

BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,

V.

CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT.

CASE NO. 2026010414

DECISION

May 28, 2026

On January 14, 2026, the Office of Administrative Hearings, called OAH, received a due process hearing request from Student, naming Castro Valley Unified School District. OAH continued the matter on February 13, 2026, at the parties' request. Administrative Law Judge Charles Marson heard this matter by videoconference on April 7 and 8, 2026.

Parent represented Student and was assisted by a Mandarin interpreter. Attorney Amanda E. D'Amico represented Castro Valley. Special Education Director Stacey Lillard attended both hearing days on Castro Valley's behalf.

(This space is intentionally left blank. Text continues on the following page.)

At the parties' request the matter was continued to April 27, 2026, for written closing briefs. The record was closed, and the matter was submitted on April 27, 2026.

In this Decision, a free appropriate public education is called a FAPE, and an individualized education program is called an IEP.

ISSUES

1. Did Castro Valley deny Student a FAPE from November 3, 2025, to January 14, 2026, by:
 - a. failing to assess Student in all areas of suspected disability, specifically an academic assessment in mathematics;
 - b. providing a factually false document that included inaccurate present levels of performance at the November 20, 2025 IEP team meeting;
 - c. failing to offer specialized academic instruction in math; and
 - d. denying meaningful parental participation in the IEP process at the November 20, 2025 IEP team meeting?

JURISDICTION

This hearing was held under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, its regulations, and California statutes and regulations. (20 U.S.C. § 1400 et. seq.; 34 C.F.R.

(This space is intentionally left blank. Text continues on the following page.)

§ 300.1 (2006) et seq.; Ed. Code, § 56000 et seq.; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3000 et seq.)

The main purposes of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, referred to as the IDEA, are to ensure:

- 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, and
- the rights of children with disabilities and their parents are protected. (20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1); Csee Ed. Code, § 56000, subd. (a).)

The IDEA affords parents and local educational agencies the procedural protection of an impartial due process hearing with respect to any matter relating to the identification, assessment, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a FAPE to the child. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(6) & (f); 34 C.F.R. § 300.511 (2006); Ed. Code, §§ 56501, 56502, and 56505; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3082.) The party requesting the hearing is limited to the issues alleged in the complaint, unless the other party consents, and has the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(3)(B); Ed. Code, § 56502, subd. (i); *Schaffer v. Weast* (2005) 546 U.S. 49, 57-58, 62 [126 S.Ct. 528, 163 L.Ed.2d 387]; see also 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C)(iii).) In this matter Student requested the due process hearing and bears the burden of proof. The factual statements in this Decision constitute the written findings of fact required by the IDEA and state law. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(h)(4); Ed. Code, § 56505, subd. (e)(5).)

Student was 11 years old and in the fourth grade at Castro Valley's Marshall Elementary School at the time of hearing. He resided within Castro Valley's geographical boundaries at all relevant times. Student was eligible for special education under the categories of autism and other health impairment.

ISSUE 1 a: DID CASTRO VALLEY DENY STUDENT A FAPE FROM NOVEMBER 3, 2025, TO JANUARY 14, 2026, BY FAILING TO ASSESS HIM IN ALL AREAS OF SUSPECTED DISABILITY, SPECIFICALLY AN ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT IN MATHEMATICS?

Student's issues are limited to the time period between November 3, 2025, and January 14, 2026, because the parties entered into a settlement agreement on November 2, 2025, resolving a previous due process dispute. In that agreement, Parent waived all educational claims, causes of action, and disputes up to November 2, 2025, the date of full execution of the agreement.

Student contends that in an IEP offer dated November 20, 2025, Castro Valley misstated his abilities in math, specifically in multi-digit multiplication. He contends that Castro Valley would have accurately known his skill at two-digit multiplication if it had conducted an assessment in math between November 3, 2025, and January 14, 2026, and denied him a FAPE by failing to do so.

Castro Valley contends that Student's present levels of mathematical performance were stated accurately in its November 20, 2025 IEP offer. It contends that it appropriately assessed Student's present levels of performance in math when it conducted assessments for his triennial evaluation in fall 2024. Castro Valley further contends that between

November 3, 2025, and January 14, 2026, there was no reason to assess Student's math abilities again, and that no one, including Parent, requested such an assessment during that period.

A FAPE means special education and related services that are available to an eligible child that meets state educational standards at no charge to the parent or guardian. (20 U.S.C. § 1401(9); 34 C.F.R. § 300.17 (2006).) Parents and school personnel develop an IEP for an eligible student based upon state law and the IDEA. (20 U.S.C. §§ 1401(14), 1414(d)(1); see Ed. Code, §§ 56031, 56032, 56341, 56345, subd. (a) and 56363 subd. (a); 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.320 (2007), 300.321 (2007), and 300.501 (2006).)

In general, a child eligible for special education must be provided access to specialized instruction and related services which are individually designed to provide educational benefit through an IEP reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances. (*Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central Sch. Dist. v. Rowley* (1982) 458 U.S. 176, 201-204; *Endrew F. v. Douglas County Sch. Dist. RE-1* (2017) 580 U.S. 386, 402 [137 S.Ct. 988, 1000].)

A district must ensure that a child is assessed in all areas related to a suspected disability. (20 U.S.C. § 1414(b)(3)(B); Ed. Code, § 56320, subd. (f).) A district need not assess under these provisions unless it has some notice that a child has displayed symptoms of a covered disability. (*Timothy O. v. Paso Robles Unified Sch. Dist.* (9th Cir. 2016) 822 F.3d 1105, 1119.)

Castro Valley assessed Student's math skills 14 months before the November 20, 2025, IEP team meeting as part of his triennial evaluation. On September 17, and 18, 2024, special education teacher Catalina Calderon assessed Student's math skills by

administering the widely used Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Academic Achievement (4th ed.). Calderon reported the results in writing on October 21, 2024, and her report was considered by the IEP team which met that day.

Calderon confirmed at hearing that her assessment report contained a substantial section on Student's math skills. Under the heading "Math Facts Fluency," Calderon reported that Student was given 54 math calculation problems to solve in three minutes and correctly solved 50 of them. The assessment report also addressed Student's performance on subtests in the areas of calculation, applied problems, and number matrices.

Neither Parent nor anyone else requested that Castro Valley assess Student in math, or any other area, during or immediately before the period between November 3, 2025, and January 14, 2026. Nothing in the record suggests that there was any reason to do so. In his closing brief, Student did not mention any need for assessment in the area of intellectual development, and no evidence of such a need was introduced at hearing.

Instead, in his closing brief, Student expands upon his original issue by arguing that Castro Valley did not "appropriately" assess Student in math. Student argues that it was the individual, personal responsibility of the special day class teacher to assess Student in math before beginning to teach him. Student faults the teacher for not conforming to the statutory requirements for assessments. Student identifies a particular mathematics worksheet that special day class teacher Popoff referred to in the annual meeting. That worksheet showed that on a particular exercise, Student got

most of the answers wrong. Student argued that the numerous questions and the crowded, noisy conditions under which he completed the worksheet precluded him from giving accurate answers.

As teacher Popoff established in her testimony, however, that worksheet was not an assessment, or even a test. The requirements for formal assessment are therefore not applicable to it.

Student's argument also misconstrues Castro Valley's obligation to assess. That obligation is institutional, not personal. Castro Valley was obliged to assess Student, but the special day class teacher individually was not. (20 U.S.C. § 1414(b)(3)(B); Ed. Code, § 56320, subd. (f).) The many regulations, code sections, and judicial decisions cited by Student in support of this contention do not support his interpretation of the duty to assess.

Student did not prove that Castro Valley denied him a FAPE by failing to assess him, or assess him appropriately, in the area of academic achievement in math between November 3, 2025, and January 14, 2026.

(This space is intentionally left blank. Text continues on the following page.)

ISSUE 1 b: DID CASTRO VALLEY DENY STUDENT A FAPE FROM NOVEMBER 3, 2025, TO JANUARY 14, 2026, BY PROVIDING A FACTUALLY FALSE DOCUMENT AT THE NOVEMBER 20, 2025 IEP TEAM MEETING THAT INCLUDED INACCURATE PRESENT LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE?

Student contends that the present levels of academic and functional performance in math that Castro Valley stated in its November 20, 2025 offer of FAPE were inaccurate because they stated or implied that Student could not do two-digit multiplication. The phrase to which Parent objects is: "Student has learned multiplication facts up to 12."

Student contends that the phrase "up to 12" means that he cannot do multi-digit multiplication beyond 12. The evidence showed that Student can do multi-digit multiplication past 12. Parent repeatedly requested that Student's ability to perform two-digit multiplication be recognized by Castro Valley and stated expressly in Castro Valley documents.

Castro Valley contends that it knows Student is capable of multi-digit multiplication, and that Parent misinterprets the language of the disputed present level.

The IDEA requires that an IEP contain a statement of an eligible student's "present levels of academic achievement and functional performance" as a basis for making educational programming decisions. (20 U.S.C. § 1414(d)(1)(A)(i)(I); 34 C.F.R. 300.320 (a)(1)(2007).)

Among educators, the phrase “math facts” has an established meaning. In 2023, the State Board of Education adopted the new California Mathematics Framework, which changed the meaning of math facts from an earlier framework. The new framework was part of an effort to move beyond multiplication tables, to include addition, subtraction, and division in the concept of math facts, and to emphasize strategies for understanding basic math exercises other than rote memorization. The evidence established that math facts refers to a set of basic math operations, usually using single digit numbers, that are known by a student well enough that he can make virtually automatic use of them in more difficult calculations. It does not express any limit on any student’s abilities. (See California Department of Education News Release CDE/SBE Joint Release: #23-54, California Approves Revised Math Framework as a Step Forward for Equity and Excellence (2023).

The statement of present levels with which Parent disagrees originated in an IEP offer produced at a two-part annual IEP team meeting on October 17 and November 20, 2025. Parent stated at the annual IEP team meeting, in later meetings, and at hearing that she understood the statement that Student “has learned multiplication facts up to 12” to mean he has not learned multiplication facts any further than 12. Parent did not consent to the offered annual IEP.

In an email on January 7, 2026, Parent claimed that Castro Valley was “teaching [Student] only multiplication facts up to 12.” In response, Castro Valley proposed on January 13, 2026, to amend the IEP offer by adding this language: “1/13/26 General education teacher reports, and parent observation, that [Student] can add and subtract

multiple digit math problems and also per teacher reporting and parent observation [Student] is able to do multi-digit multiplication with support (prompting, checking steps).” Parent did not consent to the amendment.

Parent did not explain at hearing why she interpreted the disputed phrase as she did, or offer any evidence that anyone else agreed with her interpretation.

The language of the disputed phrase cannot reasonably be interpreted the way Parent did. “[U]p to 12” does not necessarily mean no further than 12. Other statements in the November 20, 2025 IEP offer contradict Parent’s interpretation. Cheryl Herring, Student’s general education teacher, reported that “He can do 2x2 digit multiplication, some success with 2x3 digits.” The draft document referred repeatedly to the fact that math calculation was a strength for Student.

In addition, Parent’s interpretation was disputed at hearing by three of Student’s teachers.. Liz McCarthy was Student’s case manager. She had been a Castro Valley program specialist for eight years, and before that, a Castro Valley resource specialist program teacher for grades kindergarten through fifth. McCarthy held a Bachelor of Arts degree in psychology and a Master of Arts degree in special education. She also held a multiple subject teaching credential, a learning handicapped credential, autism and RSP certifications, a language development specialist certification, and a Tier I Administrative Credential. Overall, she had nearly 35 years of experience in education.

McCarthy had known Student since he was in kindergarten. She agreed at hearing that he could do two-digit multiplication. She established that the report that Student knows his multiplication facts up to 12 did not mean he could not do

multi-digit math operations past 12. It did not connote any limitation. McCarthy also established that other entries in the November 20, 2025, IEP offer, including in the meeting notes, showed that Student could do multi-digit multiplication.

McCarthy explained that Student's placement when Castro Valley made the November 2025 IEP offer was in a mild/moderate special day class with specialized academic instruction, pull-out and push-in language and speech therapy, and behavioral support. However, in August 2025, Student's strength in math calculation led Castro Valley to assign him to a general education class for math calculation, at Parent's request. His specialized academic instruction in math was reduced to reflect the change.

Herring was Student's general education teacher in fifth grade. Herring had 18 years of experience teaching fifth grade, and nearly 25 years of teaching experience overall. She held a Bachelor of Arts degree in Liberal Studies and a multiple subject teaching credential with English learner authorization for grades kindergarten through sixth grade.

Herring testified that Student could do two-digit multiplication and division. She informed the IEP team of that fact at the first part of the annual IEP team meeting, and also told the team that he was working on three-digit by two-digit multiplication. Herring established that the disputed sentence does not mean that Student can multiply only up to 12. Instead, she explained, in Student's case it meant that he knew his multiplication facts up to 12 without prompting.

(This space is intentionally left blank. Text continues on the following page.)

Febra Popoff was Student's special day class teacher between August and December 2025. She held a Bachelor of Arts degree in interdisciplinary studies and was working toward a teaching credential through the Alameda County Office of Education and the Santa Clara County Office of Education teacher internship program.

Popoff established that in her class, Student demonstrated proficiency in foundational math skills in the areas of addition, subtraction, and multiplication. She also reported that Student had learned his multiplication facts up to 12. However, this did not mean that Student could only multiply up to 12.

Student's three teachers were credible witnesses. They knew Student, his program, and his abilities well. Their testimony was consistent with contemporary documentation. They were thoughtful and careful in their testimony. Cross-examination did not expose any weaknesses in their testimony. The testimony of McCarthy, Herring, and Popoff was therefore given significant weight here.

The evidence showed that Parent misinterpreted the reference in Student's present levels as meaning he could not multiply numbers above 12. Instead, the reference addressed his ability automatically to recall and apply basic mathematical concepts in performing more difficult calculations. Specifically, no one at Castro Valley believed that Student could not multiply numbers past 12, and repeatedly informed Parent that they agreed he could accomplish that.

In sum, the present levels of performance in the November 2025 IEP offer were accurate. This is confirmed by the wording of the statement, other entries in the November 20, 2025 IEP, and three of Student's teachers, all of whom were familiar with his mathematical skills. Castro Valley did not provide a factually inaccurate document regarding Student's math abilities.

However, even if Castro Valley had not stated accurate present levels of performance, that would not have denied Student a FAPE. That error would have been a procedural violation. A procedural error does not deny FAPE unless it impedes the child's right to a FAPE, significantly impedes the parents' opportunity to participate in the decision-making process regarding the provision of a FAPE to the child, or causes a deprivation of educational benefits. (20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(3)(E); Ed. Code, § 56505, subd. (l).)

Student claimed in his closing brief that he suffered substantial educational injury because of the inaccurate statement of his present levels in math. However, he did not identify any specific injuries. Student made this contention on the apparent assumption that Castro Valley was implementing the disputed IEP, which it was not.

Student describes the October-November IEP offer as "a legal document that governed every educational decision made for [Student] during the 2024-2025 school year." No evidence supported that description. Student refers to "the semester [Castro Valley] took from a child who deserved better" and that the disputed phrase created "a false baseline that infected every IEP decision made for Student." No evidence supported those claims either. Parent did not consent to the IEP containing the alleged misstatement. There was no evidence Castro Valley implemented any part of that IEP. There was no evidence that anyone at Castro Valley took any action in reliance on the disputed statement. There was no evidence that Student's education was injured or even affected in any way by the statement of present math levels in the November 2025 IEP offer.

(This space is intentionally left blank. Text continues on the following page.)

Student also argues that the allegedly inaccurate statement of present levels denied Parent meaningful participation in the IEP process. “[A] district violates IDEA,” Student argues, “when it provides inaccurate or misleading information that denies the parent a meaningful role.” However, Parent knew, perhaps better than anyone else, exactly what math calculation skills Student had. She tutored him in math every school day evening for at least an hour. She sent Castro Valley numerous short videos purportedly showing Student multiplying multi-digit numbers.

This case is quite like *J.L.N. v. Grossmont Union High Sch. Dist.* (S.D.Cal., Sept. 30, 2019, No. 17-cv-2097-L-MDD) *7 [nonpub. opn.]. In *J.L.N.* the district court accepted an ALJ’s ruling that present levels of performance in the student’s IEP were inadequate, but held that the procedural violation was nonetheless harmless, in reasoning that fully applies here.

The court in *J.L.N.* pointed out that parent in fact knew exactly how her child was performing and participated fully in the IEP process notwithstanding the district’s inadequate present levels. She “was closely involved in her son’s education.” (*Id.* at p.*7.) She “closely monitored” his performance and was “acutely aware” of it.. (*Ibid.*) She helped him with his homework, regularly communicated with teachers, and monitored his grades. The description in *J.L.N.* of the parent’s involvement closely resembles this Parent’s involvement in this matter, and shows why Student’s claim of denial of meaningful participation must fail.

Parent here participated fully and meaningfully in the IEP process. Parent testified at hearing that she participated in the two-part annual meeting, had an opportunity to share her concerns, and did so. There was no evidence that the disputed passage in the IEP had any negative effect on her participation. As Student admits in his closing brief,

Parent “did everything the law asks a parent to do. She communicated. She documented ... She attended every IEP meeting. She provided evidence. She raised her concerns in writing.”

Parent’s participation had results. During the annual meeting she proposed that Castro Valley reduce the number of word problems Student would be given, and Castro Valley agreed to do that. On January 13, 2026, Castro Valley offered to amend the IEP at parent’s request by adding a sentence to the IEP explaining that Student could engage in multi-digit multiplication. And in March 2026, Castro Valley removed the disputed present level statement entirely from a proposed IEP. Case manager McCarthy explained that Castro Valley removed the “up to 12” statement not because it was inaccurate, but because it was confusing to Parent and not accurate in her mind.

Student argued that Parent’s participation in the IEP process was not meaningful because the District did not incorporate her views into the proposed IEP. However, considering a parent’s viewpoint is not the same as adopting it. Student contends that “Under 34 C.F.R. § 300.324(a)(1)(ii), considering parent input means incorporating it.” The cited regulation does not even remotely impose that requirement. A district is obliged to consider a parent’s opinion in good faith, but it is not obliged to agree with the parent’s opinion or grant a parent veto power over any particular IEP provision. (*Ms. S. v. Vashon Island Sch. Dist.* (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1131-1132.)

Student describes use of the disputed phrase as a continuing wrong being maintained from November 2, 2025, to January 14, 2026, not just an event in an IEP offer. However, the IDEA does not address the continual maintenance of present levels

of performance. It only requires that present levels be included in an IEP. (20 U.S.C. § 1414(d)(1)(A)(i)(I)). Moreover, it would not matter if there were such a duty because the present level in dispute was accurate during that period of time.

Student did not prove that he was denied a FAPE because of Castro Valley's alleged provision of a factually false document. Properly understood, the statement in the IEP offer that Student knew his multiplication up to 12 was true and accurate.

ISSUE 1 c: DID CASTRO VALLEY DENY STUDENT A FAPE FROM NOVEMBER 3, 2025, TO JANUARY 14, 2026, BY FAILING TO OFFER SPECIALIZED ACADEMIC INSTRUCTION IN MATH?

While the Order Following Prehearing Conference framed this issue as a failure "to offer specialized academic instruction in mathematics," Student's complaint made a more specific contention that the instruction Student received in math in his special day class was on "already mastered material." Both parties and the ALJ understood that to be Student's contention and addressed it at hearing, so it is decided here.

Student points out that in fifth grade general education, he was being instructed in fifth grade math calculation, but in his special day class he was being taught first-to-second grade math word problems. He claims that he had already mastered the materials he was being taught in the special day class, and therefore his instruction was duplicating already mastered material and was insufficiently ambitious.

This argument is unpersuasive because Student fails to distinguish between math calculation and math word problems. They are different subjects, and are addressed in different ways in the IEP's that Castro Valley offered Student. Castro Valley put Student

in general education for math calculation because of his strength in that subject, but taught him math word problems in the special day class because he had serious difficulty understanding them. It is unclear if his difficulties in understanding math word problems were related to the fact that he was an English Learner whose native language is Cantonese. Regardless of the underlying reason, the evidence established that Student had greater challenges solving word problems than numerical calculations. Fifth grade teacher Herring did not require that he address any word problems.

The parties had long been aware that Student was strong in math calculation but had much more difficulty solving math word problems. That difference was noted in the 2024 triennial assessments and elsewhere in Student's records. On the Woodcock-Johnson examination conducted for his 2024 triennial review, he scored 95 on math calculation, which is in the average range, but only 54 on math problem solving, which is in the very low range. The meeting notes for the IEP team meeting on October 17, 2025, record that Parent expressed concerns about Student's comprehension of word problems, saying "he doesn't get it." Parent also stated that word problems didn't help and were a waste of time.

Student now equates math calculation and math word problems in order to argue that he already mastered the first- and second-grade material he was being taught in the special day class. However, that material included math word problems, which the evidence consistently showed Student had not mastered.

Student did not prove that he needed additional specialized academic instruction in math or that he was being taught material he had already mastered.

ISSUE 1 d: DID CASTRO VALLEY DENY STUDENT A FAPE FROM NOVEMBER 3, 2025, TO JANUARY 14, 2026, BY DENYING MEANINGFUL PARENTAL PARTICIPATION IN THE IEP PROCESS AT THE NOVEMBER 20, 2025 IEP TEAM MEETING?

Student contends that Castro Valley denied Parent meaningful participation in the IEP process at the November 20 2025 IEP team meeting.

Castro Valley contends that Parent participated thoroughly in the annual meeting held in October and November 2025.

Federal and State law require that the parents of a child with a disability must be afforded an opportunity to participate in meetings with respect to the assessment, educational placement, and provision of a FAPE to their child. (20 U.S.C. §1414(d)(1)(B)(i); Ed. Code, §§ 56304, 56342.5.) A district must ensure that the parent of a student who is eligible for special education and related services is a member of any group that makes decisions on the educational placement of the student. (Ed. Code, §56342.5.)

A parent has meaningfully participated in the development of an IEP when she is informed of her child's problems, attends the IEP team meeting, expresses her disagreement with the IEP team's conclusions, and requests revisions in the IEP. (*N.L. v. Knox Cty. Schools* (6th Cir. 2003) 315 F.3d 688, 693.) A parent who has an opportunity to discuss a proposed IEP, and whose concerns are considered by the IEP team, has participated in the IEP development process in a meaningful way. (*Fuhrmann v. East Hanover Bd. of Educ.* (3d Cir. 1993) 993 F.2d 1031, 1036.)

As determined above, Parent participated fully and meaningfully in the IEP process at the two part annual IEP team meeting. Parent expressed concern about Student's ability to complete math word problems. Parent explained Student's strength in math calculations. As the meeting notes indicate, the IEP team discussed Student's math abilities in great detail.

Castro Valley did not deny Parent meaningful participation in the IEP process at the 2025 annual IEP team meeting or at any other time between November 3, 2025, and January 14, 2006.

CONCLUSIONS AND PREVAILING PARTY

As required by California Education Code section 56507, subdivision (d), the hearing decision must indicate the extent to which each party has prevailed on each issue heard and decided.

ISSUE 1, SUBSECTION a:

Castro Valley did not deny Student a FAPE by failing to assess Student in all areas of suspected disability, specifically, academic assessment in mathematics.

Castro Valley prevailed on Issue 1, subsection a.

ISSUE 1, SUBSECTION b:

Castro Valley did not deny Student a FAPE by providing a factually false document that included inaccurate present levels of performance at the November 20, 2025 IEP team meeting.

Castro Valley prevailed on Issue 1, subsection b.

ISSUE 1, SUBSECTION c:

Castro Valley did not deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer specialized academic instruction in math, nor did it teach Student materials he had already mastered.

Castro Valley prevailed on Issue 1, subsection c.

ISSUE 1, SUBSECTION d:

Castro Valley did not deny Student a FAPE by preventing meaningful parental participation in the IEP process at the November 20, 2025 IEP meeting.

Castro Valley prevailed on Issue 1, subsection d.

ORDER

All of Student's requests for relief are denied.

RIGHT TO APPEAL THIS DECISION

This is a final administrative decision, and all parties are bound by it. Pursuant to Education Code section 56505, subdivision (k), any party may appeal this Decision to a court of competent jurisdiction within 90 days of receipt.

Charles Marson

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings