



October 11, 2013

XXX
XXX
XXX
XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski
Director of Special Education
Harford County Public Schools
102 South Hickory Avenue
Bel Air, Maryland 21014

RE: XXXXX
Reference: #14-011

Dear Parties:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (DSE/EIS), has completed the investigation of the complaint regarding special education services for the above-referenced student. This correspondence is the report of the final results of the investigation.

ALLEGATIONS:

On August 15, 2013, the MSDE received a complaint from Mr. XXXXXXXX and Mrs. XXXXXXXX, hereafter, “the complainants,” on behalf of their son. In that correspondence, the complainants alleged that the Harford County Public Schools (HCPS) violated certain provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and applicable State regulations with respect to the above-referenced student.

The MSDE investigated the allegations listed below:

1. The HCPS did not ensure that the student was provided with the supports required by the Individualized Education Program (IEP) and Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP) from August 27, 2012 to September 28, 2012, in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.101 and .323;
2. The HCPS did not ensure that proper procedures were followed when behavior interventions were used with the student from August 27, 2012 to September 28, 2012, in accordance with COMAR 13A.08.04.02, .03, and .05;

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 2

3. The HCPS did not follow proper procedures when providing Home and Hospital Teaching (HHT) services during the 2012-2013 school year, in accordance with COMAR 13A.03.05.03 and .04 and COMAR 13A.05.01.10(C)(5)); and
4. The HCPS has not followed proper procedures when determining the student's educational placement since March 2013 in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.114-.116 and .321 and COMAR 13A.05.01.10(C)(1)).

INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES:

1. Ms. Koliwe Moyo, Education Program Specialist, MSDE, was assigned to investigate the complaint.
2. On August 15, 2013, the MSDE sent a copy of the complaint, via facsimile, to Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski, Director of Special Education, HCPS; and Ms. Eileen Watson, Coordinator of Compliance, HCPS.
3. On August 28, 2013, Ms. Moyo spoke with the student's mother by telephone and clarified the allegations to be investigated.
4. On August 29, 2013, the MSDE sent correspondence to the complainants that acknowledged receipt of the complaint and identified the allegations subject to this investigation. On the same date, the MSDE notified Ms. Spakowski of the allegations and requested that her office review the alleged violations.
5. On September 12, 2013, Ms. Moyo and Ms. Christine Hartman, Education Program Specialist, MSDE, conducted a site visit at the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and interviewed the staff listed below.
 - a. Ms. XXXXXXXXXXXXX, Principal;
 - b. Ms. XXXXXXXXXXX, Assistant Principal;
 - c. Ms. XXXXXXXXXXXXX, Coordinator of Nonpublic Placements; and
 - d. Ms. XXXXXXXXXXX, Special Education Teacher.

Ms. Watson attended the site visit as a representative of the HCPS and to provide information on the HCPS policies and procedures, as needed. On the same date, the HCPS staff provided Ms. Moyo with documentation from the student's educational record.

6. On September 26, 2013, the HCPS staff provided Ms. Moyo with additional documentation from the student's educational record.
7. The MSDE reviewed documentation, relevant to the findings and conclusions referenced in this Letter of Findings, which includes:

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 3

- a. Functional Behavior Assessment report, dated May 8, 2012;
- b. Behavior Intervention Plan, dated May 8, 2012;
- c. IEP and prior written notice, dated August 14, 2012;
- d. Electronic mail correspondence (email) from between school staff and the student's mother, dated August 28, 2012;
- e. Daily point sheet from August 28, 2012 to September 28, 2012;
- f. Counseling logs, dated August 28, 2012 to September
- g. Daily behavior journal from September 5, 2012 to September 27, 2012;
- h. Student's daily class schedule, undated;
- i. Emails between the student's mother and HCPS staff dated September 20, 25 -27, 2012;
- j. Prior written notice, dated September 28, 2012;
- k. Teacher progress report of the student's class performance, undated;
- l. Use of behavior intervention reports completed in September 2012;
- m. Emails between the student's mother and school staff, dated September 20, 2012;
- n. Student's daily school schedule, undated;
- o. Home and Hospital Program verification, dated October 4, 2012;
- p. Prior written notice, dated October 10, 2012;
- q. HHT teacher assignment, dated October 10, 2012;
- r. Email between school staff and the HCPS staff, dated October 10 and 11, 2012;
- s. Notice of placement on HHT, dated October 11, 2012;
- t. Email from the student's mother to HCPS staff, dated October 12, 2012;
- u. Emails between the HCPS staff and the student's mother, dated October 17 and 18, 2012
- v. Reports of progress toward achieving the annual goals, dated November 1, 2012;
- w. HHT teacher progress report, dated November 9, 2012;
- x. Prior written notice, dated November 26, 2012;
- y. HHT re-verification, dated November 29, 2012;
- z. IEP team amendment, dated December 21, 2012;
- aa. HHT re-verification, dated February 4, 2012
- bb. IEP team amendment, dated February 6, 2013;
- cc. HHT teacher progress report, dated January 18, 2013;
- dd. Prior written notice, dated February 22, 2013;
- ee. IEP and prior written notice, dated March 1, 2013;
- ff. Correspondence from XXXXXXXXXXXX to the HCPS staff, dated March 12, 2013;
- gg. Email from the XXXXXXXX staff to the HCPS staff, dated April 19, 2013;
- hh. HHT re-verification, dated April 24, 2013;
- ii. Correspondence from the HCPS to the complainants, dated May 6, 2013;
- jj. Correspondence from the HCPS to the complainants, dated May 10, 2013;
- kk. Emails from the student's mother to the HCPS staff, dated April 5, 2013 and May 13, 2013;
- ll. Correspondence from the XXXXXXXXXXXX to the complainants, dated May 20, 2013;
- mm. Email from the student's mother to the HCPS staff, dated May 22, 2013;
- nn. Home schooling notification form, dated May 22, 2013;
- oo. Correspondence from the complainant to HCPS staff, dated May 28, 2013;

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 4

- pp. Correspondence from the HCPS to the complainants, dated May 29, 2013; and
- qq. Correspondence and attachments from the complainant to the MSDE, received on August 15, 2013.

BACKGROUND:

The student is seven (7) years old and is identified as a student with an Emotional Disability under the IDEA. While the student has an IEP that requires the provision of special education instruction and related services, he is currently “home-schooled” (which is referred to as “home-instruction” in the COMAR) by the complainants. During the period of time addressed by this investigation, the complainants participated in the education decision-making process and were provided with written notice of the IEP team decisions and notice of the procedural safeguards.

From the start of the 2012-2013 school year until September 28, 2012, the student attended XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. On September 28, 2012, the student became unable to attend school due to an emotional crisis.

From October 4, 2012 until April 8, 2013, the HCPS provided the student with Home and Hospital Teaching (HHT) services. Because there was no re-verification of the student’s continuing need for those services, HHT services were discontinued on April 8, 2013, at the end of the period of time covered by the initial verification.

From April 8, 2013 until May 22, 2013, the complainants did not send the student to school and he received no educational services during this time period¹.

On May 22, 2013, the complainants withdrew the student from the school system and began providing him with home instruction, using an HCPS approved online teaching program (Docs. c, f, j, k, o, p, s, v - ee, mm - qq).

ALLEGATION #1: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM AND BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTION PLAN FROM AUGUST 2012 TO SEPTEMBER 2012

Findings of Facts:

1. The IEP in effect in August 2012 was developed on August 14, 2012. The IEP included annual goals for increasing appropriate behaviors in school, utilizing learned strategies to demonstrate socially appropriate reactions to challenging/frustrating situations, and self-monitoring personal behaviors in group situations. The team determined that the IEP could be implemented in both the general and separate special education classrooms with the provision of supplementary aids and services (Doc. c).

¹ There is documentation that the complainants were informed by the school system that the student was required to attend school, by law, and that truancy proceedings would be conducted if they did not return him to school (Doc. ii).

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 5

2. The IEP required the use of a structured schedule, redirection, verbal prompts, clear directions, and the ability to take breaks when needed. The IEP also required that the student be provided with reduced distractions, reinforcement of appropriate behavior, points and rewards for appropriate behavior, access to a visual schedule and social stories (Doc. c).
3. The IEP states that the student will be provided with special education instruction in both the general education and separate special education classrooms. The student's class schedule reflects that the student was provided with special education instruction in both the general education and separate special education classrooms (Doc. c).
4. The Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) in effect in August 2012 was developed on May 8, 2012. It required the provision of interventions to address the student's "non-compliance, disruption, and aggression." The BIP required that the student be provided time with the teacher each morning to discuss his schedule for the day. It also required, instruction on socially appropriate ways to express anger and frustration, encouragement, frequent positive reinforcement, incentives and praise for appropriate behaviors, and space in the classroom to calm himself and take breaks (Docs. a and b).
5. The daily point sheets, reports of the student's progress toward achieving the annual IEP goals and electronic correspondences between school staff and the student's mother document that the student is provided with the behavioral supports required by the IEP and the BIP (Docs d, e, g – i, and v.).

Discussion/Conclusions:

The public agency is required to ensure that students are provided with the special education and related services in the education placement required by the IEP. In order to ensure that services are provided as determined by the IEP team, the IEP must include a clearly written statement of the special education and related services to be provided, including the frequency, location, and duration of those services (34 CFR §§300.101, .320, and .323).

In this case, the complainants allege that the student was not provided with the behavioral supports required by the IEP and the BIP in both the general and separate special education classrooms, as required by the IEP, until two (2) weeks into the school year. Based on the Findings of Facts#1 - #5, the MSDE finds that the student was provided with the behavior supports in the placements required by the IEP and BIP from August 28, 2012 when the 2012-2013 school year began until September 27, 2012, when the student stopped attending school. Therefore, the MSDE does not find that a violation occurred with regard to this allegation.

ALLEGATION #2: **USE OF BEHAVIOR INTERVENTIONS FROM**
AUGUST 2012 TO SEPTEMBER 2012

Findings of Facts:

6. The IEP in effect from August 27, 2012 to September 28, 2012, provided for “crisis intervention” services to be used when the student “poses a threat that places himself or others in imminent danger,” including the use of exclusion, seclusion, and physical restraint (Doc. c).
7. There is documentation that the student received “time-outs” when he became agitated or displayed inappropriate behaviors frequently from August 27, 2012 to September 28, 2012. During the “time-outs” the student was removed from the classroom to an open area. There is no documentation that the student was provided with special education instruction or related services during the “time-outs.” However, the school staff did not document the use of these “time-outs” as incidents of exclusion (Docs. e, g, and review of the education record).
8. On September 11, 12, 20, 24, 25, and 27, 2012, the school staff documents that exclusion had been used with the student, but there is no documentation that the student was provided with an explanation of the behavior that resulted in the removals, informed of the behavior required in order to return to the classroom, or of the length of each incidence of exclusion. The student’s daily point sheets and behavior journal reflect that exclusion was used on other occasions in addition to the dates above; however, these incidents were not documented as incidents of exclusion (Docs. e, g, and review of the education record).
9. There is a separate room adjacent to the student’s classroom called the “quiet room,” which school staff report is used as a “seclusion room.” The MSDE staff conducted an on-site tour of this room and noted that the room had adequate lighting with an unobstructed view of the student, was free of objects and fixtures with which a student could self-inflict bodily harm, did not have a locking mechanism, and had adequate ventilation (Interview with XXXXXXXXXX school staff and on-site tour).
10. The documentation indicates that on September 20, 24, 25, 27, and 28, 2012, seclusion was used with the student following incidents where his actions caused physical harm to school staff or another student. Each use of seclusion was documented; however, the school staff did not document that the student was informed of the behaviors necessary in order to return to the classroom. In addition, on September 24, 2012, the school staff did not document the length of time of the seclusion incident (Doc. 1).
11. There is documentation that physical restraint was used with the student on September 20, 24, 25, and 27, 2012. The documentation indicates that restraint was used in response to emergency situations when it was necessary to intervene to protect the student and others from physical harm. The documentation also reflects the alternative

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 7

approaches that were considered and determined to be inappropriate and contains information about the school staff involved in each incident. However, the documentation does not describe the type of restraint used or the duration of each instance of physical restraint (Doc. l).

12. The student's behavior journal, which was maintained by the school staff, indicates that on September 7 and 11, 2012, physical restraint was used with the student. However, there is no other documentation of these incidents of physical restraint except as noted in the behavior journal (Doc. g and review of the education record).

Discussion/Conclusions:

Use of Exclusion

The term "exclusion" means the removal of a student to a supervised area for a limited period of time during which the student has an opportunity to regain self-control and is not receiving instruction, including special education, related services, or support (COMAR 13A.08.04.02). The school personnel must ensure that each period of exclusion is appropriate to the developmental level of the student and the severity of the behavior exhibited and, in no case, should the use of exclusion exceed thirty (30) minutes.

The school personnel must also monitor a student placed in exclusion and provide the student with an explanation of the behavior that resulted in the removal and instructions on the behavior required to return to the learning environment (COMAR 13A.08.04.04(B), 13A.08.04.04(C), and 13A.08.04.04(D)).

Use of Seclusion

Seclusion is defined as the confinement of a student, alone in a room, from which the student is physically prevented from leaving. The use of seclusion is prohibited in public agencies and nonpublic schools unless the student's IEP or BIP describes the specific behaviors and circumstances in which seclusion may be used (COMAR 13A.08.04.02).

The room used for seclusion must be free of objects and fixtures with which a student could self-inflict bodily harm. The room used for seclusion must provide school personnel with an adequate view of the student from an adjacent area and adequate lighting and ventilation (COMAR 13A.08.04.05).

While using seclusion with the student, the school personnel must keep the student in their view at all times. The school personnel must also provide a student placed in seclusion with an explanation of the behavior that resulted in the removal and instructions on the behavior required to return to the learning environment. A seclusion event must be appropriate to the student's developmental level and severity of the behavior, cannot restrict the student's ability to communicate distress, and cannot exceed thirty (30) minutes (COMAR 13A.08.04.05).

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 8

Each time a student is placed in seclusion, school personnel must document the other less intrusive interventions that have failed or been determined inappropriate, the precipitating event immediately preceding the behavior that prompted the use of seclusion, the behavior that prompted the use of seclusion, and the names and signatures of the staff members implementing and monitoring the seclusion. The documentation must also include a description of the seclusion event, including justification for initiating the use of seclusion. The length of time in seclusion, the student's behavior and reaction during the seclusion, the name and signature of the administrator informed of the use of seclusion. The documentation of the use of seclusion must be maintained in the student's educational record and available for inspection by the student's parent or legal guardian (COMAR 13A.08.04.05B).

Use of Physical Restraint

Physical restraint means the use of physical force, without the use of any device or material, that restricts the free movement of all or a portion of the student's body (COMAR 13A.08.04.02).

The use of physical restraint is prohibited in public agencies and nonpublic schools unless specified in the IEP or if there is an emergency situation and physical restraint is necessary to protect a student or another person from imminent, serious physical harm, after other less intrusive, nonphysical interventions have failed, or been determined inappropriate. Physical restraint must be discontinued as soon as the student is calm and its use may not exceed thirty (30) minutes (COMAR 13A.08.04.05A(1)).

Each time that physical restraint is used, school staff must document the incident. This documentation must include information about the type of restraint used and the length of time in restraint (COMAR 13A.08.04.05(3)). Each time that exclusion, seclusion, or physical restraint is used, the parents must be provided with either verbal or written notification of the incident within twenty-four (24) hours unless otherwise provided for in the IEP or behavior intervention plan (COMAR 13A.08.04.05).

In this case, the complainants allege that the school staff did not properly document the use of exclusion, seclusion, and physical restraint and as a result, they were not provided with proper notice of the use of the behavior interventions. Based on the Finding of Fact #6, the MSDE finds that the use of exclusion, seclusion, and physical restraint was permitted by the student's IEP. However, based on the Findings of Facts #7 - #12, the MSDE finds that the HCPS did not ensure that there was proper documentation of the use of these behavioral interventions when these incidents occurred. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to this allegation.

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 9

ALLEGATION #3: **THE PROVISION OF HOME AND HOSPITAL
TEACHING SERVICES**

Findings of Facts:

13. On October 4, 2012, the student's private psychologist provided verification that the student was unable to attend school due to an emotional condition. The re-verifications of the student's inability to attend school were provided on November 29, 2012 and February 4, 2013 (Docs. o, y, and aa).
14. There is documentation that the IEP team determined the services to be provided to the student at home and that the Home and Hospital Teaching (HHT) services were initiated within ten (10) days of the receipt of verification of the student's need for HHT services. However, there is no documentation that the IEP team developed a plan for returning the student to a school-based program. Subsequent to that IEP team meeting, the IEP team was convened on three (3) more occasions to discuss the student's program and progress; however there is no documentation that the IEP team developed a plan for transitioning the student back to a school-based program (Docs. p - s, w, dd, ee, and review of the education record).
15. On May 10, 2013, the school system staff informed the complainants, in writing, that the HHT services could no longer be provided because the student had already received services in excess of the sixty (60) consecutive school days for an emotional condition (Doc. jj).

Discussion/Conclusions:

Provision of Home and Hospital Teaching Services

Home and Hospital Teaching (HHT) services are to be provided only when a psychologist, physician, or psychiatrist provides verification that a student is unable to attend school due to a physical or emotional condition (COMAR 13A.03.05.04). Upon receipt of such a verification, the local school system must make instructional services available to students during convalescence or treatment time in a medical institution, or therapeutic treatment center, and at the student's place of residence, or all of these (COMAR 13A.03.05.01 - 04).

If a student with a disability is unable to participate in the student's school of enrollment and is provided with instruction at home because of a physical or an emotional condition, the IEP team must review and revise the student's IEP and determine the instructional services to be provided as long as the medical restrictions apply. The IEP team must also develop a plan for returning the student to a school-based program (COMAR 13A.05.01.10(C)(5)). When the period of treatment or convalescence ends, the IEP team must review and revise the IEP and determine the appropriate placement in the LRE (COMAR 13A.05.01.10(C)(5)).

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 10

An educational placement in the home for a student with an emotional condition may not exceed sixty (60) consecutive school days (COMAR 13A.05.01.10(C)(5)). Further, a student's home may not be used as an instructional setting for a student with a disability waiting for placement in a nonpublic special school or a change of placement (COMAR 13A.05.01.10(C)(5)).

In this case, the complainants allege that the school system did not ensure that a plan was implemented to transition the student back to a school-based program following the provision of HHT services. Based on the Findings of Facts #13 and #14, the MSDE finds that, after receiving verification that the student was unable to attend school due to an emotional condition in October 2012, the IEP team determined the instructional services to be provided to the student during the period of his absence and that the services began within the required timeframe.

However, based on the Finding of Fact #13 - #15, the MSDE finds that the IEP team did not develop a transition plan for returning the student to a school-based program and that the period of the provision of HHT services for an emotional condition exceeded sixty (60) consecutive school days. Therefore, the MSDE finds that violations occurred regarding this allegation.

ALLEGATION #4: **THE EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT SINCE**
MARCH 2013

Findings of Facts:

16. On March 1, 2013, the IEP team determined that the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) in which the IEP could be implemented upon the student's return to a school-based program was a nonpublic separate special education school (Doc. ee.).
17. Following the March 1, 2013 the IEP team meeting, the complainants visited several nonpublic separate special education schools as requested by the school system staff (Docs. ff, gg, ii - ll).
18. On April 19, 2013, the staff from one of the nonpublic schools notified the school system staff that the complainants expressed their concern that none of the nonpublic separate special education schools they visited could implement the IEP. However, there is no documentation that the school system staff reconvened the IEP team to consider the complainants' concerns (Doc. gg and review of the education record).

Discussion/Conclusions:

Placement Determination

The public agency must ensure that the educational placement is determined by the IEP team in conformity with the LRE requirement (34 CFR §300.116 and COMAR 13A.05.01.10). The documentation of a particular school or location of the educational program is typically an administrative decision that is made by the public agency and is not considered a decision regarding the educational placement, which is made by the IEP team. Unless the school location

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 11

chosen by the public agency would substantially alter the education program, the matter is not considered an educational placement decision (Letter to Fisher, 21 IDELR 992, United State Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, July 6, 1994 and A.K. v. Alexandria City School Board, 484 F.3d 672, April 26, 2007).

When reviewing and revising the IEP, the IEP team must include the student's parent and must consider any concerns the parent may raise. In addition to ensuring that the IEP team reviews the IEP at least annually, the public agency must also ensure that the team convenes to consider information provided by the parent and any information about the student's anticipated needs (34 CFR §300.324).

In this case, the complainants allege that the IEP team did not consider their concerns about the nonpublic school placements offered by the school system. Based on the Finding of Fact #16 - #18, the MSDE finds that the complainants expressed concern about whether the IEP could be implemented in the programs offered by the nonpublic schools, and that the concern was shared with the school staff. Further, based on the Finding of Fact #18, the MSDE finds that the HCPS did not ensure that the IEP team convened to consider those concerns. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred.

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS/TIMELINE:

Student-Specific

The MSDE requires the HCPS to provide documentation by January 15, 2014 that the IEP team has determined whether the violations identified in this investigation had a negative impact on the student's ability to benefit from his education program. If the IEP team determines that there was a negative impact, it must also determine the amount and nature of compensatory services or other remedy to be provided if the student is re-enrolled in a HCPS school-based program.

The HCPS must provide the complainants with proper written notice of the determinations made at the IEP team meeting, including a written explanation of the basis for the determinations, as required by 34 CFR §300.503. If the complainants disagree with the IEP team's determinations, they maintain the right to request mediation or to file a due process complaint, in accordance with the IDEA.

School-Based/Systemic

As the result of an investigation conducted in another State complaint for the student (#13-070), the MSDE identified a violation related to the documentation of the use of physical restraint by Prospect Mill Elementary School staff, and school-based corrective action was required. Because this office continues to identify violations related to the documentation of the use of behavior interventions, the HCPS is required to provide documentation by April 1, 2014 of the steps taken to determine whether the violations are unique to this case or whether they present a pattern of noncompliance at XXXXXXXXXX or any other schools within the school system.

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 12

Specifically, the school system is required to conduct a review of student records, data, or other relevant information to determine if the regulatory requirements are being implemented and must provide documentation of the results of this review to the MSDE. If the school system reports compliance with the requirements, the MSDE staff will verify compliance with the determinations found in the initial report.

If the school system determines that the regulatory requirements are not being implemented, the school system must identify the actions that will be taken to ensure that the violations do not recur. The school system must submit a follow-up report to document correction within ninety (90) days of the initial date that the school system determines non-compliance.

Upon receipt of this report, the MSDE will re-verify the data to ensure continued compliance with the regulatory requirements, consistent with the requirements of The United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. Additionally, the findings in the Letter of Findings will be shared with the MSDE's Policy and Accountability Branch for its consideration during present or future monitoring of the HCPS.

Documentation of all corrective action taken is to be submitted to this office to: Attention: Chief, Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services, MSDE.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

Technical assistance is available to the parties through Mrs. Martha J. Arthur, Education Program Specialist, MSDE. Mrs. Arthur may be contacted at (410) 767-0255.

Please be advised that both parties have the right to submit additional written documentation to this office, which must be received within fifteen (15) days of the date of this letter, if they disagree with the findings of fact or conclusions reached in this Letter of Findings. The additional written documentation must not have been provided or otherwise available to this office during the complaint investigation and must be related to the issues identified and addressed in the Letter of Findings.

If additional information is provided, it will be reviewed and the MSDE will determine if a reconsideration of the conclusions is necessary. Upon consideration of this additional documentation, this office may leave its findings and conclusions intact, set forth additional findings and conclusions, or enter new findings and conclusions. Pending the decision on a request for reconsideration, the school system must implement any corrective actions consistent with the timeline requirements as reported in this Letter of Findings.

Questions regarding the findings, conclusions and corrective actions contained in this letter should be addressed to this office in writing. The complainants and the school system maintain the right to request mediation or to file a due process complaint, if they disagree with the

XXX

XXX

Ms. Ann-Marie Spakowski

October 11, 2013

Page 13

identification, evaluation, placement, or provision of a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for the student, including issues subject to this State complaint investigation, consistent with the IDEA. The MSDE recommends that this Letter of Findings be included with any request for mediation or due process complaint.

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.

Assistant State Superintendent

Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

MEF/km

cc : Barbara P. Canavan

Eileen Watson

XXXXXXXXXX

Dori Wilson

Anita Mandis

Martha J. Arthur

Koliwe Moyo