



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

December 21, 2016

XXX
XXX
XXX

Ms. Nancy Fitzgerald
Executive Director of Special Education
and Student Services
Howard County Public Schools
10910 Route 108
Ellicott City, Maryland 21042-6198

RE: XXXXX
Reference: #17-053

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.

ALLEGATION:

On October 31, 2016, the MSDE received a complaint from Ms. XXXXXXXXXXXX, hereafter, “the complainant,” on behalf of her daughter, the above-referenced student. In that correspondence, the complainant alleged that the Howard County Public Schools (HCPS) violated certain provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) with respect to the above-referenced student.

The MSDE investigated the allegation that the HCPS did not ensure that the Individualized Education Program (IEP) addressed the student’s need for an assistive technology tablet device from November, 2015¹ to May, 2016, in accordance with 34 CFR §300.324.

¹ While the complainant alleged that the violation occurred prior to this date, she was notified, in writing, that this office has authority to investigate allegations of violations that occurred not more than 1 year prior to the date the complaint is received, in accordance with 34 CFR §300.153.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES:

1. On November 3, 2016, the MSDE sent a copy of the complaint, via facsimile, to Ms. Nancy Fitzgerald, Executive Director of Special Education and Student Services, HCPS.
2. On November 9, 2016, the MSDE requested documentation from the HCPS.
3. On November 21, 2016, Mr. Albert Chichester, Ms. Sharon Floyd, Ms. K. Sabrina Austin, and Mr. Gerald Loiacono, Education Program Specialists, MSDE, conducted a telephone interview with the complainant about the allegation.
4. On November 22, 2016, the MSDE sent correspondence to the complainant that acknowledged receipt of the complaint and identified the allegation subject to this investigation. On the same date, the MSDE notified the HCPS of the allegation and requested that the school system staff review the alleged violation.
5. On November 29, 2016, the MSDE received additional documentation from the complainant to be considered.
6. On December 12, 2016, the HCPS provided the MSDE with documentation to be considered.
7. The MSDE reviewed documentation, relevant to the findings and conclusions referenced in this Letter of Findings, which includes:
 - a. IEP, dated August 3, 2015;
 - b. IEP, dated November 6, 2015;
 - c. IEP, dated January 27, 2016;
 - d. IEP, dated May 13, 2016; and
 - e. Correspondence from the complainant containing an allegation of a violation of the IDEA, received by the MSDE on October 31, 2016.

BACKGROUND:

The student is 11 years old and attends XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. She is identified as a student with Autism under the IDEA and has an IEP that requires the provision of special education and related services (Docs. a - d).

During the time period addressed by this investigation, the complainant was provided with notice of the procedural safeguards (Docs. a - d).

FINDING OF FACT:

1. The IEP in effect between November 2015 and May 2016, required that the student have access to an assistive technology device. The IEP indicated that the device was to be utilized as a supplementary aid and as an instructional and testing accommodation. The IEP required that the use of a laptop and/or tablet with word prediction software be used when appropriate as an alternative to writing and to enable the student to type lengthy written assignments (Docs. a - d).

DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION:

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 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. The public agency must also ensure that the IEP team considers the student's need for assistive technology devices and services (34 CFR §300.324).

In this case, the complainant alleges that the student required the use of an assistive technology device from November, 2015 to May, 2016, but that the IEP did not address the need for this time period (Doc. e).

Based on the Finding of Fact #1, the MSDE finds that the student's IEP did, in fact, address the student's need for an assistive technology tablet device, from November, 2015 to May, 2016. Therefore, this office does not find a violation occurred with respect to the allegation.

TIMELINE:

Please be advised that the HCPS and the complainant have the right to submit additional written documentation to this office 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 within the timelines reported in this Letter of Findings.

XXX
Ms. Nancy Fitzgerald
December 21, 2016
Page 4

Questions regarding the findings, conclusions and corrective actions contained in this letter should be addressed to this office in writing. The complainant 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 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.

Sincerely,

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

MEF:ac

c: Renee A. Foose
Kelly Russo
XXXXXXXXXXXX
Dori Wilson
Anita Mandis
Albert Chichester
Nancy Birenbaum