

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

Student v. Board of Education

Appearing on behalf of the Parent: Attorney Andrew A. Feinstein  
Law Offices of David C. Shaw, LLC  
34 Jerome Avenue, Suite 210  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

Appearing on behalf of the Board: Attorney Julie C. Fay  
Shipman & Goodwin LLP  
One Constitution Plaza  
Hartford, CT 06103-1919

Appearing before: Attorney Mary H.B. Gelfman  
Hearing Officer

**FINAL DECISION AND ORDER**

**ISSUES:**

1. Is the Individualized Education Program (IEP) proposed on October 10, 2006, appropriate to Student's special education needs in the least restrictive environment?
2. Is Student entitled to compensatory educational services for the following periods:  
2003-2004 school year, after June 24, 2004?  
2004-2005 school year, including extended school year?  
2005-2006 school year, including extended school year?  
2006-2007 school year, including extended school year?
3. Are the mentoring services provided by the Board for 2006-2007 appropriate to Student's needs?
4. Is the Board responsible for funding Student's art class at Asnuntuck?

At the time this case was settled, there was also a proposed addition to the list of issues concerning Student's graduation.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:**

This hearing was requested on November 22, 2006, and the hearing officer was appointed on November 27, 2006. The Board challenged the sufficiency of the request for hearing, and Parents submitted a revised request on December 8, 2006. A pre-hearing conference was held on December 14, 2006. Since the parties had requested mediation, the date for convening the hearing was set for January 22, 2007. The deadline for mailing the final decision and order was set for February 22, 2007. Parents requested either an additional issue concerning graduation or an other hearing to address that issue. On January 18, 2007, the hearing officer agreed to consolidate this request with the hearing. When the hearing convened, the parties requested time to continue settlement negotiations. A second session was scheduled, and when the hearing re-convened on February 5, 2007, the parties reported that they had reached a settlement.

All motions and objections not previously ruled upon, if any, are hereby overruled.

**FINAL DECISION AND ORDER:**

Because the parties have reached an agreement, no issues remain in dispute. This case is DISMISSED without prejudice.