

200 West Baltimore Street • Baltimore, MD 21201 • 410-767-0100 • 410-333-6442 TTY/TDD • msde.maryland.gov

March 10, 2017

XXX XXX XXX XXX

Ms. Rebecca Rider Director of Special Education Baltimore County Public Schools The Jefferson Bldg. 4th Floor 105 W. Chesapeake Avenue Towson, Maryland 21204

> RE: XXXXX Reference: #17-084

Dear Parties:

The Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services (MSDE), 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 January 9, 2017, the MSDE received a complaint from Ms. XXXXX and Mr. XXXXXX, hereafter, "the complainants," on behalf of their daughter, the above-referenced student. In that correspondence, the complainant alleged that the Baltimore County Public Schools (BCPS) violated certain provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) with respect to the above-referenced student.

The MSDE investigated the following allegations:

- 1. The BCPS has not developed an Individualized Education Program (IEP) that addresses the student's identified academic needs since January 2016,¹ in accordance with 34 CFR §300.324.
- 2. The BCPS has not ensured that the student has been provided with the accommodations, supports, and services required by the IEP since January 2016¹, in accordance with 34 CFR §§ 300.101 and .323.

¹ While the complainants alleged that the violation has occurred for a longer period of time, they were informed, in writing, that only those violations of the IDEA that are alleged to have occurred within one year of the filing of a State complaint could be addressed through the State complaint process (34 CFR §300.153).

INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES:

- 1. On January 9, 2017, the MSDE received the State complaint and documentation to be considered.
- 2. On January 18, 2017, the MSDE sent a copy of the complaint, via facsimile, to Ms. Rebecca Rider, Director of Special Education, BCPS.
- 3. On January 20, 2017, Mr. Gerald Lioacono, Complaint Investigator, MSDE, conducted a telephone interview with the student's mother to discuss the allegations.
- 4. On January 24, 2017, the MSDE sent correspondence to the complainants that acknowledged receipt of the complaint and identified the allegations subject to this investigation. The MSDE also notified Ms. Rider of the allegations to be investigated and requested that her office review the alleged violations.
- 5. On February 28, 2017, Mr. Albert Chichester, Complaint Investigator, MSDE, and Mr. Loiacono, conducted a site visit to the XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX to review the student's educational record, and interviewed Ms. XXXXXXXXX, Special Education Department Chairperson, BCPS, and Mr. XXXXXXXX, Special Education teacher, BCPS. Ms. Gloria Cooper-Blue, Resource Teacher, Office of Special Education, BCPS, attended the site visit as a representative and to provide information on the school system's policies and procedures, as needed.
- 6. Documentation provided by the parties was reviewed. The documents referenced in this Letter of Findings include:
 - a. IEP, dated January 4, 2016;
 - b. IEP, dated December 19, 2016;
 - c. IEP meeting summary, dated January 4, 2016;
 - d. IEP meeting summary, dated December 19, 2016;
 - e. Progress reports, dated January 15, 2016, April 8, 2016, June 10, 2016, November 7, 2016, and January 25, 2017;
 - f. An educational assessment report, dated November 25, 2015; and
 - g. Correspondence from the complainant containing allegations of violations of the IDEA, received by the MSDE on January 9, 2017.

BACKGROUND:

During the time period covered by this investigation, the complainants were provided with written notice of the procedural safeguards (Docs. a and b).

ALLEGATION #1: AN IEP THAT ADDRESSES THE STUDENT'S ACADEMIC NEEDS

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

- 1. On January 4, 2016, the IEP team convened and considered the results of the assessment data. The educational assessment report states that the student's overall reading skills are in the upper limited of the "very low range," and identifies weaknesses in reading comprehension and fluency. The report states that the student's overall math skills are in the "very low range," and identifies weaknesses in applied math problem solving. The report states that the student's overall writing skills are in the "low range," and identifies weaknesses in writing fluency. The IEP reflects that the team determined that the student was performing at the following instructional grade levels: reading 4.0, mathematics 3.0, and writing 3.5. The student was in the 7th grade when the IEP was reviewed by the team (Docs. a and g).
- 2. The IEP goals were developed for the student to improve her reading vocabulary by selecting replacement words at an eighty percent accuracy and, her reading comprehension by summarizing text passages with 80% accuracy, her math problem solving by solving oral math problems with 66% accuracy, and written language skills by writing sentences to respond to a passage at 80% accuracy (Docs. a, b, and e).
- 3. The IEP team did not include goals to address the student's needs in reading fluency, and did not document a basis for its decision to not work on the area of need through the development of a goal. To assist the student with reading needs, the IEP requires that the student be provided with a human reader or audio recordings of selected texts (Doc a and c).
- 4. The IEP requires that the student be provided with a "calculator, number line, hundreds chart, etc." during instructional and testing accommodations in order to complete tasks as a result of her difficulty with math calculation, despite the determination that math calculation being a relative strength of the student (Doc. a).
- 5. Reports were made during the 2015-2016 school year, and at the end of the first quarter of the 2015-2016 school year, which state that the student was making sufficient progress to achieve the annual IEP goals. The reports reflect the following performance:
 - a. <u>Reading vocabulary</u>:

January 15, 2016: not yet measurable,

April 8, 2016: defining words at 72% accuracy; the target accuracy is 80%, June 10, 2016: defining words at 75% accuracy; the target accuracy is 80%, and November 7, 2016: defining words at 80% on one test, 60% on another; the target accuracy is 80%.

b. <u>Reading comprehension</u>:

January 15, 2016: not yet measurable, April 8, 2016: summarizing passages at 81% accuracy; the target accuracy is 80%, June 10, 2016: summarizing passages at 81% accuracy; the target accuracy is 80%, and November 7, 2016: summarizing passages at 80% on one test, 60% on another; the target accuracy is 80%

c. <u>Mathematical problem solving</u>:

January 15, 2016: not yet measurable,

April 8, 2016: solving problems at 33% accuracy; the target accuracy is 66%, June 10, 2016: solving problems at 33% accuracy; the target accuracy is 66%, and November 7, 2016: solving problems at 50% on one test, 66% on another; the target accuracy is 66%

d. <u>Writing</u>:

January 15, 2016: not yet measurable, April 8, 2016: writing accurate passages at 40% accuracy; the target accuracy is 80%, June 10, 2016: writing accurate passages at 60% accuracy; the target accuracy is 80%, and November 7, 2016: writing accurate passages at 50% on one test, 60% on another; the target accuracy is 80% (Docs. a and e).

- 6. On December 19, 2016, when the student was in the 8th grade, the IEP team convened to review the IEP. The team reported that the student's skills were more than three grade levels below in reading, writing, and math, and the IEP reflects the following instructional grade level performances: reading 4.5, math 3.0, and writing 4.0. The IEP team developed new goals for student targeting areas of new and continued need including algebraic equations in math, reading comprehension, and sentence composition. In order to address the concerns raised by the review of the student's current levels of performance, the IEP team decided that the student would be provided with special education instruction in a separate special education classroom in order to provide additional supports in reading and math (Docs. b e and g).
- 7. Reports were made during the second quarter of the 2016-2017 school year, which states that the student was making sufficient progress to achieve the annual IEP goals. The reports reflect the following performance:
 - a. <u>Reading vocabulary</u>: January 25, 2017: defining words at 80% accuracy; the target accuracy of 70%.
 - b. <u>Reading comprehension</u>: January 25, 2017: comprehension at 70% accuracy; the target accuracy is 70%.

- c. <u>Mathematical processes</u>: January 25, 2017: solving with 80% accuracy; the target accuracy is 70%.
- d. <u>Writing</u>: January 25, 2017: Not yet measurable (Doc. e).

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS:

In order to provide a student with a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), the public agency must ensure that an IEP is developed that addresses all of the needs that arise out of the student's disability that are identified in the evaluation data. In developing each student's IEP, the public agency must ensure that it includes a statement of the student's present levels of performance, including how the disability affects the student's progress in the general curriculum (34 CFR §300.320).

The IEP must also include measurable annual goals that are designed to both meet the needs that arise out of the student's disability; and enable the student to be involved in and make progress in the general curriculum, which is defined as the same curriculum used for nondisabled students (34 CFR §300.320).

In developing each student's IEP, the public agency must ensure that the IEP team considers the strengths of the student, the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of the student, the results of the most recent evaluation, and the academic, developmental, and functional needs of the student (34 CFR §300.324).

The United States Department of Education (USDOE) has explained that the annual goals must be aligned with the State's academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled, and take into account a student's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance. In a situation in which a student is performing significantly below the level of the grade in which the student is enrolled, the USDOE explained that the IEP team should determine annual goals that are ambitious but achievable, and ensure that the IEP includes "specially designed instruction," which the USDOE defines as an "element of special education instruction," that includes the following:

Adapting, as appropriate to the needs of an eligible child, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction to address the unique needs of the child that result from the child's disability and to ensure access of the child to the general curriculum so that the child can meet the educational standards within the jurisdiction of the public agency that apply to all children (34 CFR §300.39 and *USDOE Dear Colleague Letter*, dated November 16, 2015 and Analysis of Comments and Changes to the IDEA, *Federal Register*, Vol. 71, No. 156, August 14, 2006, p. 46662).

Based on the Findings of Facts #1- #7, the MSDE finds that there is no documentation that the IEP team addressed the student's needs in reading fluency where a need had been identified, and goals have not been developed for the student to improve these skills.

In addition, based on the Findings of Facts #1 and #6, the MSDE finds that, while the student has made progress towards achievement of the annual goals, that progress has not resulted in an improvement of the student's skills in the areas addressed by the goals. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to the allegation.

ALLEGATION #2: THE PROVISION OF ACCOMMODATIONS

FINDINGS OF FACTS:

8. The student's IEP, requires the following:

Instructional and Testing Accommodations:

- Human reader or audio recording of selected sections of test;
- Scribe;
- Spelling and grammar devices;
- Mathematical tools and calculation devices;
- Extended time: time and a half; and
- Reduced distractions to the student (Docs. a c).

Supplementary Aids, Services, Program Modification and Supports with the corresponding frequency:

- Allow use of organizational aids, periodically;
- Student repeat and /or paraphrase information, periodically;
- Altered/modified assignments, periodically;
- Breakdown assignments into smaller units, periodically;
- Chunking of texts, periodically;
- Preferential seating, daily (Docs. a c).
- 9. While there is documentation that the accommodations and supports required by the student's IEP were, at times, made available since January 2016, there is no documentation that the accommodations were consistently provided with the frequency required by the IEP (Review of student's record, and an interview with school staff).

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS:

The public agency must ensure that each student is provided with the special education instruction and supplementary aids and services required by the student's IEP (34 CFR §§300.101 and .323).

Based on the Findings of Facts #8 and #9, the MSDE finds that there is no documentation that the services and supports were consistently provided to the student with the frequency required by the IEP. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to this allegation.

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS/TIMELINES:

Student-Specific

The MSDE requires the BCPS to provide documentation by April 30, 2017, that the supplementary aids and services required by the student's IEP are being consistently provided, in accordance with the IEP.

The MSDE also requires the BCPS to provide documentation, by May 30, 2017, that the IEP team has taken the following action:

- a. Determined the student's present levels of performance in all academic areas; and
- b. Determined the compensatory services needed to accelerate the narrowing of the gap between the student's present levels of performance and grade level expectations within one year of the date of this Letter of Findings.

The BCPS must provide documentation that the compensatory services have been provided within one year of the date of this Letter of Findings.

The BCPS must ensure that the complainants are provided with written notice of the team's decisions. The complainants maintain the right to request mediation or to file a due process complaint to resolve any disagreement with the team's decisions.

School-Based

The MSDE requires the BCPS to provide documentation by June 30, 2017, of the steps it has taken to determine if the violations identified in the Letter of Findings are unique to this case or if they represent a pattern of noncompliance at XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. Specifically, a review of student records, data, or other relevant information must be conducted in order to determine if the regulatory requirements are being implemented and documentation of the results of this review must be provided to the MSDE. If compliance with the requirements is reported, the MSDE staff will verify compliance with the determinations found in the initial report.

If the regulatory requirements are not being implemented, actions to be taken in order to ensure that the violation does not recur must be identified, and a follow-up report to document correction must be submitted within ninety (90) days of the initial date of a determination of non-compliance. Upon receipt of this report, the MSDE will re-verify the data to ensure continued compliance with the regulatory requirements.

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 by contacting Dr. Nancy Birenbaum, Compliance Specialist, Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch, MSDE at (410) 767-7770

Please be advised that both the complainant and the BCPS 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 facts 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 within the timelines reported in this Letter of Findings.

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

> Loiacono Birenbaum

Sincerely,

Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S. Assistant State Superintendent Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services

MEF:gl

c:	S. Dallas Dance	Dori Wilson
	Denise Mabry	Anita Mandis
	Conya Bailey	Gerald Loiaco
	XXXXXXXXXX	Nancy Birenba
	XXXXXXXXX	·