

Based upon the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, Petitioner's requests for relief are **DENIED**.

Signed November 7, 2025.

FILED
701-25-04897

11/7/2025 12:46 PM
STATE OFFICE OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
Carol Hale, CLERK

ACCEPTED
701-25-04897
11/7/2025 1:29:42 pm
STATE OFFICE OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
Carol Hale, CLERK

ALJ Signature:



Ian Spechler

Presiding Administrative Law Judge

NOTICE TO THE PARTIES

The decision of the Judge in this case is a final and appealable order. Any party aggrieved by the findings and decisions made by the Judge may bring a civil action with respect to the issues presented at the due process hearing in any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a district court of the United States. 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2); 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.514(a), 300.516; 19 Tex. Admin. Code § 89.1185(n).