



February 3, 2012

Miss Kristin Stewart  
Ohio Virtual Academy  
1655 Holland Rd., Suite F  
Maumee, OH 43537

RE: # **CP 0248-2011; Letter of Findings**

Dear Miss Kristin Stewart:

After reviewing the information regarding the complaint concerning \_\_\_\_\_, (hereinafter the "student") the Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) has made the following findings:

**ISSUE 1:** Whether the community school failed to provide an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) that was adequate in its services, description of specialized services, scope and detail. These alleged IEP deficiencies were a potential violation of 34 CFR §300.320 [Definition of individualized educational program], 34 CFR §300.324 [Development, review and revision of IEP], 34 CFR §300.323(e) [When IEPs must be in effect] and 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

**FACTS:**

1. The community school provided copies of three Individualized Educational Program(s) (IEP) that were utilized from the time of the student's enrollment at the Ohio Virtual Academy until the current complaint was filed. The community school "adopted" a previous school's IEP on February 4, 2011, completed an "amended" IEP (Facilitated IEP) on June 23, 2011 and additional "amended" IEP (second Facilitated IEP) with a listed start date of October 12, 2011, but an apparent meeting date of November 10, 2011. There are numerous procedural errors, confusing dates, lack of staff and parent signatures and a lack of clear intent associated with these IEPs, which makes an accurate determination of the adequacy of the plan to serve this student confusing at best.
2. The community school and the parent submitted copies of IEPs which differ from one another even though they were apparently drafted at or around the same time. These were apparently different "drafts" of IEPs, which differ in small but important details. None of the IEPs provided to OEC by the community school has clearly defined meeting dates, did not have signatures, and contained differing "amendment" dates.
3. The community school submitted a DASL record indicating the school's Adoption Date of the previous school's IEP on February 4, 2011.
4. The community school adopted an IEP from Pickerington Local School District on February 4, 2011. However, there are no indications that the community school actually intended to provide or had the capacity to provide the services and supports outlined in this IEP.
5. The parent provided a copy of Prior Written Notice (PWN) issued by the community school dated May 23, 2011. The Prior Written Notice indicated the need to meet and discuss issues including the following.
  - a. An offer of IEP facilitation to discuss unresolved issues.
  - b. That the team had met with the parent on numerous occasions regarding the IEP and that no consensus had been reached.

- c. Following meetings on 3/2/11/, 3/25/11, 3/28/11, 4/22/11, and 5/12/11 the community school was unable to secure the parents agreement on the proposed IEP amendments.
- d. Indication that a Change of Placement must occur when a student moves from a physical brick and mortar learning environment to a virtual learning environment. The community school's belief that the parent was refusing to work with the school's teachers in gaining educational knowledge needed to amend the student's IEP.
- 6. The community school sent to the parent a Prior Written Notice on 05/23/2011 which indicated the school's intention to have a meeting to implement a variety of changes in the student's IEP (as cited in item 5). It appears the community school was not articulating a plan to serve or a summary of IEP amendments to this point within the context of the PWN, rather an intent to meet again.
- 7. The community school submitted an IEP "amendment" with no specified meeting date, with an IEP effective date of 10/13/10 (prior to enrollment at the community school), with a list of amendments dated 05/23/11, and no school or parent signatures. This IEP or a close version of it was the apparent framework for IEP discussions at the June 23, 2011 Facilitated IEP meeting.
- 8. The parent submitted an IEP listed as an "amendment" dated 03/25/2011, with an IEP effective date of 10/13/10 (prior school IEP start date), with a list of amendments dated 03/25/2011. This "amended" IEP was reported by the parent to have been agreed upon at a June 23, 2011 Facilitated IEP meeting. This IEP contains community school staff signatures and was signed in agreement of implementation by the parent. This "amended" IEP lists major changes in the IEP goals, service times, and services (discontinue OT). This "amended" IEP utilizes essentially the same Profile description from the adopted Pickerington IEP. This "amended" IEP fails to describe a rationale for the large scale change in goals and services.
- 9. The community school submitted a third IEP (amended) with no meeting date listed, with no staff or parent signatures, with a listed start date of 10/12/2011. This IEP apparently drafted by community school staff on or around 10/12/2011. There was an IEP scheduled for 10/12/2011 but the parent did not attend due to her advocate not being available at that time. The content of this IEP was reportedly verbally approved by the parent, but has no signatures, and was discussed at a second Facilitated IEP meeting on November 10, 2011. The IEP contains some amendments and an amended Profile section. It is not clear why this IEP is listed as an amendment rather than an annual review IEP.
- 10. The parent provided a letter from Ms. Valorie Dombroskas, Advocate/Trainer with the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities who assisted the parent during the present and past IEP processes. Ms. Dombroskas reports in part, "Amendments to the IEP that have been agreed upon by (parent) and OHVA do not always get documented in the IEP, or they are documented in the IEP, but the date of the amendment is inaccurate and/or the language relating to the changes is not clear. You can see much evidence of this if you review the records. This leads to numerous emails, conversations and meetings; all of which results in a lot of confusion and conflict."

#### **FINDINGS:**

The community school failed to provide an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) that was adequate in its services, description of specialized services, scope and detail. These IEP deficiencies are a violation of 34 CFR §300.320 [Definition of individualized educational program], 34 CFR §300.324 [Development, review and revision of IEP].

- The community school did not follow proper procedures in its adoption of the IEP from the prior school district (Pickerington). The services (on the continuum of special education services) and the least restrictive environment (LRE) setting were significantly different upon enrollment at the community school and warranted a new IEP or at minimum a PWN articulating major changes to the student's plan.
- The other two "amended" IEPs: Facilitated IEP with date of June 23, 2011 and second Facilitated IEP with listed start date of October 12, 2011 (meeting date of November 10, 2011) also were not executed with proper procedures. The June 23, 2011 contained major revisions in goals and services from the adopted IEP, which constituted changes beyond what could be called an amendment. A new IEP should have been written and included a revised student profile section. The IEP with the listed start date of October 12, 2011 should have been a new annual review IEP rather than another amended IEP.
- The community school failed to document (in student Profile section or elsewhere) how the large scale changes in services and supports found in the amended IEPs (June 23, 2011 & October 12, 2011/November 10, 2011) adequately address the individualized needs of the student. The IEPs also failed to document a rationale for the significant adjustments of IEP goals and services in a manner that is tied to the needs of the student.
- The various IEPs utilized were not adequate in scope or detail. The lack of rationale for changes, the failure to follow proper procedures in IEP development, the contradictory and confusing dates and the lack of properly executed signatures did not afford the parent a framework of informed consent on which to make decisions about the adequacy, details or scope of the respective IEPs or the various proposed amendments.
- The multiple "draft" versions of IEP, without clearly defined meeting dates, without staff signatures, with confusing amendment dates has resulted in the community school failing to provide a properly articulated IEP for this student.

The community school failed to provide Prior Written Notice (PWN) in a manner consistent with 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

- Although the community school provided to the parent PWN inviting her to meetings to discuss IEP concerns, the community school failed to provide PWN regarding their plans to adequately meet the needs of the student on issues in dispute with the parent (e.g. modifications to the student's curriculum, special transportation or adapted physical education)

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:** See details in the Corrective Action Summary.

**ISSUE 2:** Whether the community school failed to provide the specially designed instruction that was specified, or should have been specified, in the student's IEP. This allegation is a potential violation of 34 CFR §300.320(a) [Definition of individualized education program] and 34 CFR §300.324 [Development, review, and revision of IEP].

**FACTS:**

1. The IEP which was adopted from Pickerington Local School District listed several aspects of Specially Designed Services which were not provided by the community school. Aspects of Specially Designed Services which were not provided or not fully provided include the following in the time period of February 4, 2011 (adoption) to June 23, 2011 ("amended"):
  - a. Specially Designed Instruction: small group instruction for reading, language arts, math and behavioral support at \_\_\_\_\_ minutes, daily in a resource room setting.

- b. Adapted Physical Education Services by APE teacher in gym and school settings for minutes monthly.
  - c. Special Transportation by transportation staff at non-school settings.
  - d. Occupational Therapy Services by an occupational therapist in a small group or one on one setting for minutes monthly. Occupational Therapy Services were provided to the student by the community school; however there have been gaps in the service provision between the IEP adoption date of February 4, 2011 and the complaint date of December 7, 2011. OT treatment notes indicate no OT was provided during the periods of: 2/4/11 to 3/17/11 and 9/1/11 to 10/12/11.
2. The set of confusing and contradictory "amending" dates, the lack of clear IEP meeting dates, failure to provide PWN regarding services, and the lack of properly executed new IEP makes specially designed instruction determinations much more difficult. The parent has provided OEC with a signed copy of the Facilitated IEP from the June 23, 2011 meeting. The parent verifies she accepted the proposed "amendments" to the "adopted" IEP at that time.
  3. The community school acknowledges that the student has not received Adapted Physical Education services from the time of enrollment through the date of the complaint. The community school has taken recent steps to complete a reassessment of the student's adapted physical education needs and to identify a potential provider for these services.
  4. Special transportation was listed as a service on the "adopted" IEP (adopted February 4, 2011). The "amended" June 23, 2011 IEP ceased transportation as a related service with the citation, "does not need special transportation with OHVA." There was no additional clarification as to why this support was discontinued. The IEP continued to list speech therapy and occupational therapy which is provided at a separate location. The parent reports requesting a reinstatement of transportation services at the November 10, 2011 Facilitated IEP meeting. The parent further reports that at the November 10, 2011 Facilitated IEP meeting she was informed by school representatives that there would be a \$300.00 limitation on any potential transportation reimbursement. There is no specific IEP or PWN information to help clarify this issue.
  5. The June 23, 2011 Facilitated IEP (listing amendments dated 5/23/11 & start date of 10/13/10 (prior to enrollment)) lists IEP amendments to sections: 1, 6, 7.1, 7.2, 8, 9, 10, and 11 and the participant & role as the parent. The Specially Designed Instruction section lists Intervention Specialist support via Virtual Web Based Tools or Phone addressing goals for reading comprehension, written expression, and behavior totaling 110 minutes per month.
  6. The parent agreed to changes to specially designed instruction at the time of the June 23, 2011 IEP meeting. However, in her complaint to OEC the parent indicates the community school should "provide academic instruction more than the 30 minutes given IS (Intervention Specialist), delivered by the IS on a continual basis daily and not place burden on the Learning Coach/Parent to modify lessons or instruction."
  7. The community school did not provide to OEC progress report information applicable to the student during period from time of enrollment to the end of the 2010-11 school year. The community school did provide progress report information related to the first quarter of the 2011-12 school year; however, the progress on goals was listed as either discontinued or not introduced. It appears the student was not participating in the "Class Connect" sessions during the Fall 2011. The series of email records provided indicate there was a breakdown in services provided related to: a) parent dissatisfaction with a lack of a modified curriculum, b) scheduling difficulties, c) parent dissatisfaction with the teacher, and d) dispute as to whether a new teacher could be assigned with a facilitated IEP pending.

8. On June 17, 2011 staff of the community school and the parent signed an Evaluation Team Report (ETR). The ETR outlines and updates a fairly extensive set of educational needs of the student.
9. The June 17, 2011 ETR reports the following Implications for Instruction Progress and Monitoring:

**FINDINGS:**

The community school failed to provide services specified or which should have been specified in the student's IEP. This is a violation of 34 CFR §300.320(a) [Definition of individualized education program] and 34 CFR §300.324 [Development, review, and revision of IEP].

- During the period of February 4, 2011 (adopted IEP) through June 23, 2011 ("amended" IEP) the community school failed to provide the following services:
  - minutes per day of specially designed instruction in a resource room
  - Special transportation (as would be needed for attendance at off-site related services)
  - Adapted physical education for minutes per month (omission continuing to the present)
  - Sessions of occupational therapy were to have been provided minutes per month from the time of IEP adoption. OT sessions were omitted during the time periods of 2/4/11 to 3/17/11 and 9/1/11 to 10/12/11.
- The community school failed to document a rationale consistent with the individualized needs of the student via the IEP or PWN regarding how the student's needs and goals could be adequately addressed given the large reduction in specialized instruction by an intervention specialist compared to what had been provided by the previous school district ( minutes per day of intervention specialist support in a resource room vs. minutes per month provided via web based tools or phone).
- The ETR (June 17, 2011) developed by the community school and completed one week prior to the June 23, 2011 Facilitated IEP appears to substantially contradict the decision by the community school to significantly reduce the amount of specially designed instruction and supports provided to the student. The ETR recommends a lengthy set of instructional needs for the student.

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:** See Corrective Action Summary section.

**ISSUE 3:** Whether the community school failed to make needed and appropriate modifications and accommodations to the student's academic curriculum, (as promised, as specified or as should have been specified), thereby placing an unreasonable burden upon the parent to be responsible for the

student's academic progress. This allegation is a potential violation of 34 CFR §300.320(a) [Definition of individualized education program], and 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

**FACTS:**

The IEP adopted on February 4, 2011 lists modifications for the student

2. Email documentation provided by the parent indicates that she had an early and ongoing concern about the ability or willingness of the community school to provide modifications to the student's curriculum. On February 8, 2011 the parent communicated, "I understand that what I have received to this point is merely on the assumption that he can and will follow the curriculum. This is not the case as to his primary educational needs has been circled around his IEP goals which academics are limited to special needs. I am looking forward to this curriculum being tweaked around his IEP and adjusted according to his needs."
3. The June 23, 2011 Facilitated IEP lists Specially Designed Services – Modifications (begin date of 10/13/10 - ??)
4. The parent indicates in her complaint that the community school failed to make modifications to the student curriculum as stated in his IEP and "it was ALL on me to modify anything that was being taught to my son." The parent also indicates in her complaint that community school personnel have stated to her that "what you want in modifications just cannot happen" and "We do not have the ability to go into the online school and manually make modifications to the k12 curriculum if this is what you are thinking of as modifications."
5. The parent's complaint further indicates that she as a parent lacks the knowledge or training to be responsible for properly modifying the student's curriculum.
6. As can best be determined by the documentation presented to OEC from the community school the parent (in the role of Learning Coach) was offered the options of either using a standard, self-paced, online k12 curriculum or the use of the self-paced, or online "Unique" curriculum (reduced standards). In a long series of emails between the parent and community school staff beginning in September, 2011 it is clear that the parent had expected enhanced efforts from the community school to provide curriculum modifications following the June 23, 2011 Facilitated IEP. There is no documentation to suggest that the community school's intervention specialist was actively modifying the student's curriculum in a manner that addressed his individualized learning and behavioral needs.
7. In a September 28, 2011 email from the community school to the parent the school representative suggested that the parent enlist the help of various specialists to "assist in modifications" for the student's curriculum. The email did not reflect a plan by the community school to plan, provide, and readjust as needed curriculum modifications tailored to the student's progress and individualized needs.
8. The community school did not document via PWN a response to the parent's expressed concerns outlining the manner in which they were providing adequate modifications to the student's curriculum.

**FINDINGS:**

The community school failed to make needed and appropriate modifications and accommodations to the student's academic curriculum and/or failed to document by Prior Written Notice the manner in which they were providing adequate modifications to the student's curriculum. This is a violation of 34 CFR §300.320(a) [Definition of individualized education program], and 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:** See the Corrective Action Summary Section.

**ISSUE 4:** Whether the community school failed to provide needed Adapted Physical Education services during the time that the student has been in attendance at the community school. Additionally, that the community school failed to provide an evaluation for the determination of Adapted Physical Education needs or proper formal documentation as to why this service has not been provided. This allegation is a potential violation of CFR 34 §330.108 [Physical education] and 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

**FACTS:**

1. The "adopted" IEP listed 120 minutes/monthly of Adapted Physical Education as a Specially Designed Service for the student.
2. The June 23, 2011 Facilitated IEP Specially Designed Services Section refers to a May, 2011 dated amendment to Adapted Physical Education. However, there is no description as to the nature of any such amendment to the Adapted Physical Education.
3. The second Facilitated IEP (February 10, 2011) contains a listed amendment of "specially designed physical education" but the amendment to this service is not described in the Specially Designed Services Section.
4. The community school acknowledges that Adapted Physical Education was not provided to the student and is currently taking steps to assess and plan for these services.
5. The community school has not provided PWN describing to the parent a rationale for not providing or for amending adapted physical education.

**FINDINGS:**

The community school failed to provide needed Adapted Physical Education services during the time that the student has been in attendance at the community school. Adapted Physical Education was listed on the student's adopted IEP. There was no rationale and no PWN for any intended cessation or "amendment" to adapted physical education services for the student. This is a violation of CFR 34 §330.108 [Physical education] and 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:** See Corrective Action Summary Section

**ISSUE 5:** Whether the community school failed to provide needed transportation in support of related services, or reimbursement for such transportation. This allegation is a potential violation of 34 CFR §300.39 [Special Education], and 34 CFR §300.34(a)(c) [Related services].

**FACTS:**

1. The adopted IEP (February 4, 2011) lists special transportation provided by transportation staff at non-school settings in the Description of Specially Designed Services section.

2. The first facilitated IEP (June 23, 2011) lists an amendment stating “.....does not need special transportation with OHVA.”
3. The facilitated IEP (June 23, 2011) continues to list related services of speech therapy and occupational therapy provided at off-site locations. The community school does not provide a rationale or PWN as to why special transportation is not needed to access these IEP specified related services.

**FINDINGS:**

The community school failed to provide needed transportation in support of related services, or reimbursement for such transportation. This allegation is a violation of 34 CFR §300.39 [Special Education], and 34 CFR §300.34(a)(c) [Related services].

- The community school failed to document a rationale or provide PWN as to why special transportation was not provided to enable the student to access related services (speech and occupational therapy) as listed on the student’s IEP(s).

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:** See Corrective Action Summary

**ISSUE 6:** Whether the community school failed to respond to the parent request for an Administrative Review, which was sent on September 13, 2011. This allegation was a potential violation of ORC 3301-51-05(K)(1) [Administrative Reviews] and 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

**FACTS:**

1. A copy of a letter provided by the parent, dated September 13, 2011, lists on the subject line: “Request for Records Review.” In the body of the letter the parent does indicate the belief that the school team “has failed to provide the free and appropriate education as outlined in his current Individualized Education Plan.” The parent’s communication does not use the term Administrative Review, or a request for a written response in the letter submitted.
2. The community school responded to this request via email messages on September 15, 2011 and September 16, 2011 indicating a desire to schedule an IEP team meeting.

**FINDINGS:**

The community school did not fail to respond to a parent request for an Administrative Review. The community school did not violate ORC 3301-51-05(K)(1) [Administrative Reviews] and 34 CFR §300.503 [Prior notice by the public agency; content of notice].

- Although the parent did indicate in her letter a serious concern, she failed to communicate in a discernible manner that her request was for an Administrative Review.
- The community school did respond to the parent’s concern by taking steps to schedule an IEP team meeting and later a second Facilitated IEP meeting.

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:** No corrective action required.

**ISSUE 7:** Whether the community school failed to provide the student with a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) as a function of the alleged deficiencies cited in Issues 1 – 6. The allegations could be summarized as: the IEP offered was not properly written, the academic curriculum and specially designed instruction were not properly modified to meet the needs of the student and that



services specified were not provided or not provided as specified. The alleged failure to provide FAPE is a potential violation of 34 CFR §300.17 [Free appropriate public education].

**FACTS:**

1. The reader is referred to the Findings for ISSUES 1-6.

**FINDINGS:**

As a function of the cumulative effects of the concerns outlined in Issues 1-5, the community school failed to provide the student with a Free and Appropriate Public Education. This is a violation of 34 CFR §300.17 [Free appropriate public education].

- The community school failed to provide an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) that was adequate in its services, description of specialized services, scope and detail. The IEPs presented to the parent were not constructed through proper procedures and lacked essential details and clarity to enable the parent to make an informed consent response to the various IEP offerings.
- During the period of February 4, 2011 (adopted IEP) through June 23, 2011 ("amended" IEP) the community school failed to provide 170 minutes per day of specially designed instruction in a resource room.
- The community school failed to provide Adapted Physical Education as specified on the student's adopted IEP and failed to document a rationale for any elimination of Adapted Physical Education.
- Sessions of occupational therapy were to have been provided 90 minutes per month from the time of IEP adoption. OT sessions were omitted during the time periods of 2/4/11 to 3/17/11 and 9/1/11 to 10/12/11.
- The community school failed to make needed and appropriate modifications and accommodations to the student's academic curriculum and/or failed to document by Prior Written Notice the manner in which they were providing adequate modifications to the student's curriculum. The community school delegated to parent in the role of Learning Coach responsibilities for an individualized modification of the student's curriculum in a manner that exceeded the parent's knowledge and training.
- The community school failed to provide needed transportation in support of related services, or reimbursement for such transportation.

**CORRECTIVE ACTION:** See Corrective Action Summary

**CORRECTIVE ACTION SUMMARY:**

1. The community school will reconvene the IEP team to develop a properly executed and properly signed IEP with a clear and descriptive outlining of Specially Designed Services being offered. Specially Designed Instruction shall be planned and described in a manner consistent with the needs of the student and consistent with the needs outlined in the June 17, 2011 Evaluation Team Report. If there are remaining issues in dispute with the parent the community school will provide the parent with Prior Written Notice. The IEP team will reconvene promptly and finalize an IEP no later than March 9, 2012.
2. To address the specially designed instruction that was not provided in a manner consistent with the adopted IEP during the period of February 4, 2011 through June 23, 2011 the community school will provide the student with compensatory individual tutoring sessions totaling hours. The tutoring will be provided at no cost (for tutoring or travel) to the parent. The tutor

will be a certified Intervention Specialist with experience working with handicapped populations. Tutor services to be initiated by March 16, 2012 and completed by August 31, 2012.

3. To address the gaps in occupational therapy services that were omitted during the periods of February 4, 2011 through March 17, 2011 and September 1, 2011 through October 12, 2011 the community school will provide to the student     minutes of compensatory occupational therapy at no cost (for service or travel) to the parent. Compensatory occupational therapy services to be completed by May 31, 2012.
4. The IEP that is to be developed prior to March 9, 2012 will clearly address procedures for properly trained community school personnel to make modifications to the student's curriculum in a manner that is consistent with the student's academic and behavioral needs.
5. The community school will provide to the student compensatory Adapted Physical Education Services to address the services that were not provided during the time between IEP adoption (February 4, 2011) through time of complaint (December 7, 2011) at no cost to the parent (for service or transportation). Compensatory Adapted Physical Education Services to equal minutes of total service (   months at   minutes per month). Compensatory Adapted Physical Education Services to be initiated by March 16, 2012 and completed by October 31, 2012.
6. The community school will provide to the parent financial compensation for the roundtrip transportation costs of student attendance at speech and occupational therapies during the period of February 4, 2011 through June 23, 2011.
7. The community school will work with the staff of the State Support Team – Region 1 and the Office for Exceptional Children to obtain additional training on special education procedures. The training topics will include: a) provision of a Free and Appropriate Public Education, b) writing compliant Individualized Educational Programs, and c) procedures for providing modifications to curriculum in a manner consistent with the individual needs of students. The community school will comply with any ongoing monitoring or corrective action requirements indicated by the Office for Exceptional Children.

All of your corrective action is to be in our office by **November 9, 2012**.

The due dates for corrective action to be in our office are as follows:

- Documentation of a revised IEP, which includes plans for modifying the student's curriculum, and/or documentation of Prior Written Notice to be received by **March 23, 2012**.
- Documentation of the completion of compensatory tutoring services to be received by **September 28, 2012**.
- Documentation of the completion of compensatory occupational therapy by **June 29, 2012**.
- Documentation of the completion of compensatory adapted physical education by **November 9, 2012**.
- Documentation of reimbursement for roundtrip transportation costs (as cited above) to the parent by **March 23, 2012**.
- Documentation of completion of additional training (as cited above) with the State Support Team – Region 1 or Office for Exceptional Children by **June 29, 2012**.

We appreciate your cooperation in the resolution of the complaint investigation.

Please refer to the above referenced complaint number when corresponding with this office and address all correspondence to the attention of Shirley Crabtree.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wendy Stoica". The signature is stylized with a large, loopy "W" and "S".

Wendy Stoica, Assistant Director  
Office for Exceptional Children

cc: Ms. Kristin Stewart, Superintendent  
Dr. Randel Grieser, Special Education Director  
Dr. Michael Petrasek, Educational Consultant