

**STATE OF MAINE
SPECIAL EDUCATION DUE PROCESS HEARING**

February 16, 2004

Case # 03.164H, *Parents v. Portland School Department*

REPRESENTING THE FAMILY : Janet Charney, Esq.

REPRESENTING THE SCHOOL: James Schwellenbach, Esq.

HEARING OFFICER: Lynne A. Williams, J.D., Ph.D.

This hearing was held and the decision written pursuant to Title 20-A, MRSA, 7202 et. seq., and 20 U.S.C. §1415 et. seq., and accompanying regulations.

This due process hearing was requested by the mother and father on December 16, 2003. The case involves the child, whose date of birth is xx/xx/xxxx. She is currently attending the REACH Preschool in Portland on an interim basis, pending the outcome of this hearing. The child is eligible for special education services under the category of Multiple Disabilities.

Due to school vacation, and by mutual agreement of both parties, a prehearing conference call was not held until January 12, 2004. At that time, the issues for hearing were agreed upon. Documents and witness lists were exchanged in a timely manner. A series of hearing dates commenced on January 20, 2004 and continued on January 22, 2004, ending with a conference call on January 29, 2004. Final written closing arguments were submitted on February 4, 2004 and the record was closed at that time.

The family submitted 49 pages of documents and the school department submitted 66 pages. Ten witnesses testified.

Following is the decision in this matter.

I. Preliminary Statement

This case involves a xx year-old female student who is eligible for special education services under the category of Multiple Disabilities. She is currently attending the REACH Preschool in Portland, pending the outcome of this hearing. She has attended REACH since 2000.

The family requested this hearing. It is their contention that the xx placement proposed by the Portland School Department, the Functional Life Skills (FLS) classroom at the Riverton School in Portland [sic] does not offer Student a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive e+nvironment. They further contend that the Portland

School Department violated Student's stay put rights by modifying her program subsequent to the submission of the family's due process hearing request.

The Portland School Department contends that, given Student's significant needs, the Riverton School FLS does offer a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment, and deny the alleged violation of Student's stay put rights.

II. Issues to be Decided by Hearing

- Does the Portland School Department's proposed 2003-2004 IEP and placement offer student a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment? (M.S.E.R. §11.1)
- Did the Portland School Department violate Student's stay put rights by modifying her program subsequent to the family's request for a due process hearing? (M.S.E.R. §12.12(C))
- Is an augmentative communication evaluation necessary in order to give the PET information necessary in order to develop an appropriate I.E.P.? (M.S.E.R. §6.16)

III. Resolutions Reached During the Course of the Hearing

At the prehearing, the family requested that the hearing officer address the issue of whether or not Student needed an augmentative communication evaluation, and whether the school department should pay for the evaluation if one was needed. During the course of the hearing, the Portland School Department agreed to provide an augmentative communication evaluation of Student. This matter was therefore not addressed in this hearing decision.

VI. Findings of Fact

1. Student's date of birth is xx/xx/xxxx, and she is currently xx years old. (Due Process Request)
2. Student was diagnosed with global developmental delays, including ataxia and hypotonia, in 1998. (Testimony: Father)
3. When Student was xx years old, she began attending the REACH Preschool in Portland and received therapeutic services through CDS. At first she attended REACH for a half day, then began attending a full day. Since she began at REACH, Student has received occupational therapy, physical therapy, developmental therapy and speech/language services. Her current IFSP was developed on November 5, 2002 and she attends REACH from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., five days a week. For most of her time there she has been in a one-to-one

- placement. REACH is a school for children with autism and developmental delays. (Testimony: Father, C. Ingersoll)
4. Since beginning REACH, Student has made progress in motor control, particularly head control, sitting and standing. Student continues to be essentially non-verbal and has problems with transitions and working with new people. (Testimony: Father)
 5. Student also receives occupational and physical therapy outside of REACH and participates in a therapeutic swimming program. (Testimony: Father, K. McPhee; Exhibits: P41-43)
 6. Student's Father works with her on a daily basis, delivering what appears to be a modified form of ABA, utilizing a card and number system. His testimony indicated that Student's progress in this home-based program has been steady and suggestive of higher cognitive ability than previously thought. (Testimony: Father; Exhibit: S40)
 7. On February 7, 2003, June Gagnon, MA, conducted a developmental re-evaluation of Student. Ms. Gagnon had previously tested Student in 2001. The evaluator used the Bayley Scales, despite the fact that they are only normed for use from birth to 3 ½ years. It was her opinion that this was one of the few standardized tests with toys that might interest Student. Because of this, a standardized score could not be obtained, but an age level was computed. Student's estimated cognitive age level was determined to be 11 months. Student's raw score was 82 and if she were 3 ½ years old, that raw score would translate into a standard score of <50. It was therefore assumed that at her current age, Student's standardized score would be <50. (Exhibits: S48)
 8. Ms. Gagnon also administered the Behavior Rating Scale and Student's scores were 2nd percentile in Orientation/Engagement, 4th percentile in Emotional Regulation and 1st percentile in Motor Quality. She also received a standard score of 47, < 1st percentile, on the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales, Teacher Questionnaire. (Exhibits: S46-52)
 9. In her report narrative, Ms. Gagnon noted that Student did not talk at school but used two or three words at home. She was also beginning to use PECS and a few signs. She followed three or four familiar verbal directions though not consistently. Ms. Gagnon's recommendations for the 2003-2004 school year, when Student would be leaving REACH, included a small self-contained special education classroom with very close, completely continuous one-to-one supervision. She did not view mainstreaming as an option and opined that Student's slow but steady progress was due to her highly individualized program at REACH. (Exhibits: S46-52)

10. On April 28, 2003, Karen McPhee, Ph.D., Director of the Maine Center for Therapeutic Recreation, developed a report addressing Student's progress in her therapeutic swimming program. In the first quarter of 2003, Dr. McPhee noted that Student now walked into the building, as opposed to using her stroller. She had begun to forgo use of the mat for dressing. Student now sat on a chair rather than the mat and had begun generalizing the use of a chair in more than just the dressing situation. Her swim skills had also improved and she was able to help with dressing and undressing. (Testimony: K. McPhee; Exhibits: P41-43)
11. On May 28, 2003, Student's occupational and physical therapist, Jane Walker, prepared suggested goals and objectives for Student's transition IEP, including goals in improved sensory processing skills, fine motor skills and self care skills. Specific objectives includes [sic] decreasing biting behavior, increasing attention span, learning to maintain an upright posture, improving toileting skills and improvement in other self care skills. (Exhibits: S44-45)
12. At the suggestion of the Portland School Department, Student's parents visited the Lyseth School mainstream xx, the Hall School combined functional academics/FLS classroom, and the Riverton School FLS classroom. They had a favorable impression of Lyseth and Hall, but expressed concerns about the Riverton program. At the time of their visit, they observed an FLS student sitting alone in the mainstream classroom, and were concerned about the low-key atmosphere in the FLS classroom. In addition, they expressed concern about the lack of verbal students in the class. (Testimony: Father, Mother; Exhibits: S42)
13. A PET meeting was held on June 2, 2003, to plan Student's transition into xx. This meeting was attended by the parents, Barbara Dee, Director of Student Services, Rachel Berwick, Cumberland CDS, Colleen Foley Ingersoll, Director of the REACH School, Student's therapists, Dr. McPhee, Mary Ann Kotros, Riverton School Learning Specialist, and teachers and administrators from the Lyseth and Riverton Schools. A list of Student's strengths and weaknesses was developed and necessary accommodations/modifications were discussed, including Student's need for a warning before transitions, a consistent schedule, one-to-one adult assistance, a routine that allowed a work-break-work-break predictable schedule, adaptive equipment, feeding and toileting assistance, and consistent caregivers who know Student. The family showed a videotape of Student performing successfully in her home-based program. During this meeting, the principal of Lyseth School expressed concern about Lyseth's inability to provide and manage the in depth program that Student requires. Student's parents expressed their poor impression of the Riverton FLS classroom and their more favorable impressions of Hall and Lyseth. It was agreed that the family would again visit both Hall and Riverton and the PET would reconvene after this had been done. The family also conveyed to the team that they had scheduled Student for an evaluation with neurologist Dr. Ellen Popenoe. (Testimony: Father; Exhibits: S37-43)

14. The PET reconvened on June 10, 2003. In attendance were the parents, representatives from the Hall School, the Riverton School, Student's therapists, Dr. Dee and the Director of the REACH School. The Hall School combined FLS/Functional Academics program was reviewed, as was the Riverton FLS program. The family had again visited Hall and Riverton. Their impressions of the Hall program continued to be favorable but they again had issues with the Riverton program, in particular the isolated nature and low key ambience of the FLS classroom and they continued to feel that the Riverton program was not an appropriate match for Student. Dr. Dee communicated that she and the other educators on the team believed that Riverton would provide optimal services for Student and that part of the day she could be mainstreamed into a regular education xx class. Dr. Dee further offered to schedule a meeting for six weeks after Student entered the Riverton program in order to reassess how the program was working for her, but the family was concerned about possibly having to move her twice. It was determined that since Dr. Popenoe would be evaluating Student, she would remain at REACH through the month of September and Portland staff would observe Student at REACH. (Testimony: Father, B. Dee; Exhibits: P34-40)
15. During July 2003, Dr. Dee, along with Learning Specialist Mary Ann Kotros and Assistant Director of Special Services, Lynn Silva, visited REACH School to observe Student in the classroom. (Testimony: B. Dee, M. Kotros)
16. On September 4, 2003 and September 26, 2003, Dr. Ellen Popenoe conducted a psychological evaluation of Student. Dr. Popenoe's evaluation included an observation of Student at REACH, record review, a BASC Structured Developmental History, the Parent Rating Scales, conducting a family clinical interview, a telephone consultation with Student's speech and language pathologist, Nicole Boivin, and two attempted administrations of the PPVT IIIB. Dr. Popenoe was unable to get responses to the PPVT and she was unable to rate Student on the BASC due to too many blank answers. She noted that Student does not have verbal language skills but had recently begun learning signs and opines that with intensive repetition she has learned to recognize the written words for a number of objects, and she is capable of learning communication skills with multiple repetition and reinforcement. Popenoe recommended that the PET consider a mainstream setting with one-to-one support so that Student could have exposure to normally developing and higher functioning peers. She further stated that if Student is placed in a special education setting, it should be with higher functioning peers, with daily opportunities for mainstream experiences. Dr. Popenoe recommended that primary goals for Student include sitting and walking independently and increasing her receptive and expressive communication skills and, to this end, recommended an augmentative communication assessment. (Testimony: E. Popenoe; Exhibits: S27-31)
17. The PET reconvened on September 29, 2003. Present at that meeting were the parents, Dr. Dee, educators from Hall, Riverton and Lyseth, Lynn Silva, Dr.

- McPhee, advocates from Southern Maine Parent Awareness, Student's speech and language pathologist, and Colleen Foley Ingersoll. Dr. Dee reported that she, along with Mary Ann Kotros and Lynn Silva, observed Student at REACH in July and they continued to recommend the Riverton FLS placement for Student, due to her intensive needs. She also stated that Riverton School had more mainstreaming opportunities than the other placements, since it was a larger school. The team discussed a possible transition plan, whereby Student would enter the three-to-one classroom at REACH, with the support of a one-to-one aide, and her progress there would be assessed. It was determined that the PET would reconvene on October 27, 2003 in order to discuss Dr. Popenoe's findings and recommendations and Student's progress in the three-to-one classroom. (Testimony: Father, B. Dee, C. Ingersoll; Exhibits: P27-29, S34-36)
18. Within a few days of the September 29, 2003 PET meeting, the Portland School Department aide joined Student at REACH and was trained over a period of four days. During her time there, she worked with Student in the three-to-one classroom. (Testimony: B. Dee)
 19. A PET meeting was held on October 27, 2003, with the attorneys for both the family and the Portland School Department in attendance. Jill Blackwood, the principal of Riverton School, also attended. At this meeting, it was determined that an augmentative communication [sic] would be considered after Student is comfortable with her new school routine. It was also decided that the REACH placement would only continue for five more days until the PET reconvened on November 5, 2003. (Exhibits: S18-25)
 20. In early November 2003, Student was moved back into the REACH one-to-one classroom because her slot in the three-to-one classroom was filled by an incoming CDS student. At this time, the aide that had been supporting Student in the one-to-one classroom ceased coming to REACH since, according to REACH staff, she was no longer needed. (Testimony: B. Dee)
 21. In late November 2003, Dr. Chris Kaufman, Portland School Department psychologist, visited the REACH School to observe Student. Based on his observations during the visit, Dr. Kaufman subsequently disagreed somewhat with June Gagnon's recommendation that "mainstreaming is not an option" and recommended partial inclusion with appropriate peers. (Testimony: C. Kaufman)
 22. A PET meeting was held on November 5, 2003. At this meeting Ms. Silva stated that the Portland School Department was recommending the Riverton FLS placement. Ms. Kotros presented a draft schedule that included some mainstreaming and some reverse mainstreaming, comprising approximately 50% of Student's school day. The schedule mirrored the regular education xx schedule, and it was noted that increased mainstreaming time would be a PET determination. Ms. Ingersoll stressed that Student's scheduled [sic] should include

at least three hours per day of discrete trial training and Dr. Kaufman expressed a similar concern with a lack of direct instructional time. Ms. Boivin stated that Student needed three hours per week of direct speech and language time. The service plan that was eventually developed at this meeting included three hours per week of speech therapy, 13.5 – 27 hours per week of direct instruction in the FLS classroom, up to 13.5 hours per week in the mainstream xx classroom, one hour per week of OT, 90 minutes per week of PT and extended school year services. The description of Student’s involvement with the general education curriculum stated that “[Student] will participate in xx activities as determined by the PET. She will participate in recess, lunch, socialization, art, music, swim, community time, garden club and library.” Her goals and objectives included decreasing maladaptive behaviors, such as aggression and mouthing behavior, increasing gross motor skills, increasing pre-academic and attending skills, and improving expressive and receptive language skills. (Testimony: M. Kotros; Exhibits: S1-17)

23. Riverton School has 480 students and 90 staff members, some of them part-time. The FLS program currently enrolls five students, all of whom have global developmental delays. Two are verbal and one is somewhat verbal, with the assistance of PECS. The FLS staff employs a systematic language approach, and speech and language therapy, OT and PT are integrated into the program. Daily living skills are taught and there is a once a week community field experience. Pre-academics including reading and math [sic] in a one-to-one format. There is also a swim program. The FLS classroom is directly across from the xx classroom and has access to an on site rehabilitation aide, as well as nursing staff, a specially trained special education teacher and two educational technicians. The students have access to the computer lab and have computers and augmentative communication devices within the FLS classroom. Students are included to the maximum extent possible within the activities of the school, including musical performances. Consensus was not reached at this meeting. (Testimony: M. Kotros)
24. On December 16, 2003, the family filed a request for a Due Process Hearing. (Due Process Hearing Request)
25. Student has continued to attend the REACH Preschool, pending the outcome of this hearing. (Testimony: Father, B. Dee)

V. Discussion and Conclusions

The issue in this case is whether the xx placement offered by the Portland School Department, the FLS classroom at the Riverton School, is the least restrictive educational setting within which Student can be reasonably expected to make educational progress. The goals and objectives in the IEP developed by the P.E.T. on November 5, 2004, are

not at issue. However, in addition to the Riverton placement itself, the amount of mainstreaming in the proposed IEP is also at issue.

As Maine Special Education Regulations state,

“...removal of students with disabilities from the regular educational environment shall occur only when the nature or severity of the disability of a student is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

MSER §11.1 (1999); *See also* 34 CFR §300.550(b)(2)

Additional clarification of these regulations was given in the Federal Department of Education’s *Appendix A to Part 300 – Notice of Interpretation*. The Federal Department was questioned as to whether a school district was required to make a regular education placement for a child whose behavior would significantly impair the learning of others. In its [sic] response, the Department stated the PET is required to consider “strategies, including positive behavioral interventions, strategies and supports to address the behavior” of the child. Furthermore, “[I]f the child can appropriately function in the regular classroom with appropriate behavioral supports, strategies or interventions, placement in a more restrictive environment would be inconsistent with the least restrictive environment provisions of the IDEA.” *DOE Q & A Document*, Question 39, 64 Fed. Reg. 12479 (March 12, 1999).

Likewise, case law provides us similar guidance. The 3rd Circuit, in *Oberti v. Board of Educ. of the Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, 995 F.2d 1204 (3rd Cir. 1993), prescribed a two-part test for meeting the mainstreaming requirement of the IDEA. First, can the student with disabilities be satisfactorily educated in a regular class with supplemental aids and services; and, second, whether the school has included the child in school programs with non-disabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.

In order to address the first prong of this test, three factors must be examined. First, whether the school has made reasonable efforts to accommodate the child in the regular classroom; second, the educational benefits available to the child in a regular classroom, with appropriate supplementary aids and services, as compared to the benefits provided in a special education class; and, third, the possible negative effects of the inclusion of the child on the education of the other students in the class. *Oberti* at 1217-1218.

It is the second factor, a consideration of the relative educational benefits available in the mainstream setting, as opposed to the FLS class, that is particularly relevant in this case. The family contends that Student could be successfully educated, essentially meeting her goals and objectives, in the mainstream xx at Lyseth School, as long as she was given full-time one-to-one support.

Student has significant special needs. She is essentially non-verbal and although there is some evidence, mainly anecdotal, that her cognitive potential may be higher than testing

has indicated, the only available scores, from February 2003, place her at an 11-month level. Student has been attending the REACH Preschool, a special purpose, very restrictive CDS program. For most of her time in this program, Student was instructed in a one-to-one situation, with a special education teacher. Her educational programming has included a structured, but modified, ABA program. When she was temporarily placed in a three-to-one classroom at REACH, Student required a full-time one on one aide, who was provided by the Portland School Department.

Student's father works with her at home on a daily basis, delivering what also appears to be a modified ABA program. Basing his comments on his work with her, Student's father presented anecdotal evidence suggesting that Student's cognitive potential might be higher than previously believed. He may very well be correct in this assessment, although evaluators' inability to obtain valid and reliable cognitive scores complicates this question.

However, the possibility that Student has greater cognitive ability and therefore higher academic potential does not automatically indicate that a mainstream classroom placement is appropriate for her *at this time*. Student has been in a very restrictive setting for her entire academic experience. She has had no contact with regularly developing peers. She remains essentially non-verbal and transitions and change are difficult for her. Student will be moving from a very structured, restrictive, supportive setting to a new facility with new personnel. No matter what school she attends, and what classroom she is educated in, there will be significant stressors placed on Student. If she were to enter a mainstream xx, the pressure to help her deal with her new setting and experiences would be on her one-to-one aide who, no matter how well trained, would likely not be as prepared as the FLS teacher to deal with Student's needs during the transition period. And, if her aide needed to deal with emotional, social and possibly behavioral needs that may emerge during the transition period, Student's academic needs would most likely be shortchanged.

If, as is quite possible, Student's academic potential is higher than previously assumed, shifting focus from a structured, supportive program where, by all accounts, Student was successful, would likely stall her academic progress. It cannot be assumed that the academic support and programming that Student would receive in a mainstream classroom, even with a one-to-one aide, would be equivalent to what she would receive in a FLS classroom with a specially trained teacher.

At the November 5, 2004 [sic] PET meeting, it was made very clear by REACH Director Colleen Foley Ingersoll, and to some extent by Dr. Kaufman, that Student needs to have three hours per day of individual instruction in discrete trial training. This individualized instruction would necessarily separate her from the mainstream xx. In addition to the 15 hours per week of direct instructional time, Student would be removed from the classroom for 3 hours per week of direct speech services, 1 hour per week of OT, 1.5 hours per week of PT, for a total of 20.5 hours per week, although if Student's PT and/or OT were integrated with the xx physical education activities, that would increase the time

somewhat. Given a 30-hour school week, that would leave approximately 9.5 hours for activities and classes with the mainstream xx.

Conversely, if Student were placed in the FLS class, she would receive her direct instruction in that room and her therapies either in that room or, in the case of PT and/or OT, possibly while participating in the mainstream physical education class. There is no reason that Student could not have lunch, recess, circle time and specials with the mainstream xx, as long as she had one-to-one support at those times. Likewise, according to Ms. Kotros, Student could also join the xx class at other times, such as when the FLS class is in the community. That would leave her with essentially the same program, except for the fact that her three-hour per day academic program would be delivered by a certified special education teacher rather than an educational technician.

Student's parents have expressed concern that the Portland School Department is taking the position that Student would have to "prove" herself in order to participate in mainstream activities. However, this concern may be grounded in semantics, rather than reality. If Student's IEP included specific mainstream classes and activities, those classes and activities would need to be accessible to Student. They would be a specific part of her schedule. If, however, after a period of participation in these activities, Student appeared to react negatively to an activity, it would behoove the PET to meet and ponder the reasons for Student's negative responses. Perhaps the PET would conclude that additional modifications would better support Student's participation. However, there may be, in fact, classes or activities that are beyond Student's capabilities, even with additional supports, and it would be counterproductive to include those activities or classes in Student's schedule. Rather, the PET would need to identify classes or activities that would be more appropriate to Student's level of functioning. Individualizing Student's schedule does not mean requiring Student to prove herself in order to access mainstream classes and activities.

It is therefore held that the IEP developed on November 5, 2004 [sic] can be successfully delivered in the Riverton School FLS classroom. It is further held, however, that in order to meet the LRE requirements of the IDEA, the PET must convene and develop a new IEP that includes specifically defined periods for mainstream activities and classes.

The family also alleges that the Portland School Department violated Student's stay put Rights [sic] subsequent to the family's request for a due process hearing. This issue comes about because the one-to-one aide that had been working with Student when she was placed in the three-to-one classroom at REACH was removed when Student was returned to the one-to-one classroom. The support of the aide was necessary when Student was in the higher ratio setting, and was no longer necessary when she was again receiving individual instruction. Minutes of the September 29, 2003 PET state that "[Student] will access 3:1 program at Reach with support from Portland Public School staff." However, no new IEP was prepared at that time. The provision of the aide never became a part of Student's IEP and consequently terminating the aide's services does not rise to a violation of Student's stay put rights.

VI. Order

1. The PET shall reconvene in order to amend Student's IEP so as to indicate specific times for Student to participate with the Riverton mainstream xx classes and activities. Such mainstream participation shall be to the maximum extent possible, given the constraints of Student's need for 15 hours per week of direct instructional time and the time required for her various therapies. The PET meeting shall be held on or before March 5, 2004.

Dated: February 17, 2004

Lynne A. Williams, J.D., Ph.D.
Hearing Officer

PARENTS' DOCUMENT LIST

- P1 Prescription by Dr. Poh-Yong Chang , 1/05/04
- P2 E-mail from father to Mark Hammond and response to father from Mark Hammond, 11/30/03
- P3-5 Letter to James Schwellenbach, Esq. from Janet Charney, Esq., and fax confirmation, 11/17/03
- P6-7 Letter from James Schwellenbach, Esq. to Janet Charney, Esq., 11/14/03
- P8-13 Letter to Dr. Barbara Dee from Janet Charney, Esq., and fax confirmation, 10/20/03
- P14-15 Letter to mother and father from Dr. Barbara Dee, with envelope, 10/17/03
- P16-19 Letter to Dr. Barbara Dee from Janet Charney, Esq., and fax confirmation, 10/16/03
- P20-23 Letter to Dr. Barbara Dee from Janet Charney, Esq., and fax confirmation, 10/09/03
- P24-25 E-mail from father to Dr. Barbara Dee (10/7/03) with response from Dr. Barbara Dee to father (10/8/03)
- P26 E-mail from mother to Dr. Barbara Dee with response to mother from Dr. Barbara Dee, 6/19/03
- P27-32 REACH School clinical notes for child, 9/28/03 – 9/29/03
- P33 Prescription for child from Maine Pediatric Specialty Group, for an evaluation and up to 3 sessions of augmentative communication/speech therapy, 9/30/03
- P34-40 PET Meeting Minutes, 6/10/03
- P41-43 Report from Dr. Karen McPhee, The Center for Therapeutic Recreation, Inc., 4/28/03
- P44-50 PET Meeting Minutes (Amended), with attached cover letter from Janet Charney, Esq. to Lynne A. Williams, Esq., 6/2/03

PARENTS' WITNESS LIST

Father

Mother

Dr. Ellen Popenoe, Clinical Neuropsychologist, Maine Medical Center

Karen McPhee, Ph.D., Director, Maine Center for Therapeutic Recreation

Colleen Foley Ingersoll, Director, the REACH Preschool

SCHOOL'S INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

S1-5	PET Meeting Minutes, 11/5/03
S6-17	IEP, 11/05/03
S18-25	PET Meeting Minutes, 10/27/03
S26	Correspondence to Barbara Dee from Janet Charney, 10/22/03
S27-31	Psychological Evaluation by Ellen Popenoe, 10/07/03
S32-36	PET Meeting Minutes, 09/29/03
S37-43	PET Meeting Minutes, 06/02/03
S44-45	Occupational & Physical Therapy Report by Jane Walker, 05/28/03
S46-52	Developmental Re-evaluation by June Gagnon, 02/07/03
S53-54	Occupational & Physical Therapy Report, 12/01/02
S55	ECT Meeting Minutes, 11/27/02
S56-60	ECT Meeting Minutes, 11/05/02
S61-64	IFSP, 11/05/02
S65-66	Correspondence to Rachel Berwick from Nicole Boivin, 11/05/02

SCHOOL'S WITNESS LIST

Dr. Barbara Dee, Director of Special Services, Portland School Department

Dr. Chris Kaufman, Psychologist, Portland School Department

Mary Ann Kotros, Learning Specialist, Portland School Department

Jill Blackwood, Principal, Riverton Elementary School

Jeff Porter, Principal, Lyseth Elementary School