

**BEFORE THE
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN THE CONSOLIDATED MATTERS OF:
PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,**

v.

**CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
OAH CASE NUMBER 2019040392**

and

CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,

v.

**PARENT ON BEHALF OF STUDENT,
OAH CASE NUMBER 2019050347**

ORDER FOLLOWING PREHEARING CONFERENCE

On September 6, 2019, Administrative Law Judge Sabrina Kong Office of Administrative Hearings held a telephonic prehearing conference. The Administrative Law Judge will be referred to as an ALJ. The Office of Administrative Hearings will be referred to as OAH. Prehearing conference will be referred to as PHC.

Attorney Justin Youngs appeared on behalf of Student. Attorneys Summer Dalessandro and Joshua Walden appeared on behalf of Corona-Norco Unified School District. Corona-Norco Unified School District will be referred to as Corona-Norco. The PHC was recorded. Based upon discussion with the parties, the ALJ issues the following order:

HEARING DATES, TIMES, AND LOCATION

DUE PROCESS HEARING

The hearing will take place on September 17, 18, and 19, 2019, continue day to day at the discretion of the ALJ. The hearing shall begin at 9:30 AM on the first day of the hearing and at 9:00 AM on all other days, unless otherwise ordered.

HEARING LOCATION

The hearing will be held at Corona-Norco located at 2820 Clark Avenue, Norco, CA 92860.

The parties shall immediately notify all potential witnesses of the hearing dates, and shall subpoena witnesses if necessary, to ensure that the witnesses will be available to testify. A witness will not be regarded as unavailable for purposes of showing good cause to continue the hearing if the witness is not properly notified of the hearing date or properly subpoenaed, as applicable.

District facilities shall fully comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794 et seq.), the Unruh Civil Rights Act (Civ. Code, § 51 et seq.), and all laws governing accessibility of government facilities to persons with disabilities. Districts are required to file written certification with OAH that the facilities District provides comply with these laws.

Corona-Norco shall file the required certification with two days of this Order and provide facilities that comply with these laws.

Before the beginning of the hearing, Corona-Norco shall ensure that the hearing room is configured into a courtroom setting and shall contain:

- a table for Student and his representatives;
- a table for Corona-Norco's legal representative and special education representative;
- a table for the witness;
- a table for the ALJ, near an electrical outlet with a chair that adjusts to an appropriate height for typing at the table provided; and
- water and tissue available for the participants.

The same hearing room shall be used for each day of hearing and shall be available at least one hour before the beginning of the hearing each day. The hearing room shall be locked following the hearing each night. Corona-Norco shall ensure that the hearing room and access to it are in compliance with the all laws governing accessibility of government facilities to persons with disabilities.

Corona-Norco shall also ensure that one parking space is available on each hearing day for each of the following: the ALJ, Parents, Student's attorneys, District's attorneys, and witnesses.

ISSUES AND PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Free appropriate public education will be referred to as a FAPE. Individualized education program will be referred to as IEP. The issues at the due process hearing, and

proposed resolutions, as alleged in the complaint and clarified by the parties and the ALJ during the prehearing conference are:

STUDENT'S ISSUES

1. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to appropriately assess in all areas of suspected disabilities specifically:
 - A. Psycho-educational;
 - B. Functional vision;
 - C. Social skills; and
 - D. Behavior on a timely basis?
2. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to accurately state present levels of performance in the March 15, 2017 IEP for the following areas:
 - A. Developmental, academic, functional skills;
 - B. Communication development;
 - C. Gross and Fine Motor Development;
 - D. Social, emotional, and behavioral;
 - E. Health;
 - F. Vocational; and
 - G. Adaptive and daily living skills?
3. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to accurately state present levels of performance in the November 3, 2017 IEP for the following areas:
 - A. Communication Development;
 - B. Gross and fine motor development;
 - C. Social, emotional, and behavioral;
 - D. Health;

- E. Vocational; and
 - F. Adaptive and daily living skills?
4. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to craft appropriate and measurable goals in the March 15, 2017 IEP specifically:
- A. Speech and language, goal 1;
 - B. One-to-one correspondence, goal 2;
 - C. Sight word identification, goal 3;
 - D. Word identification, goal 4;
 - E. Speech and language, goal 5;
 - F. Speech and language, goal 6;
 - G. Stairs; goal 7;
 - H. Fine motion and visual motor, goal 8; and
 - I. Object control, goal 9?
5. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to craft appropriate and measurable goals in the November 3, 2017 IEP specifically:
- A. Semantics and comprehension, goal 4;
 - B. Sight words, goal 5;
 - C. Comprehension, goal 6;
 - D. Decoding consonant vowel consonant words, goal 7;
 - E. Informational writing, goal 8;
 - F. Know number names and quantity, goal 9;
 - G. Identify greater than, less than, and equal to, goal 10;
 - H. Fine motor precision control, goal 11;
 - I. Motor planning and bilateral coordination, goal 12;
 - J. Object control, goal 13; and
 - K. Accessing doors, goal 14?

6. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by making unilateral changes to his November 3, 2017 IEP, specifically speech and language services without informed parental consent?
7. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by denying Parents full and effective participation in the IEP process by failing to keep accurate records of Student's behavioral services in the 2017-2018 school year?
8. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by denying Parents full and effective participation in the IEP process by failing to keep accurate records of Student's occupational therapy services in the 2017-2018 school year?
9. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by denying Parents full and effective participation in the IEP process by not timely giving them a complete copy of the September 7, 2017 IEP document?
10. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by not giving Parents prior written notice about the failure to implement occupational therapy services after the August 27, 2018 IEP?
11. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by not giving Parents Student's complete educational records upon their request on September 5, 2018 and September 18, 2018?
12. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer an appropriate placement in the least restrictive environment in the March 15, 2017 IEP?
13. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer an appropriate placement in the least restrictive environment in the November 3, 2017 IEP?

14. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer an appropriate placement in the March 20, 2018 IEP which resulted in a lack of academic progress?
15. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer an appropriate placement in the October 17, 2018 IEP which resulted in a lack of academic progress?
16. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer trained and qualified aide support in the March 15, 2017 IEP?
17. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer trained and qualified aide support in the November 3, 2017 IEP?
18. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer trained and qualified aide support in the March 20, 2018 IEP?
19. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer trained and qualified aide support in the August 27, 2018 IEP?
20. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer behavior intervention services and a behavior intervention plan in the March 15, 2017 IEP?
21. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer behavior intervention services and a behavior intervention plan in the November 3, 2017 IEP?
22. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer behavior intervention services and a behavior intervention plan in the October 17, 2018 IEP?
23. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer adequate speech and language therapy in the November 3, 2017 IEP?

24. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate occupational therapy in the March 15, 2017 IEP?
25. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate occupational therapy in the September 7, 2017 IEP?
26. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate occupational therapy in the November 3, 2017 IEP?
27. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate occupational therapy in the August 27, 2018 IEP?
28. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate occupational therapy in the October 17, 2018 IEP?
29. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer adequate assistive technology and assistive augmentative communication supports and services in the 2016-2017 school year?
30. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer adequate assistive technology and assistive augmentative communication supports and services in the 2017-2018 school year?
31. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer adequate assistive technology and assistive augmentative communication supports and services in the 2018-2019 school year?
32. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to implement the assistive technology and assistive augmentative communication supports and services offered in the February 2, 2017 IEP?
33. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to implement the assistive technology and assistive augmentative communication supports and services offered in the September 7, 2017 IEP?

34. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer social skills training in the March 15, 2017 IEP?
35. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer social skills training in the November 3, 2017 IEP?
36. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer social skills training in the March 20, 2018 IEP?
37. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate extended school year services in the March 15, 2017 IEP?
38. Did Corona-Norco deny Student a FAPE by failing to offer appropriate extended school year services in the November 3, 2017 IEP?

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

The resolutions requested by Student include a complete copy of his educational records, independent evaluations, an appropriate placement with transportation, compensatory services and transportation to access those services, reimbursement to parents for educational services, and development of an appropriate IEP.

Corona-Norco filed its response to Student's complaint on April 22, 2019. (*M.C. v. Antelope Valley Unified School Dist.* (9th Cir. 2017) 858 F.3d 1189, 1199-1200.)

CORONA-NORCO'S ISSUE

1. Whether Corona-Norco's October 17, 2018 annual IEP, developed on October 17, 2018, November 29, 2018, January 15, 2019, February 6, 2019, and as clarified and supplemented in its April 15, 2019 letter, offered Student a FAPE?

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

Corona-Norco requests that OAH order that its October 17, 2018 IEP offered Student a FAPE and that it may implement without parental consent.

EXHIBITS

BINDERS

Exhibits shall be pre-marked and placed in three-ring binders before the hearing. Exhibit binders shall include a tab for each exhibit. Each binder shall contain a detailed table of contents which clearly identifies the tabs and documents. The ALJ and witnesses must be able to easily turn to exhibit tabs and to turn pages in the binders. Multiple binders may be submitted if necessary.

TAB AND PAGE NUMBERS

The parties shall place a letter followed by a number on each tab to identify each exhibit. Student shall use the letter S before the number to identify Student's exhibits. Corona-Norco shall use the letter D before the number to identify Corona-Norco's exhibits. For example, S-1 means Student's exhibit tab 1 and D-1 means Corona-Norco's exhibit tab 1. Each page of each binder shall be numbered consecutively from the first page of the first exhibit to the last page of the last exhibit in the binder. Parties may use a Bates-stamp type system for numbering.

CONTENT

Each exhibit shall consist of one document. Separate documents may not be combined into one exhibit. Emails or letters may be consolidated into one exhibit if they are part of a single chain of messages. Documents offered as evidence to support

a request for reimbursement must be separated by vendor and should be internally chronological where possible. Exhibits in the binders should be in chronological order.

Parties should include resumes or curriculum vitae for each witness who is expected to testify as to their professional credentials. Notwithstanding the requirements of Education Code section 56505, subdivision (e)(7), the parties shall exchange resumes not later than 24 hours before the witness is scheduled to testify.

Corona-Norco's binder shall include a color copy of the school calendar for each school year in question and shall have witnesses available to explain the calendar if necessary.

COPIES OF BINDERS

The parties shall serve copies of their evidence binders on each other. This exchange is required by Education Code section 56505, subdivision (e)(7). Each party shall bring two additional sets of the binders containing their exhibits to the hearing. One set will be used by the ALJ, and the other set will be used by witnesses. The parties may not serve exhibits on OAH before the hearing.

Except for good cause shown, or unless used solely for rebuttal or impeachment, any exhibit not timely exchanged shall not be admitted into evidence at the hearing unless the ALJ rules that it is admissible.

WITNESSES

Parties are responsible for producing their own witnesses unless otherwise ordered by the ALJ. Parties shall make witnesses under their control reasonably available. The parties shall schedule their witnesses to avoid delays in the hearing and to minimize or eliminate the need for calling witnesses out of order. Neither party shall

be permitted to call any witnesses not timely disclosed except for good cause shown, and at the discretion of the ALJ.

The ALJ has discretion to limit the number of witnesses who testify and the time allowed for witnesses' testimony. Education Code, section 56505.1, subd. (h), empowers the ALJ to set a reasonable limit on the length of the hearing after consideration of four factors. The first two factors are the issues to be heard and the complexity of facts to be proven. The second two factors are the ability of the parties or their representatives to present their respective cases and the parties' estimates of the time needed to present their cases.

MEET AND CONFER

The parties are encouraged to review and shorten their witness and exhibit lists before the hearing. Evidence will be excluded if it is repetitive, cumulative, or insufficiently probative to justify the time it would take to hear. The parties are ordered to meet and confer no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 10, 2019. The parties shall discuss the availability of witnesses, the order of witnesses and the length of witness testimony. The parties should attempt to eliminate duplicate exhibits from their binders. The parties may discuss whether they can produce a written stipulation stating basic facts to shorten the length of time needed for the hearing.

EVIDENCE PRESENTATION

In an administrative proceeding, the burden of proof is ordinarily on the party requesting the hearing. (*Schaffer v. Weast* (2005) 546 U.S. 49, 62.) In this consolidated matter, Student's case-in-chief shall be presented first, followed by Corona-Norco.

WITNESS LISTS

The parties shall give the ALJ a joint proposed witness list for the first day of hearing. The list should include dates and time estimates of expected testimony. In the event an agreement cannot be reached, each party shall prepare a separate written list. Corona-Norco shall have witnesses available in case there is no agreement. Before the hearing begins, the ALJ and the parties will discuss the length of time anticipated for direct and cross-examination of each witness and scheduling issues for individual witnesses. The ALJ will finalize the witness schedule. Parties shall be prepared at the end of each day to discuss the witnesses to be presented the next day and the estimated time the testimony each witness is expected to take.

SCOPE OF WITNESS EXAMINATION

Each witness shall be called to testify only once, except for rebuttal purposes. All parties shall examine witness on all issues when the witness is first called. Requiring a witness to appear only once takes precedence over the order in which parties presents their case in chief.

TELEPHONIC TESTIMONY

Neither party anticipates the need for telephonic testimony at the time of the PHC. Whether a witness may appear by telephone is a matter within the discretion of the ALJ. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 3082, subd. (g).) Any party seeking to present a witness by telephone shall request for leave to do so before the hearing, unless the opposing party has stipulated that the witness may appear by telephone. The party offering the witness shall provide the witness with a complete set of exhibit binders from all parties before the hearing. The binders must be exact paper copies of all of each party's exhibits. Electronic copies are not acceptable. The party presenting the

witness shall ensure the witness testifies from a private location with no other persons present. The party offering telephonic testimony shall ensure that the witness has telephone equipment that allows clear testimony at a volume that allows clear transmission of what the witness is saying, allows the witness' testimony to make a clear recording, and allows the witness to hear objections and rulings. Corona-Norco shall ensure that the hearing room has telephone speaker equipment that allows everyone in the room to hear the witness, and allows the witness to hear objections and rulings. No witness will be heard by telephone unless all these requirements have been fulfilled.

ELECTRONIC RECORDINGS

Audio Recording

A party may request permission to make an audio recording of the hearing. Permission to make an audio recording is subject to the ALJ's discretion and based upon certain conditions. Such requests are routinely granted on the following conditions:

- the OAH recording is the only official recording;
- the parties shall turn the recording device on and off at the same time that the ALJ is on and off the record to avoid recording conversations while off the record;
- the recording device will be removed by the party recording during any recess where the party leaves the room;
- operation of the party's recording mechanism will not be allowed to delay the hearing;
- a parties' recording may not be used to prepare the testimony of a witness in the hearing;
- the recording shall not be shared with any non-party, possible witness, or through social media;

- the parties shall not use the recording in any subsequent due process hearing;
- the recording is subject to the same confidentiality as the due process hearing; and
- the parties shall dispose of the unofficial recording when the time for filing an appeal has passed or, in the event of an appeal, when the time for submission of the record on appeal has passed.

Both parties requested and were granted permission to audio record the hearing subject to these conditions.

Video Recording

No party, witness or anyone else may make any video recording of any part of the proceedings. Any person doing so shall be subject to sanctions.

Recordings as exhibits

Neither party proposed to introduce all or part of a recording of an individualized education program team meeting. The ALJ has discretion to admit or exclude evidence in the form of a recording. Any request to submit a recording shall be considered at the time of hearing. The ALJ may grant or deny the request, or grant the request subject to certain conditions. The party offering the recording must establish that all or a part of the recording is relevant. The ALJ may request a transcript of the portion of the recording requested or have the party offering the recording to provide an exact identifiable portion of the recording the party seeks to admit. The identities of any person speaking on the portion of the tape being introduced must be established. An ALJ may allow the opposing party to offer additional portions of a recording to establish the context, or to rebut, the recording.

Excerpts of an audio record of an individualized education program team meeting must be transcribed and offered as documentary evidence. The portion of the audio record transcribed shall be provided to the opposing party with the transcript to allow an opportunity to verify the accuracy of the transcription. Transcription need not be done by a certified court reporter. Electronic recording of the excerpts of the audio record shall be included with the transcript, at the ALJ's discretion, to allow the ALJ to listen to the recording as well as read the transcript.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION OR REIMBURSEMENT

Any party seeking reimbursement for expenditures shall present admissible evidence of these expenditures, or a stipulation to the amount of the expenditures. A party seeking compensatory education should provide evidence regarding the type, amount, duration, and need for any requested compensatory education.

MOTIONS

At the PHC, Ms. Dalessandro informed the ALJ that the March 15, 2017 IEP was more than two years from Student's April 9, 2019 filing of the complaint. Corona-Norco did not file any motions objecting to the March 15, 2017 IEP because it was more than two years of the date Student filed his complaint. Mr. Young stated that the parties had entered into a tolling agreement. Because Ms. Dalessandro became the handling attorney for this case recently, upon her colleague's retirement, she was not aware of the tolling agreement terms or its implication, if any, on whether the March 15, 2017 IEP would be properly before OAH. Both parties agreed to brief OAH on this issue. The parties shall file with OAH and serve initial briefs on whether the March 15, 2017 IEP should be considered by OAH at hearing by 5:00 p.m. on September 11, 2019. The initial briefs shall be no longer than fifteen pages, double-spaced, twelve-point font.

The parties may file with OAH and serve responsive briefs by 5:00 p.m. September 12, 2019. The responsive briefs shall be no longer than ten pages, double-spaced, twelve-point font. The ALJ will rule on this issue on the first day of hearing. The parties agreed to this briefing schedule and to the ALJ's ruling on this issue on the first day of hearing as the most economically expedient as they proceed with both hearing preparation and settlement discussions.

No other prehearing motions are pending or contemplated. Any motion that was not filed three business days before the Prehearing Conference, shall be supported by a declaration under penalty of perjury establishing good cause why the motion was not timely filed.

STIPULATIONS

Stipulations to pertinent facts, contentions or resolutions are encouraged. Any proposed stipulation shall be submitted to the assigned ALJ in writing.

CONDUCT OF COUNSEL AND HEARING ROOM DECORUM

Counsel, all parties, and all witnesses shall conduct themselves in a professional and courteous manner at all times. Cellular phones, recorders, and other noisemaking electronic devices shall be shut off or set to vibrate during the hearing unless the ALJ grants permission otherwise. No food or drinks other than water will be permitted in the hearing room during the hearing.

LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS AND REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS

Neither party requested any accommodations at the PHC. A party or participant to this case, such as a witness, requiring reasonable accommodation to participate in a mediation or hearing may contact OAH at (916) 263-0880, or send an email to

OAHADA@dgs.ca.gov as soon as the need is known. The e-mail should have "Request for Accommodation" in the Subject Line. Additional information concerning requests for reasonable accommodation is available on OAH's website at:

<https://www.dgs.ca.gov/OAH/Services/Page-Content/Office-of-Administrative-Hearings-Services-List-Folder/Accommodations-at-OAH>.

HEARING OPEN OR CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

The hearing is closed to the public. Special Education hearings are closed to the public unless Student requests the hearing to be open to the public.

SETTLEMENT

The parties are encouraged to continue working together to reach an agreement before the due process hearing. The parties shall inform OAH in writing immediately if they reach a settlement or otherwise resolve the dispute before the scheduled hearing. In addition, if a settlement is reached within five days of the scheduled start of the due process hearing, the parties shall also inform OAH of the settlement by telephone at (916) 263-0880. At the same time, the parties should send the signature page of the signed agreement or a letter withdrawing the case to OAH at <https://www.applications.dgs.ca.gov/oah/oahsftweb>.

If a full and final written settlement agreement is reached after 4:00 p.m. the day prior to hearing, the parties shall leave a voicemail message regarding the settlement at (916) 274-6035. The parties should also leave contact information such as cellular phone numbers of each party or counsel for each party.

Dates for hearing will not be cancelled until the letter of withdrawal or signature page of the signed agreement has been received by OAH. If an agreement in principle

is reached, the parties should plan to attend the scheduled hearing unless different arrangements have been agreed upon by the assigned ALJ. The assigned ALJ will check for messages before the hearing.

If the matter settles subject to board approval, in addition to a signed copy of the signature page of the settlement agreement, the parties shall provide the date of the next board meeting. The hearing dates will not be cancelled without this information.

FAILURE TO COMPLY

The failure to comply with this Order may result in the exclusion of evidence or other sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 9, 2019

DocuSigned by:
Sabrina Kong
6159FBB6742E44F...

Sabrina Kong
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings