
December 30, 2020

Ms. Marcella E. Franczkowski, M.S.
Assistant State Superintendent
Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Special Education/Early Intervention Services
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Re: Maryland's Procedures

Dear Ms. Franczkowski:

Last year I was noticing several strange things in Maryland. I am not sure if these were just coincidences:

1. On January 09, 2019, I informed you of deficiencies in Maryland's State Complaint Resolution Procedures, referred to it as Maryland's Procedures. On the same date, Ms. Laurie VanderPloeg, Director, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), the United States Department of Education (the Department) [informed you](#) of the deficiencies in Maryland's Procedural Safeguard based on a complaint I filed against Maryland and the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE);
2. On January 09, 2019, Ms. VanderPloeg informed you that OSEP required the MSDE to complete corrective actions. On the same date you informed Ms. Trinell Bowman, Executive Director, Prince George's County Public Schools (PGCPS) that the MSDE required PGCPS to complete corrections, but for unrelated matters; and
3. On January 09, 2019, I indicated to you that you attempted to exclude yourself from unqualified staff who were implementing Maryland's Procedures. On the same date Ms. VanderPloeg informed you that in the Maryland's Procedural Safeguard Notice, the MSDE excluded itself from the public agencies responsible for establishing, maintaining and implementing procedural safeguards, again based on the complaint I filed.

I also noticed several things which were not strange in Maryland. On January 09, 2019, Ms. VanderPloeg informed you that OSEP required MSDE to revise Maryland's Procedural Safeguard Notice and provide copy of the revised notice to stakeholders including interested parties and informed you that the complaint was filed by me and provided my name to you. Later, MSDE informed OSEP that corrective action was completed, without providing me with a copy of the revised notice. It was not the first time I was seeing corrective action being documented as completed without actually completing it. That was a good opportunity for the MSDE to be a good role model public agency in Maryland for the LEAs.

When the corrective was required by the OSEP, I know that the MSDE attempted to obtain a copy of the complaint. I did not give permission for OSEP to give a copy of the complaint. There was no requirement under IDEA that I provide the MSDE with a copy of the complaint. Also, the MSDE did not provide a legitimate reason and the corrective action was clearly written on what needs to be done, unlike the corrective actions you write.

I continue to find that provision of Prior Written Notice is not being properly implemented in Maryland. Sometime back I called a parent support center number provided in Maryland's Prior Written Notice. The staff who was supposed to help parents informed me that she didn't know why a Prior Written Notice is called a Prior Written Notice, as she found that Prior Written Notice was always provided after the IEP meetings. This was not a strange thing in Maryland. Someone needs to make sure that qualified staff are placed at the parent support centers.

Sincerely,
Hameed Jamarussadiq

c: Laurie VanderPloeg
Gregg Corr
Christine Pilgrim
Gbenimah Slopadoe
Priscilla Irvine
Karen B. Salmon
Carol A. Williamson
Trinell Bowman