

**ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
IMPARTIAL DUE PROCESS HEARING**

---

[Petitioner],	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	<u>Case No. 25-77</u>
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
AUTAUGA COUNTY BOE,	)	<u>Hon. Jeffrey J. Courtney</u>
	)	Hearing Officer
Respondent.	)	

---

**To:**  
James R. Gallini, Esq.  
Gina S. Lowe, Esq.  
The Gallini Group, LLC  
One Perimeter Park South; Suite 100N  
Birmingham, AL 35243  
[jgallini@thegallinigroup.com](mailto:jgallini@thegallinigroup.com)  
[ginalowe@thegallinigroup.com](mailto:ginalowe@thegallinigroup.com)

Erika P. Tatum, Esq.  
Hill, Hill, Franco, Carter, Cole & Black, P.C.  
425 South Perry Street  
Montgomery, AL 36104  
[etatum@hillhillcarter.com](mailto:etatum@hillhillcarter.com)  
[kcoleman@hillhillcarter.com](mailto:kcoleman@hillhillcarter.com)

**VIA EMAIL ONLY**

**ORDER AMENDING CLERICAL ERRORS**

Upon review of the January 26, 2026 Final Decision in this cause the following items that are contained in the Final Decision are specified and amended by way of this Order:

1. On page 2 in the top paragraph of that page and in reference to the “July 14, 2026” Prehearing Order, that date is amended to “July 14, 2025”.

2. On page 3 in the second paragraph and in reference to the “September 16 and 17, 2026” dates to which the hearing was continued pursuant to the Petitioner’s Motion to Continue, those dates are amended to September 16 and 17, 2025.

3. All other terms and conditions of the January 26, 2026 Final Decision in this cause, that are not specifically referenced herein shall remain in full force and effect.

DONE THIS 3<sup>rd</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026.

/s/ Hon. Jeffrey J. Courtney  
Hearing Officer  
P.O. Box 100  
Wetumpka, AL 36092  
334-567-2545  
334-567-2547 fax  
[jeffcourtney@jcourtneylawfirm.com](mailto:jeffcourtney@jcourtneylawfirm.com)

c: ALSDE Due Process

**ALABAMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
IMPARTIAL DUE PROCESS HEARING**

---

[Petitioner],	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	<u>Case No. 25-77</u>
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
AUTAUGA COUNTY BOE,	)	<u>Hon. Jeffrey J. Courtney</u>
	)	Hearing Officer
Respondent.	)	

---

**To:**  
James R. Gallini, Esq.  
Gina S. Lowe, Esq.  
The Gallini Group, LLC  
One Perimeter Park South; Suite 100N  
Birmingham, AL 35243  
[jgallini@thegallinigroup.com](mailto:jgallini@thegallinigroup.com)  
[ginalowe@thegallinigroup.com](mailto:ginalowe@thegallinigroup.com)

Erika P. Tatum, Esq.  
Hill, Hill, Franco, Carter, Cole & Black, P.C.  
425 South Perry Street  
Montgomery, AL 36104  
[etatum@hillhillcarter.com](mailto:etatum@hillhillcarter.com)  
[kcoleman@hillhillcarter.com](mailto:kcoleman@hillhillcarter.com)  
**VIA EMAIL AND USPS**

## **FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION**

### **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

This matter comes before the undersigned Hearing Officer on Petitioners' Complaint for Due Process (hereinafter, at times, the "initial Complaint"), filed on or about May 2, 2025. The undersigned Hearing Officer (hereinafter, at times, "HO"), Jeffrey J. Courtney, was appointed to serve as such on May 2, 2025 by the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE). The response to the initial Complaint was filed by the Respondent on or about May 12, 2025. A resolution meeting pursuant to the initial Complaint was initially scheduled to occur on May 16, 2025, but the parent was unable to attend. The resolution meeting was rescheduled and held on May 21, 2026. The Parties were unable to reach an agreement on any issues in this cause at the resolution meeting. A Prehearing Order was issued on or about July 14, 2026, followed by an Amended Prehearing Order that was issued on or about August 28, 2025. Prehearing Conferences were held on August 12, 2025 and September 12, 2025. Personally identifiable information for the Petitioner is attached hereto as appendix A.

The Parties initially advised that the Due Process Hearing in this cause could be concluded in two days. As such, a Due Process hearing in this matter was scheduled for only two days, specifically, August 19 (Day 1) and 20, 2025. The subject hearing commenced on August 19, 2025. The Petitioner was represented by attorney, Gina S. Lowe, Esq., and the Respondent was represented by its attorney, Erika P. Tatum, Esq. The hearing was an open hearing.

Prior to the commencement of testimony and receipt of evidence for this hearing, the undersigned HO addressed the matter of the Respondent's August 12, 2025 Motion in Limine

during a pre-hearing phone conference on August 18, 2025. The date of the pre-hearing conference was agreeable to counsel for both parties. The said motion sought to exclude any testimony to any evidence regarding the implementation of educational services to the Petitioner from other school districts in which the Petitioner attended school, prior to the 2024/ 2025 school year. Additionally, the Respondent objected to any evidence that did not pertain to the complaint and the claims of the complaint. The Petitioner had no objection to the Respondent's subject motion. Accordingly, the Motion in Limine was granted.

Following the conclusion of testimony and on the evening of Day 1, counsel for the Petitioner requested a continuance contending that during the hearing on Day 1, she received documents that were relevant and material to this cause and that she needed additional time to review the documents before the hearing resumed, because she had not previously had an opportunity to do so. Her motion to continue was granted and the hearing was continued to September 16 and 17, 2026 to allow the Petitioner enough time to review the subject documents.

The Petitioner entered into evidence (in order) exhibits 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 20, 18, 19, 21, 9, 10, 11, 16, 15, C, H, J, L, M, N, P, Q, R, T, S, W, 24, 30, 27, A, 28, FF, GG, II, JJ, NN, Q, D, E and RR and the Respondent entered into evidence (in order) exhibits 1, 4, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. A more detailed list of admitted exhibits is attached as Appendix B to this decision. The following individuals testified in this cause for the Petitioner: (1) [Special Education Teacher 1, SET1]; A Special Education (SPED) teacher for five years and served as the Petitioner's Case Manager; (2) [Access Learning Coordinator, ALC]; Coordinator for Access Learning providing services to the school district in which the Petitioner was enrolled [District 1]; (3) [Psychometrist, PSYC] (on

August 19, 2025) A psychometrist at the school the Petitioner was attending and who was a part of the referral and eligibility process for the Petitioner; (4) [Special Education Coordinator, SEC]; Coordinator of the Special Education Department for [District 1]; (5) [General Education Teacher 1, GET1]; A current employee of the [State Agency], who served as the Petitioner's teacher at [School 1]; (6) [PSYC] (again on September 16, 2025); (7) [Access Learning Facilitator, ALF]; Access Learning Facilitator for the Petitioner; (8) [General Education Teacher 2, GET2]; A Social Science teacher at [City], Alabama High School (in the same school district as [School 1]; who served as a permanent substitute teacher for the last six weeks of the 2024-25 school year. (9) [School Counselor, SC]; Petitioner's School Counselor for the 2024-2025 school year; (10) [Transition Specialist, TS]; Transition Specialist for [District 1]; (11) [Director of Student Services, DSS]; Director of Student Services; oversaw special education department, 504, attendance mental health coordinators, counseling program mental health coordinators and discipline for the [District 1]; (12) [Petitioner]; Petitioner; (13) [Parent]; Mother of the Petitioner and former employee at [School 1]. Testifying for the Respondent: (1) [Attendance Specialist, AS]; Attendance Specialist for [District 1]; (2) [Assistant Principal, AP]; Assistant Principal at [School 2] in [County 1], Alabama; Lead Special Education Teacher at [School 1] when the Petitioner was a student at [School 1]; (3) [Principal, P1]; Principal at the [District 1] Technology Center where the Petitioner attended in the 2024-2025 school year; (4) [Coordinator of Assessment, CA]; Coordinator of Assessment of Federal Programs for [District 1]; (5) [SC]; see #9 in Petitioner's list of witnesses; (6) [Coordinator of Technology, CT]; Coordinator of Technology for [District 1]; (7) [Director of Curriculum Instruction, DC1]; Director of Curriculum Instruction for 7<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grade for [District 1]; (8) [SEC]; see #4 in Petitioner's list of witnesses (9) [Parent]; see #13 in Petitioner's list of witnesses; (10) [Principal, P2]; [School 1] Principal.

## **JURISDICTION**

The due process hearing was held, and a decision in this matter is being rendered, pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (hereinafter, "IDEA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et. Seq.*, and the Alabama Administrative Code, Chapter 290-8-9.

## **BURDEN OF PROOF**

The burden of proof in this matter is upon the Petitioner as the party seeking relief, *Schaffer v. Weast*, 546 U.S. 49 (2005) and § 290-8-9.08(9)(c).

## **GENERAL BACKGROUND**

At the time of the filing of the Complaint for due process in this cause, the Petitioner was a [age], [grade] student, attending [School 1] within the [District 1] (Alabama) Board of Education system. Although [petitioner] was a resident of another county ([County 2]), he was able to commence his attendance for the 2024-2025 school year at the [School 1] because [petitioner's] mother was an employee working there as [staff positions]. Such was in accordance with applicable rules and regulations.

The Petitioner enrolled in the Respondent School District in August of 2024. In November of 2024, the Parent requested an IDEA referral due to the Petitioner's poor grades. The Respondent subsequently conducted evaluations and an eligibility meeting involving the Respondent and the parent that occurred on December 16, 2024. It was determined that the Petitioner qualified for special education in the area of Autism. An Individualized Education Program (IEP) was developed for the Petitioner on or about January 16, 2025 (at times, "the subject IEP).

## **ISSUES**

The Petitioner contends that [petitioner] was denied FAPE because the Respondent failed to develop an IEP that was reasonably calculated to enable progress. Additionally, the Petitioner contends that [petitioner] was denied FAPE because the Respondent failed to provide the services written into the IEP and ignored the impact of virtual instruction on a student with autism and executive functioning deficits. Finally, the Petitioner asserts that the Respondent denied FAPE to [petitioner] by failing to address behavior, transition and attendance needs, failing to monitor progress or reconvene the IEP Team despite ongoing failure and by depriving the parent of meaningful participation. The Respondent contends that it expeditiously evaluated the Petitioner for Special Education Services and provided FAPE via the IEP, and implemented sufficient educational services.

## **STATEMENTS OF FACT**

Pursuant to the parties August 11, 2025 Stipulated Facts of the Parties which the parties were ordered to submit prior to the commencement of the Due Process Hearing in this cause, the parties agreed to the Petitioner's age, as well as the name of the school that the Petitioner attended during the 2024-2025 school year ([School 1]) and the operating Board of Education for the said school. Further, the parties agreed to the dates of the Petitioner's special education referral meeting, special education eligibility meeting and that the Petitioner was determined eligible for special education. Finally, the Parties agreed to the date that the IEP meeting was held to develop the Petitioner's IEP. The remaining statements / findings of fact are set forth below within the context of the discussion of issues.

## **DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

**A. Whether the Respondent denied a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) to the Petitioner by failing to develop an IEP that was reasonable calculated to enable progress:**

The Petitioner's IEP was submitted within Respondent's Exhibit 1, at pages 48-56.

Categorically, it is clear from a review of the Petitioner's IEP that it meets all ALSDE content requirements set forth in 290-8-9.06 (a) through (o) of the Alabama Administrative Code / Rules of the Alabama State Board of Education, Special Education Services. However, the Petitioner contends that the IEP is made up solely of information derived from an Iowa Assessment that was administered at the Petitioner's prior school, [School 3], and that it did not include the most recent data available to the Respondent, specifically its own evaluations. Of note, it is undisputed that multiple evaluations and assessments of the Petitioner were conducted by the Respondent and there is no allegation that the Respondent did not perform assessments expeditiously, and/or within the requisite time period. There is no dispute that these assessments were utilized by the Respondent in producing the Notice and Eligibility Decision Regarding Special Education Services for the Petitioner.

The time frame between the request for a referral by the Petitioner's mother (the "Parent") and the date of the Petitioner's subject initial IEP, was developed is brief, especially considering holiday time allowances. The Parent requested the referral on or about November 5, 2024. A referral meeting was held on November 13, 2024. The Respondent completed assessments by December 16, 2024 and was able to develop an IEP by January 16, 2025. [SET1], the Petitioner's initial Case Manager, testified that she had researched the Iowa Assessments, determined that they (the assessments) would be appropriate, and that those assessments were the last "complete" test scores. [S E T 1] testified that the Respondent sought to

utilize information that was no more than a year old. Further, she testified that, in her opinion, those test scores would provide a better benchmark than whatever the Respondent may provide because of the amount of information provided to the Respondent from the Petitioner's previous school. Given that the Petitioner had only been in the school district of the Respondent since August of 2024 and that the referral meeting had occurred in November, 2024, it is not unreasonable to utilize the Iowa Assessment that had been administered in April of 2024, near the end of the 2023-2024 school year when developing the Petitioner's IEP. Further, the Respondent asserts that the goals developed in the Petitioner's IEP were based on current assessments and data, and that she did not have to repeat the data / information from the Notice and Eligibility Decision Regarding Special Education Services on the IEP to be utilized in developing the IEP, in accordance with ALSDE guidance on page 78 of its publication, "Mastering the Maze." Accordingly, it is clear that the Iowa Assessments were not the sole and exclusive source of information utilized to develop the Petitioner's IEP, that multiple recent assessments were also utilized in the IEP process and that the Respondent did include its own data in the IEP development process. A review of the subject IEP shows that it is inclusive of the actual content requirements required by 290-8-9.06 (a) through (o) of the Alabama Administrative Code.

"Any review of an IEP must appreciate that the question is whether the IEP is reasonable, not whether the court regards it as ideal," *Andrew F. ex rel. Joseph F. v. Douglas Cnty. Sch. Dist. Re-1*, 137 S. Ct. 988 at 1000 (2017). Accordingly, the IEP was reasonably

calculated to enable progress and the Petitioner was not denied FAPE on the basis of a deficient IEP.

**B. Whether the Respondent denied FAPE to the Petitioner by failing to provide services written into the IEP:**

It was not disputed that the IEP Education Program Services portion of the subject IEP required 45 minutes of Special Education Services and 30 minutes monthly of Special Education Services as shown on page 55 of the Petitioner's IEP. The Petitioner's Case Manager, [SET1], testified that she did implement the IEP by monitoring academic progress as she was available in excess of IEP requirements, at least two hours per week and for additional time twice per month when she gave students the opportunity to learn self-advocacy skills. Additionally, [SET1] testified that the Petitioner received the requisite daily supplemental services that were written into the IEP. Further, [GET2], a qualified special education teacher also testified that she implemented the subject IEP and provided services in excess of the IEP requirements.

The Petitioner's attendance record is of significance to all issues in this matter. At the time of the January 16, 2025 IEP meeting the Petitioner had already missed 15 days. Additionally, the evidence in this matter revealed that the Petitioner often did not attend school, "because [petitioner] did not feel like it" and that there were other occasions when the Petitioner was absent because [petitioner's] mother could not get [petitioner] to go to school and [petitioner] stayed home. Of note, the Petitioner worked a full-time job at [Restaurant] where [petitioner] had been working since the [grade, -2]. Although [petitioner] apparently does a fine job there working 35 to 40 hours per week, it appears that the Petitioner was allowed to place a priority on employment over school. The Petitioner testified that [petitioner] did not miss work, even if [petitioner] was sick. [Petitioner's] work days were not

set and [petitioner] would at times work 5-school days per week, sometimes 4 per week and sometimes 3 per week. The testimony in this cause revealed that multiple school teachers / officers addressed their concerns about the Petitioner's attendance to the Petitioner and [petitioner's] mother.

**C. Whether the Respondent denied FAPE to the Petitioner by ignoring the impact of virtual instruction on a student with autism and executive functioning deficits;**

ACCESS Virtual Learning was utilized by all students at [School 1] for selected classes, including the Petitioner, due to a teacher shortage at the school. The Petitioner contends that virtual instruction was detrimental to [petitioner] because of [petitioner's] individual circumstances and conditions. However, it is important to note that the Petitioner completed two online courses in one week in June of 2025, making a "B" in Algebra 2 (part one) and an "A" in Algebra 2 (part two). Further, and testimony revealed that the Petitioner was attending a virtual high school outside of the Respondent's school district at the time of the Due Process hearing in this matter.

Testimony from various witnesses showed that the Respondent made attempts to increase the Petitioner's participation in online classes, including direct contact with the school Principal, [P2]. The Petitioner's mother testified that the Petitioner and she had no contact with the Petitioner's ACCESS teachers. In rebuttal, Respondent Special Education Coordinator [SEC] testified that he investigated the claim by obtaining the Assignment Course Log for the Petitioner and that the said log showed that there was consistent contact with the Petitioner and that he reviewed many constructive comments from the Petitioner's teachers.

Given the teacher shortage situation at [School 1], it is apparent that the Respondent had constraints that required the use of virtual learning. Appropriate methodology is for the educators of the Respondent school district, and not a right of parents, *McLaughlin v. Holt Pub. Sch. Bd. Of Educ.*, 320 F. 3d 663, 673 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003). Based on the foregoing, the Petitioner was not denied FAPE by the Respondent's use of virtual learning through the ACCESS virtual learning program.

**D. Whether the Respondent denied FAPE to the Petitioner by failing to address behavior, transition and attendance needs;**

The evidence at the hearing was clear that the Petitioner is a well-spoken and liked individual. The Petitioner had two disciplinary infractions during the 2024-2025 school year. It is undisputed by the parties that Functional Behavior Assessments and a Behavior Intervention Plans are not always required in every case. The Petitioner states that such should have been included in an FBA due to behaviors that interfered with the Petitioner's learning capabilities, while the Petitioner's IEP reflects that behavior was not an issue. Notwithstanding, according to the Petitioner's IEP, services did include various service details to address behavior such as, "(when not in virtual learning) proximity seating where instruction is being taught, near the front of the room and away from distractions and peers"; and "chunk assignments" to "break assignments into smaller and more manageable pieces." It is clear that the IEP addressed the Petitioner's needs and techniques that [petitioner's] teachers could utilize and that the Petitioner was not denied a FAPE on this basis.

The Transition goals set forth in the Petitioner's subject IEP provided that by May of 2025, the Petitioner would research and describe [petitioner's] Postsecondary Education / Training goals, [petitioner's]

Employment / Occupation / and Career Goals, and [petitioner's] Community / Independent Living Goals. Although an incorrect first name was used therein, the Respondent testified, in effect, that the applicable goal was a common goal for all students and that the incorrect name was of no real effect. In any event, Transition Specialist, [TS] testified that she attended the May, 2025 meeting to discuss the Petitioner's Transition goals. Further, she testified that although the Petitioner did not attend the May 2025 meeting wherein the Transition goals would be discussed, she was familiar with the Petitioner's Interest Inventory, [petitioner's] ONET interest profile, case, life skills information and other relevant information regarding the Petitioner. [TS ] recalled that during an April 2025 meeting that both she and the Petitioner attended, she recalled that the Petitioner's goal was to eventually be employed in the medical field. Additionally, she testified as to the Petitioner's knowledge of job skills, job interviews, resume development, online banking, job benefits, and government benefits. Ample testimony from the Petitioner established that [petitioner] attended field trips to various colleges for tours, and that [petitioner] desired to be a neurologist. The Petitioner took a technological class where [petitioner] learned about many subjects in the medical field. In fact, the Petitioner testified that [petitioner] could "go on for days" regarding the amount of information [petitioner] had learned. The Petitioner was not denied FAPE on the basis of concerns regarding Transition Service. Such was provided in accordance with the circumstances, needs, interests, and goals of the student. *Renee J. v. Houston Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 913 F.3d 523 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2019).

The Petitioner asserts that the Respondent failed to address [petitioner's] attendance needs. As described in subsection B above, none of these attendance factors are the fault of the Respondent such that the Petitioner was denied FAPE.

**E. Whether the Respondent denied FAPE to the Petitioner by failing to monitor progress or reconvene the IEP Team despite ongoing failure;**

[School 1] [P2] testified to this issue by stating that school

personnel “went above and often did more for the Petitioner,” than possibly for other students because [petitioner’s] mother was an employee (with an office very near that of [P2]) and because of his admiration of the Petitioner, stating that [petitioner] was very “respectful, humble, kind and nice.”

Prior to the filing of the Due Process Complaint and approximately 90 days after the subject IEP was developed, the Respondent scheduled a meeting in April of 2025 which included the Petitioner; the Petitioner’s mother; [P2]; the principal of the Technical School; the Director of Student Services; the Director of Curriculum and Instruction; the Transition Specialist; the School Counselor and the Coordinator of Secondary Special Education (collectively, the “team”) to address parent and Petitioner concerns, progress with ACCESS and additional supports. The notes from the meeting that were taken by Special Education Coordinator (Respondents Exhibit 1 page 168) are striking to this case. Specifically, the notes indicate the reading of teacher comments from various ACCESS teachers; emails from the ACCESS Success Coach highlighting the availability to assist when the Petitioner needs it; the availability of a Special Education Coach, Math Coach, and Reading Coach. The notes also recite various comments from the Petitioner. Specifically, that [petitioner] did not feel that [petitioner] needed any help or extensions to work classes one at a time / finishing one before [petitioner] starts the next course, despite the voiced concerns from the Respondent’s participants at the meeting. The team discussed the failing grade in Algebra 2 with the Petitioner, who stated that [petitioner], “may need a little more help.” [Petitioner] then said, “I

can text my success coach. I just got to send her an email.” Such illustrates ability and ease for communication. [ S E C ] additionally stressed to the Petitioner that [petitioner] had help available to [petitioner], but that [petitioner] would have to be willing to accept help. However, when asked about additional supports, the Petitioner stated, “Naw, I just need AI.”

**F. Whether the Respondent denied FAPE to the Petitioner by depriving the parent of meaningful participation.**

The parent was involved in the initial referral, the initial IEP meeting, received communications that were indicated on the Petitioner’s ACCESS review log, including missing online assignments, and participated in the said April 2025 meeting. Despite being an employee at the [School 1], the parent never requested any parent – teacher conferences with any special education teacher and never approached the school principal regarding any concerns about the Petitioner’s IEP. Accordingly, there is no basis to conclude that the Petitioner was denied FAPE based on any deprivation of meaningful parent participation.

**CONCLUSIONS**

For the reasons set forth in the Discussion of Issues above, the Respondent did not deny a FAPE to the Petitioner for the 2024-2025 school year.

**ORDER**

It is ordered, adjudged and decreed that any and all requests of the Petitioner are denied and that this matter is dismissed.

DONE AND ORDERED THIS 26<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY, 2026.

/s/ Hon. Jeffrey J. Courtney  
Hearing Officer  
P.O. Box 100  
Wetumpka, AL 36092  
334-567-2545  
334-567-2547 fax  
[jeffcourtney@jcourtneylawfirm.com](mailto:jeffcourtney@jcourtneylawfirm.com)

c: ALSDE Due Process

## **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Any party aggrieved by the hearing officer's decision may bring a civil action in any State court of competent jurisdiction or in a District Court of the United States without regard to the amount in controversy. 20 U.S.C. § 1415. The party bringing the civil action must file a notice of intent to file a civil action within 30 days after receipt of the hearing decision. See Ala. Admin. Code 290-8-9-.08(9)(c)16. The civil action itself must be filed within 30 days of the filing of the notice of intent. *Id.* APPENDIX A – PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION

**\*\*\*\*ONLY SET FORTH ON MAILED COPIES, NOT SET FORTH ON EMAIL SUBMISSION\*\*\*\***

## **APPENDIX B – EXHIBITS**

	<u>Transcript Page</u>
Petitioner’s Exhibit 1 (Referral for Evaluation 11/05/24)	Day 1 (D1) - 24
Petitioner’s Exhibit 2 (Notice and Eligibility Decision Regarding Special Education Services - 12-15-24)	D1-44
Petitioner’s Exhibit 4 (Letter from [Medical Office] 11-13-2020)	D1-58
Petitioner’s Exhibit 5 (Letter from [Psychologist Office] 03/16/16)	D1-58
Petitioner’s Exhibit 8 ([Private School] Educational Records)	D1 -58
Petitioner’s Exhibit 9 (Interest Inventory; Student Profile Information)	D1-110
Petitioner’s Exhibit 10 (O*NET Short Form and Score Report)	D1-110
Petitioner’s Exhibit 11 (Casey Life Skills Assessment)	D1-111
Petitioner’s Exhibit 15 (Progress Reports (IEP Goals))	D1-128
Petitioner’s Exhibit 16 (Pre ACT Score)	D1-123
Petitioner’s Exhibit 18 (Resource Classroom Assignment / Support and Communication Logs)	D1-97, 131 242
Petitioner’s Exhibit 19 (PowerSchool Schedule and Scores)	D1-101
Petitioner’s Exhibit 20 (ACCESS Scores)	D1-90

## **EXHIBITS, (CON'T)**

Petitioner's Exhibit 21 (PowerSchool Quick Lookup 4-22-25)	D1-103
Petitioner's Exhibit 24 (Meeting Notes 4-24-25)	D1-245, 252
Petitioner's Exhibit 27 (Vocational Rehabilitation Referral Form)	D1-268
Petitioner's Exhibit 28 (Teacher Surveys)	Day 2 (D2)-12
Petitioner's Exhibit 30 (Board Response to Petitioner's Due Process Complaint)	D1-260
Petitioner's Exhibit A (IEP 2025-2026)	D1-268
Petitioner's Exhibit C (Policy Manual for Teachers – ACCESS Virtual Learning)	D1-168
Petitioner's Exhibit D (Policy Manual for Facilitators – ACCESS Virtual Learning)	D2-153
Petitioner's Exhibit E (Policy Manual for Students – ACCESS Virtual Learning)	D2-232
Petitioner's Exhibit H (Special Populations Information – ACCESS Virtual Learning)	D1-192
Petitioner's Exhibit J (Frequently Asked Questions – ACCESS Virtual Learning)	D1-194
Petitioner's Exhibit L (Email between ACCESS Coordinator and Autauga County BOE, Special Education Coordinator 4-23-25)	D1-196
Petitioner's Exhibit M (Email between ACCESS Coordinator and ACCESS Success Coaches 4-22-25)	D1-196

## **EXHIBITS, (CON'T)**

Petitioner's Exhibit N (Email between [State Agency] and ACCESS Coordinator 7-9-25)	D1-200
Petitioner's Exhibit P (Emails between ACCESS English Success Coach and Student)	D1-203
Petitioner's Exhibit Q (Emails between ACCESS Special Education Success Coach and Student)	D1-203 D2-145
Petitioner's Exhibit R (Communication Log: ACCESS English Success Coach and Student)	D1-203
Petitioner's Exhibit S (ACCESS Usage Analytics)	D1-211
Petitioner's Exhibit T (ACCESS Schedule and Term Grades)	D1-210
Petitioner's Exhibit W (Email from school counselor to ACCESS teacher 4-7-25)	D1-213
Petitioner's Exhibit FF (Autism Spectrum Rating Scales 11-15-24)	D2-60
Petitioner's Exhibit GG (Autism Spectrum Rating Scales 11-21-24)	D2-62
Petitioner's Exhibit II (Conners 4 Parent Single Rater Report 11-15-24)	D2-62
Petitioner's Exhibit JJ (Conners 4 Teacher Single Rater Report 11-15-24)	D2-64
Petitioner's Exhibit NN (Notice and Eligibility Decision Regarding Special Education Services)	D2-66
Petitioner's Exhibit RR (Email Correspondence between [SC] and [ACCESS teacher 1])	D2-235

**Dispute Resolution 25-  
77 v Autauga County  
BOE Redacted E X H I B I  
T S, (CON'T)**

Respondent's Exhibit 1 (Educational Records of Petitioner)	D1-140
Respondent's Exhibit 2 (Petitioner's Complaint for Due Process)	D2-105
Respondent's Exhibit 4 (ACCESS Messages to/from Petitioner)	D1-217
Respondent's Exhibit 5 (ACTC Course Description and Information)	Day 3(D3)-215
Respondent's Exhibit 6 (Multiple ACT Documents)	Day 4(D4)-404
Respondent's Exhibit 7 (Email Correspondence [ACCESS teacher 2] to [SC])	D4-411
Respondent's Exhibit 8 (ACCESS Documents)	D4-453
Respondent's Exhibit 9 (ACT Qualified Exception to Deadline document)	D4-458
Respondent's Exhibit 10 (Multiple Emails from Erika Tatum to Gina Lowe)	D4-469
Respondent's Exhibit 11 (ACCESS Virtual Learning Documents)	D4-504