



**Karen B. Salmon, Ph.D.**  
State Superintendent of Schools

March 9, 2020

Ms. Ronetta Stanley  
Loud Voices Together  
P.O. Box 1178  
Temple Hills, Maryland 20757

Ms. Trinell Bowman  
Executive Director  
Department of Special Education  
Prince George's County Public Schools  
John Carroll Elementary School  
1400 Nalley Terrace  
Landover, Maryland 20785

RE: [REDACTED]  
Reference: #20-084

Dear Parties:

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), Division of Early Intervention and Special Education Services, 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, 2020, the MSDE received a complaint from Ms. Ronetta Stanley, hereafter, “the complainant,” on behalf of the above-referenced student. In that correspondence, the complainant alleged that the Prince George’s County Public Schools (PGCPS) violated certain provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) with respect to the student.

The MSDE investigated the following allegations:

1. The PGCPS has not ensured that the student’s behavioral, visual, and visual motor needs have been identified and addressed since January 9, 2019, in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.304 and .324.
2. The PGCPS has not ensured that the student’s need for evidence-based interventions and small class sizes, which arise out of Dyslexia and Dyscalculia, have been addressed consistent with the data since January 9, 2019, 34 CFR §300.324.

3. The PGCPS has not ensured that the student's speech/language needs have been met since January 9, 2019, in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.101, .321, .323, .324, .502, and COMAR 13A.05.01.06.
4. The PGCPS did not ensure that proper procedures were followed when determining the student's need for Extended School Year (ESY) services on December 3, 2019,<sup>1</sup> in accordance with 34 CFR §300.106 and COMAR 13A.05.01.08.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The student is eleven (11) years old and is identified with a Specific Learning Disability. She has an IEP that requires the provision of special education instruction.

During the 2018-2019 school year, the student attended the [REDACTED] Elementary School. Since the 2019-2020 school year, she has attended the [REDACTED] Middle School.

### **ALLEGATION #1 ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL AND VISUAL/VISUAL MOTOR NEEDS**

#### **FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

##### Behavioral Needs

1. The first time the IEP team documented problems for the student with peer interactions was as at a December 3, 2019 IEP team meeting. At that meeting, the team documented its discussion that, "based on previous disciplinary infractions," the student would be provided with check-ins with the guidance counselor to assist in "decreasing behavior infractions."
2. A review of the audio recording of the December 3, 2019 IEP team meeting reflects that the members of the team discussed a recent incident where the student was involved in a fight with another student, which resulted in a five (5) day disciplinary removal.
3. In response to the complainant's request for a Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA), the school-based members of the team responded that they believed the behavior resulted from the student's use of social media at school through her cell phone.
4. The complainant requested related counseling services for conflict resolution. The school-based members of the team responded that the student had experienced some minor difficulty with peers in the past, but that these problems were able to be addressed informally with the student and did not interfere with her access to instruction. Based on this information, the team decided that "check-ins" would be provided with the guidance

---

<sup>1</sup> While the allegation identified that the violation occurred on December 2, 2019, the Prior Written Notice indicates that the meeting occurred on December 3, 2019, and that the IEP is incorrectly dated December 2, 2019.

counselor to monitor the student's behavior to determine whether assistance is required.

### Visual/Visual Motor Needs

5. On October 3, 2018, the IEP in effect at the start of the time period covered by this investigation was developed. At that meeting, the team considered the results of a psychological assessment conducted in 2013 and 2016, a 2016 educational assessment, classroom-based assessments, and information from the student's parents and teachers. The student's Full Scale Intelligence Quotient (FSIQ) was reported to be at the "low to high borderline range." Based on the data, the team decided that the student's weakness in verbal comprehension and visual processing skills impacts her ability to acquire vocabulary and new academic concepts, follow classroom instruction to complete tasks, and to ask and answer appropriate questions to gain information.
6. The IEP that was developed included goals for the student to improve her academic skills and behavioral functioning, and required the provision of special education instruction to assist her in achieving the goals. It also required the use of graphic organizers, visual models, frequent breaks, reduction of distractions, extended time, provision of student and teacher notes, peer tutoring/paired work, repetition of directions, checks for understanding, chunking of assignments into smaller units, provision of structured time for organization of materials, and use of a home/school communication system.
7. The IEP team decided that the student would be provided with visuals and opportunities to learn new vocabulary and concepts through games, stories, and models, and that she would work from concrete to abstract concepts to assist her with visual processing consistent with recommendations in the assessment data.
8. A reevaluation began on February 13, 2019. No requests or recommendations were made for testing to identify visual/visual motor needs as part of that reevaluation.
9. On May 6, 2019, the IEP team considered the results of the private cognitive assessment obtained by the parent. The report of that assessment states that the student "demonstrated general intellectual ability fell within the average to very low range." The report states that the student "shows significant difficulty learning new words and explaining her knowledge aloud" and that "this was one of her weaker areas of performance when compared to her overall ability." It also identifies "significant weaknesses in written expression skills, and "some difficulty" solving word problems and applying math concepts to inform effect age appropriate daily functioning skills. The assessment report also identifies performance on visual spatial tasks as another area of weakness and states that her "performance might be stronger when she can use a hands-on approach to figuring out puzzles rather than manipulating objects in her mind."

10. The private cognitive assessment report states that “instructional strategies may alter structure, time, and/or student responding to assist students with academic problems,” and lists several examples. These include scaffolding of instruction to create a bridge between existing knowledge and new content, visual, verbal, or auditory prompts to help with organizing and remembering new information, chunking of information, instructional sequencing and scripting of lessons. They also include ideas for rate and pacing of information, pauses during instruction, and amounts of allocated and engaged time within a lesson, as well as strategies for obtaining student responses. No additional visual/visual motor supports were added to the IEP on May 6, 2019 as a result of the team’s consideration of this data.

### **DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS:**

In this case, the complainant alleges that the student demonstrated “negative peer interactions” that interfered with her learning, and that the PGCPs refused to collect the data needed to address the behavior in response to the parent’s request.

Based on the Findings of Facts #1 - #4, the MSDE finds that there was data to support the IEP team’s decisions with respect to addressing the student’s peer interactions, in accordance with §§300.304 and .324. Therefore, this office does not find that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

The complainant also alleges that, while the student has needs in the areas of vision/visual motor functioning, the PGCPs did not obtain the data needed to address those needs when it conducted the reevaluation in February 2019.

Based on the Findings of Facts #5 - #10, the MSDE finds while assessments were not recommended in this area in February 2019, the IEP team already had data about the student’s needs and the IEP included supports to address those needs, consistent with the private assessment data provided by the parent in May 2019, in accordance with §§300.304 and .324. Therefore, this office does not find that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

### **ALLEGATION #2 NEED FOR EVIDENCE-BASED INTERVENTIONS AND SMALL CLASS SIZE**

#### **FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

##### **Evidence-Based Interventions**

February 13, 2019 IEP Team Meeting

11. PWN of the February 13, 2019 reevaluation meeting states that the parent expressed concerns about the student’s grades for the first (1<sup>st</sup>) and second (2<sup>nd</sup>) quarters of the

2018-2019 school year. It also states that the student's teachers reported that the student was struggling in reading vocabulary, math problem solving, completion of tasks and study skills.

12. The PWN of the meeting reflects that the team considered information from the student's participation in evidence-based reading and math interventions, which indicated that she was performing at the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) grade level in reading and the second (2<sup>nd</sup>) grade level in math. The data states that the student "is decoding accurately, but the vocabulary score suggests that substantial gaps in word knowledge are making it very hard to read for meaning," and recommends instruction in word meanings and word learning strategies. It also recommends that the student continue to practicing and reviewing decoding multisyllabic words to be able to decode fluently. It also states that the student "would benefit from intensive intervention focused on skills and concepts related to quantitative reasoning and representation," and that "instruction that connects understanding of number relationships, computation, and problem solving skills will strengthen [the student's] math abilities."
13. The written summary of the meeting reflects that the parent reported that she was having a private cognitive assessment conducted, and the team decided to conduct an updated educational assessment. However, the team did not revise the IEP to include the recommended evidence-based interventions and the current IEP did not require participation in the interventions.

#### May 6, 2019 IEP Team Meeting

14. On May 6, 2019, the IEP team considered the report of the results of the educational assessment that states that the student's "strength is decoding and reading words," and demonstrated "advanced phonic skill," being able to use phonic skills to produce letter sounds and writing words, identifying non-words "rapidly and accurately with little effort." However, the report states that, while the student can recall information at an "average level" after reading, she "struggles with higher order thinking." It states that while the student can read at an "average rate she struggles with processing information read in a timely manner."
15. The educational assessment states that the student could do multi-digit addition and subtraction with and without regrouping with fractions and decimals, multi-digit multiplication with and without regrouping, and simple division, but struggled with math problems that require multiplication or division of fractions. It states that the student fell in the "average" range for math calculation and rate of fluency, but that there "is a significant impact between understanding word problems and recognizing patterns in math (fluid reasoning)."

16. The educational assessment states that the student was able to spell basic sight words, but struggled with spelling words as she heard them phonetically. It states that she was able to write simple and complex sentences, but she “struggled more with following the directions given, sentence structure in some areas, and filling in a missing sentence in the story.” It further states that the student could spell most words needed to write a sentence, but “demonstrated limited ability to correct grammar and sentence structure problems in test items.” The assessment contains recommendations for chunking of text, use of highlighted text for lengthy texts, providing checks for understanding, and breaking math problems into smaller steps.
17. The documentation of the meeting reflects that the IEP team completed the reevaluation and decided that the student continues to meet the criteria for identification as a student with a Specific Learning Disability under the IDEA that impacts reading comprehension, writing, and math problem solving. The team determined that the student has Dysgraphia, but not Dyscalculia, as was previously determined. Based on the data, the team clarified that the math needs arise out of the student’s weakness in reading comprehension and written expression. However, the IEP team did not revise the IEP at that time.
18. The PGCPS speech language assessment was recommended and consented to on May 6, 2019.

#### November 13, 2019 IEP Team Meeting

19. On November 13, 2019, the IEP team began an annual IEP review. The PWN of the meeting reflects that, based on the results of the educational assessment, the team determined that the student does not have difficulty with math calculation, but with the processing of the word problems, which causes her to miss steps or not perform all of the necessary steps when completing math problems.
20. A review of the audio recording of the November 13, 2019 meeting reflects that the team discussed that there was conflicting data about the student’s decoding skills. The school-based members of the team reported that the data from the evidence-based intervention recommending instruction in decoding was not as reliable as the formal assessment data that indicated that this is an area of strength for the student. Based on this information, the team rejected the complainant’s request for the IEP to address decoding, but agreed to conduct an informal measure of decoding to see if there was an impact on current grade level reading.

#### December 3, 2019 IEP Team Meeting

21. The PWN of a December 3, 2019 IEP team meeting and IEP reflect that the team considered the data, including a November 22, 2019 informal reading inventory that was administered, and decided that the student will be provided with an evidence-based interventions to address reading comprehension and math problem-solving. The IEP was

revised to require the student's participation in those interventions.

22. There is documentation that the student participated in reading and math interventions during the 2018-2019 school year. There is also documentation that the student participated in a math intervention during the 2019-2020 school year. However, the student did not participate in a reading intervention prior to the December 3, 2019, IEP team meeting.

### Small Class Size

#### **August 14, 2019 IEP Team Meeting**

23. During the 2018-2019 school year, the student received special education instruction both in the general education classroom and in smaller classes in a separate special education classroom.
24. A review of the audio recording of an August 14, 2019 IEP team meeting reflects that the student's parent expressed her belief that the student was not making sufficient progress and requested continuation of instruction in smaller classes for the 2019-2020 school year so that the student could obtain more adult assistance to maintain attention to her work. The student's special education teacher from the 2018-2019 school year recommended that the student be placed in general education classes taught by both general and special education teachers in order to receive the level of support needed.
25. A review of the audio recording does not indicate that the IEP team made a decision regarding the parent's request. However, the IEP was revised to require the provision of special education instruction in the general education classroom taught by both general and special education teachers consistent with the recommendation of the special education teacher and does not require small class sizes.

### **DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS:**

In this case, the complainant asserts that the parent has "continually raised concerns about the student's performance and lack of academic success." The complainant alleges that the parent has requested more intensive specially designed instruction in smaller classes, and evidenced-based interventions, but that the PGCPs has not addressed these concerns.

Based on the Findings of Facts #11 - #22, the MSDE finds that the IEP did not address the student's need for evidence-based interventions between February 13, 2019 and December 3, 2019, in accordance with 34 CFR§300.324. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

Notwithstanding the violation, based on the Findings of Facts #22, the MSDE finds that that the student was participating in such interventions during the 2018-2019 school year, in a math

intervention during the 2019-2020 school year, and that a reading intervention was required following the December 3, 2019 meeting. Therefore, this office finds that the violation didn't impact the student and no corrective action is required for these time periods.

Based on the Findings of Facts #22 - #24, the MSDE finds that the IEP team has not addressed the parent's request for smaller class sizes since August 14, 2019, in accordance with 34 CFR§300.324. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

### **ALLEGATION #3                      SPEECH/LANGUAGE NEEDS**

#### **FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

##### **May 6, 2019 IEP Team Meeting**

26. The documentation of the meeting states that the team did not accept a private speech/language assessment obtained by the parent, which identified expressive language (formulating sentences) and expressive vocabulary deficits and recommended speech/language services to address them. The IEP team documented that the basis for the rejection of the findings was because the evaluator "only conducted one standardized assessment which does not provide a clear picture of [the student's] performance in the areas of receptive and expressive language." The team decided to conduct additional testing in these areas to determine whether the student has identified needs in these areas.

##### **August 14, 2019 IEP Team Meeting**

27. On August 14, 2019, the IEP team considered the results of the PGCPS speech/language assessment, consented to on May 6, 2019. The PGCPS evaluator reported that she reviewed the private assessment report, and that while the student's expressive language and vocabulary were found to be "below average," the private evaluator did not indicate that possible "dialectal variations" were considered.
28. The PGCPS speech/language assessment noted no problems with articulation or pragmatic skills. However, an expressive language difference was noted due to "alternative dialect," with an example given that the term "done finish" was used instead of "finished."
29. The PGCPS speech/language evaluator noted that the student failed a hearing screening and expressed concern that the student could have a hearing problem in one ear. The assessment contains a recommendation that the student's other ear be facing instruction, that the student be seated away from noise, that the teacher looked at the student when speaking, repeat new words, speak loudly, and gain the student's attention before speaking to her. The evaluator also recommended that the student read a passage, then listen to it and track the words as the passage is read by another person, and to complete other comprehension activities.



30. The PGCPS evaluator could not rule out a receptive language deficit, and recommended that the IEP team consult with a speech/language pathologist on the supports that can be added to increase the student's comprehension of spoken language tasks, and to consider whether speech/language services are needed.
31. The documentation does not indicate that the team decided that a speech/language consultation was needed before determining that speech services were required, but states that based on the current data, speech/language goals would be added related speech/language services would be provided. However, it documented that a hearing assessment would be conducted to rule out a hearing problem.

### **September 19, 2019 IEP Team Meeting**

32. On September 19, 2019, the IEP team convened and considered the results of a hearing assessment that indicated that the student "experiences normal hearing bilaterally." The assessment report states that, in light of the student's reported difficulties understanding spoken language as well as other academic issues, an auditory processing evaluation was recommended. Based on this information, the team decided to conduct an audiological observation and self-assessment to assist with identifying strategies to improve the student's listening skills.
33. A review of the audio recording of the September 19, 2019 IEP team meeting reflects that the speech/language pathologist who participated in the meeting was not the speech/language pathologist who conducted the evaluation or her supervisor. This speech/language pathologist reported that she consulted with the speech/language evaluator and the teachers in the student's classroom and did not see that the student's disability impacts her speech/language functioning. However, the team again documented that speech goals would be developed and speech services provided.
34. The IEP team documented that it considered revising the IEP, but decided to wait for an upcoming annual IEP review meeting.

### **November 13, 2019 and December 3, 2019 IEP Team Meeting**

35. The PWN of the November 13, 2019 and December 3, 2019 annual IEP review states that "based on a review of multiply confirming pieces of data and assessments administered, [the student] does not qualify for speech services." The description of the data used as a basis for the decision includes that the same data as was used when determining that the student requires such services on August 14, 2019 and September 19, 2019.

**DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS:**

In this case, the complainant alleges that, in May 2019, the IEP team did not consider an Independent Educational Evaluation (IEE) in the area of speech/language, which was provided by the parent.

Based on the Finding of Fact #26, the MSDE finds that the team considered the IEE, in accordance with §300.502. Therefore, this office does not find that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

The complainant also alleges that the IEP team that considered the speech/language assessment conducted by the public agency on September 19, 2019 did not include the evaluator or her supervisor, and therefore, it did not include a member who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results.

Based on the Finding of Fact #33, the MSDE finds that the IEP team did include someone who could interpret those results, and that there is no requirement that the evaluator or supervisor interpret assessment results, in accordance with §300.321. Therefore, this office does not find that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

The complainant further alleges that the IEP team did not consider the results of the speech/language assessment conducted by the public agency within the required timelines.

Based on the Findings of Fact #27, the MSDE finds that the team did not consider the PGCPs speech/language assessment within the required timelines, in accordance with COMAR 13A.05.01.06. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

In addition, the complainant alleges that the IEP team did not develop speech/language goals consistent with the decision made by the team in August 2019 and that the September 19, 2019 decision about services is not consistent with the data.

Based on the Finding of Fact #35, the MSDE finds that the decision to not include speech goals and services made on December 3, 2019 was based on the same data used to support the previous decisions that goals and services are needed, in accordance with §300.324. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to this aspect of the allegation.

**ALLEGATION #4                      ESY SERVICES DECISION**

**FINDINGS OF FACTS:**

36. The IEP that was developed on December 3, 2019 documents that the team considered all of the required factors when determining the student's need for ESY services. The team

documented that it determined that the student is not demonstrating a degree of progress toward mastery of goals related to critical life skills and there is no chance of substantial regression of those skills caused by normal school breaks and a failure to recover those skills in a timely manner. The basis for these decisions was that the student does not have any annual goals related to critical life skills. However, the team also documented its decision that the student “does have IEP goals related to critical life skills in the areas of reading and math.”

37. The IEP team determined that, based on the information from considering the required factors, the benefit the student receives from the education program during the regular school year will not be significantly jeopardized if the student does not receive ESY services.

### **DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS:**

At least annually, each public agency must ensure that the IEP team determines whether a student requires ESY services in order to receive a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE). The ESY services are the individualized extension of specific special education and related services that are provided to a student beyond the normal school year of the public agency. When determining whether ESY services are required for the provision of FAPE, the IEP team must consider all of the factors below.

1. Whether the student’s IEP includes annual goals related to critical life skills;
2. Whether there is a likelihood of substantial regression of critical life skills caused by the normal school break and a failure to recover those lost skills in a reasonable time;
3. The student’s degree of progress toward mastery of the annual IEP goals related to critical life skills;
4. The presence of emerging skills or breakthrough opportunities;
5. Interfering behaviors;
6. The nature and severity of the disability; and
7. Special circumstances (34 CFR §300.106 and COMAR 13A.05.01.08).

After considering the required factors, the IEP team must decide whether the benefits that a student receives from the education program during the regular school year will be significantly jeopardized if the student is not provided with ESY services [Emphasis added] (*MM v. School District of Greenville Co. (S.C.)*, 303 F3d. 523, 37 IDELR 183 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002).

In this case, the complainant alleges that the December 2, 2019 decision that the student does not require ESY services, is inconsistent with data that the student’s academic needs address critical life skills and that there was a lack of expected progress towards achievement of the IEP goals.

Based on the Findings of Facts #36 - #37, the MSDE finds that the team determined that the student was not making a degree of progress on the IEP goals consistent with the complainant’s report that the student was not making sufficient progress on the IEP goals. However, based on

the Findings of Facts #36 - #37, the MSDE finds that the team's decisions regarding the factors it was required to consider were inconsistent with each other, in accordance with 34 CFR §§300.106, .324, and COMAR 13A.05.01.08. Therefore, this office finds that a violation occurred with respect to the allegation.

### **CORRECTIVE ACTIONS/TIMEFRAMES:**

The IDEA requires that State complaint procedures include those for effective implementation of the decisions made as a result of a State complaint investigation, including technical assistance activities, negotiations, and corrective actions to achieve compliance (34 CFR §300.152). Accordingly, the MSDE requires the public agency to provide documentation of the completion of the corrective actions listed below.

The MSDE has established a reasonable timeframe below to ensure that noncompliance is corrected in a timely manner.<sup>2</sup> This office will follow up with the public agency to ensure that it completes the required action consistent with the MSDE Special Education State Complaint Resolution Procedures.

If the public agency anticipates that any of the timeframes below may not be met, or if either party seeks technical assistance, they should contact Dr. Nancy Birenbaum, Compliance Specialist, Family Support and Dispute Resolution Branch, MSDE, to ensure the effective implementation of the action.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Birenbaum can be reached at (410) 767-7770.

The MSDE requires that the PGCPS provide documentation by the end of the 2019-2020 school year of the steps taken to ensure that the violation does not recur at [REDACTED] High School.

### **Student Specific**

The MSDE requires the PGCPS to provide documentation by May 1, 2020 that the IEP team has done the following:

1. Considered the parent's request for small class sizes;
2. Determined the student's need for speech/language goals and services consistent with the data; and

---

<sup>2</sup> The United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) states that the public agency must correct noncompliance in a timely manner, which is as soon as possible, but not later than one (1) year from the date of identification of the noncompliance. The OSEP has indicated that, in some circumstances, providing the remedy could take more than one (1) year to complete. If noncompliance is not corrected in a timely manner, the MSDE is required to provide technical assistance to the public agency, and take tiered enforcement action, involving progressive steps that could result in the redirecting, targeting, or withholding of funds, as appropriate.

<sup>3</sup> The MSDE will notify the public agency's Director of Special Education of any corrective action that has not been completed within the established timeframe.

3. Determined the student's need for ESY services following proper procedures.

If the team decides that the student requires small class sizes or speech/language goals and services, it must also determine the compensatory services to be provided to the student to remediate the violations identified through this investigation.

In addition, the IEP team must determine the compensatory services for the delay in providing a reading intervention from the start of the 2019-2020 school year until December 6, 2019.

### **School Based**

The MSDE requires the PGCPS to provide documentation by the end of the 2019-2020 school year that steps have been taken at [REDACTED] Elementary School to do the following:

1. Ensure that any delay in revising an IEP to reflect the IEP team's decisions is based only on the student's needs;
2. Ensure that the IEP team considers all parent requests made at the IEP team meeting; and
3. Ensure that reevaluations are completed with the required timelines;

The MSDE requires the PGCPS to provide documentation by the end of the 2019-2020 school year that steps have been taken at [REDACTED] Middle School to do the following:

1. Ensure that any delay in revising an IEP to reflect the IEP team's decisions is based only on the student's needs;
2. Ensure that IEP team decisions are consistent with the data; and
3. Ensure that information used as a basis for consideration of factors when determining the need for ESY services is consistent.

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

As of the date of this correspondence, this Letter of Findings is considered final. This office will not reconsider the conclusions reached in this Letter of Findings unless new, previously unavailable documentation is submitted and received by this office within fifteen (15) days of the date of this correspondence. The new documentation must support a written request for reconsideration, and the written request must include a compelling reason for why the documentation was not made available during the investigation. Pending this office's decision on a request for reconsideration, the public agency must implement any corrective actions within the timeframes reported in this Letter of Findings.

Ms. Ronetta Stanley  
Ms. Trinell Bowman  
March 9, 2020  
Page 14

The parent and the school system 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.

Sincerely,

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

MEF/dee

c:

[REDACTED]

Monica Goldson  
Gwendolyn Mason  
Barbara Vandyke

[REDACTED]

Jeffrey Krew  
Dori Wilson  
Anita Mandis  
Diane Eisenstadt  
Nancy Birenbaum