



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

400 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202-1475

REGION XI  
NORTH CAROLINA  
SOUTH CAROLINA  
VIRGINIA  
WASHINGTON, DC

June 7, 2016

Dr. Wayne A.I. Frederick  
President  
Howard University  
2225 Georgia Avenue NW  
Suite 603  
Washington, DC 20059

Re: OCR Complaint No. 11-15-2222  
Letter of Findings

Dear Dr. Frederick:

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) has completed its investigation of the complaint we received on April 20, 2015 against Howard University (the University). Specifically, OCR investigated whether:

1. The University retaliated against the Complainant for filing an OCR complaint by issuing a XXXX letter requiring the Complainant to undergo a XXXX and complete any required treatment before resuming his studies at the University.
2. The University discriminated against the Complainant and other students with disabilities on the basis of disability by requiring them to undergo a XXXX assessment and treatment before resuming their studies at the University.<sup>1</sup>

OCR enforces Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) and its implementing regulation, at 34 C.F.R. Part 104, which prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability in programs and activities that receive Federal financial assistance from the Department. OCR also enforces Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI) and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 100, which prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department. The laws enforced by OCR also prohibit retaliation against any individual who asserts rights or privileges under these laws or who files a complaint, testifies, or participates in an OCR proceeding. Because the University receives Federal financial assistance from the Department, OCR has jurisdiction over it pursuant to Section 504 and Title VI.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the Complainant alleged retaliation, during the course of OCR's investigation, OCR identified a potential compliance concern with the University's practice of requiring students to undergo a full psycho-diagnostic assessment.

In reaching a determination, OCR reviewed documents provided by the Complainant and the University and interviewed the Complainant and University staff. After carefully considering all of the information obtained regarding Allegation 2, OCR determined that a preponderance of the evidence supports a conclusion that the University failed to comply with 34 C.F.R. Part 104. The University agreed to resolve the noncompliance through the enclosed resolution agreement. OCR found insufficient evidence with regard to Allegation 1.

OCR's findings and conclusions are discussed below.

### **Background**

The Complainant enrolled in the XXXX school at the University in the XXXX. Prior to the start of that semester, the Complainant registered with the University's Office of the Dean for Special Student Services (Student Services) as a student with a disability and was approved for accommodations for XXXX. Neither party disputes that the Complainant is a qualified student with a disability. Documentation reviewed by OCR reflects that the Complainant was registered with Student Services, and the University did not contend that the Complainant was ever a threat to the safety of others or otherwise not qualified for the academic program. In addition to his known disability, the Student Services Dean indicated to OCR that she regarded the Complainant as having anxiety. The Student Services Dean based this belief on a call with the Complainant's doctor, in which the doctor mentioned that he recommended XXXX for the Complainant, and on her own conversations with the Complainant.

The Complainant expressed dissatisfaction with the University's provision of his approved accommodations on multiple occasions during the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 academic years. According to University officials, the manner in which the Complainant expressed his dissatisfaction caused the officials concern. University officials highlighted a few specific incidents, including: a 2013-2014 academic year confrontation in the University library between the Complainant and library staff; several incidents in the Student Services office; and a XXXX call with the University's Vice Dean and Dean for Academic Affairs (Vice Dean).<sup>2</sup> Both the Complainant and the University acknowledged a heated exchange in the library when the Complainant sought to switch study rooms. While the Complainant attributed any mistreatment of library and security staff to feeling threatened, the Student Services Dean noted that the Complainant's loud threats directed at security staff were in response to a request that he move to an area of the library that would remain open (because the area in which he was studying at the time was closing). Second, the Student Services Dean (and a second Student Services staff member) described visits by the Complainant to Student Services in which he yelled at staff, including one visit in which the Complainant curled up into a fetal position in the office and had an individual on the phone yell at Student Services staff along with him. The Complainant contested the Student Services Dean's description of this incident. Finally, three University officials, two during interviews with OCR and in statements to the University's Honor Council and one in a statement before the University's Honor Council, described a fifteen- to twenty-minute call in which the Complainant yelled loudly at the Vice Dean over an exam scheduling matter.

---

<sup>2</sup> These incidents are also described in OCR's letter of findings for OCR Complaint No. 11-15-2040.

While concerned with the Complainant's actions and aware of his possible anxiety (later confirmed in medical documentation provided to the University in spring 2015), University officials indicated that the University took limited or no action to stop or de-escalate these behaviors. The Student Services Dean told OCR that the University had sought to provide the Complainant with his specifically requested accommodations (*e.g.*, a particular study or exam room) to avoid these behaviors. The Assistant Dean, on the other hand, told OCR that the University had not adopted any measures to de-escalate the Complainant's behavior.

Before any further attempts at de-escalation, the Student Services Dean made what she described to OCR as an "executive decision" to require the Complainant to undergo a XXXX assessment.<sup>3</sup> The Student Services Dean told OCR that "the University does not have an extant policy that explicitly requires a student to have an assessment; rather, upon advice and counsel, the request is made to protect students and the University and to provide time for students to understand disruptive behaviors." She added that students generally will sign a withdrawal form voluntarily. According to the Student Services Dean, the Complainant's behavior was inhibiting his ability to succeed academically and interrupting the functioning of University operations. The Student Services Dean confirmed to OCR that she did not consider the Complainant to be a safety threat.

In a December 19, 2014 letter, the Student Services Dean communicated the XXXX assessment requirement to the Complainant at the end of the XXXX semester. The Student Services Dean wrote that the Complainant was required to undergo a XXXX assessment to include a diagnosis, recommendations for accommodations, and a recommendation supporting his return to the University for spring 2015. The letter provides that the assessment information would be used by the University to decide on the Complainant's readiness and suitability to continue on with his coursework. The Student Services Dean stated that she believed this assessment was necessary based on the Complainant's past behaviors and that she did not have the opportunity to consult with any University officials before making the decision because it was made at the end of the semester, when most administrators were unavailable.

The Complainant did not submit the XXXX assessment requested in the XXXX letter and continued on with his classes at the University. Ultimately, after the Complainant took voluntary leave on three occasions early in the XXXX semester (and submitted supporting documentation from his physician), the University issued a letter on XXXX, placing the Complainant on involuntary medical leave and outlining conditions of his return, including requiring a XXXX assessment, completion of any required treatment, and a letter from a physician stating that he was physically cleared to return. Due to the Complainant's past disruptive behavior and, to a lesser extent, the medical documentation provided in support of his voluntary leave, which the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (Associate Dean) noted could suggest that the Complainant was not responding to treatment, the University placed the Complainant on involuntary medical leave and (again) required him to undergo a full assessment. In the March

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on the Complainant's continued matriculation and description of the initial letter as a request, OCR initially, after its review of the documentation, considered the December 19, 2014 letter from the Student Services Dean as permissive and not compulsory. The Complainant and University officials, in particular the Student Services Dean, later emphasized that the XXXX letter was a requirement – not a request. Therefore, OCR analyzed the December 19 request from the Student Services Dean as a requirement to undergo XXXX assessment as a condition of returning to the University for the XXXX semester.

24, 2015 letter, the Vice Dean and Associate Dean advised the Complainant of his right to appeal the decision per the College of Medicine Policies and Procedures Manual (the Manual). The Manual specifies that all appeals must be filed in the form of a letter signed by the student who is appealing and indicate the nature of and reasons for the appeal.

The Complainant subsequently alerted OCR to the XXXX assessment requirement and alleged that the requirement was imposed in retaliation for his OCR complaint.

## **Analysis**

### **Allegation 2: Different Treatment**

The Section 504 regulation, at 34 C.F.R. § 104.43(a), provides that a qualified person with a disability may not be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to discrimination in any postsecondary aids, benefits, or services on the basis of disability. When investigating an allegation of different treatment, OCR first determines whether there is sufficient evidence to establish an initial, or prima facie, case of discrimination. Specifically, OCR determines whether the University treated the Complainant less favorably than similarly situated individuals without disabilities. If so, OCR then determines whether the University had a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the different treatment. Finally, OCR determines whether the reason given by the University is a pretext, or excuse, for unlawful discrimination.

OCR first considered whether the University treated the Complainant (and other students with disabilities or perceived to have disabilities) less favorably than students without disabilities in requiring the Complainant (in the XXXX letters) to submit to a XXXX assessment in order to continue his coursework at the University. During the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years, the University required XXXX assessment in order to return to the University. After OCR inquired as to the disability status of the students who had been required to undergo a XXXX assessment as a condition of return, the University indicated that every student required to undergo an assessment was a student with a disability registered with Student Services.<sup>4</sup> Because every student required to undergo the assessment was a student with a disability, OCR found sufficient evidence to establish an initial case of disability discrimination.

OCR next considered whether the University had a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the XXXX assessment requirements.

***December 2014 Requirement***

The Student Services Dean offered a few reasons for imposing the XXXX assessment requirement on the Complainant XXXX. The primary reason offered for the assessment requirement was that the Complainant's behavior was disrupting the educational process of the University. The Student Services Dean further conveyed a belief that the Complainant's actions were not acceptable in a university setting and that she intended to assist the Complainant in addressing his issues before instituting any disciplinary process, which had the potential of resulting in the Complainant's removal from the University. While discussing the reasoning behind her decision and the process by which she concluded an assessment requirement was appropriate, the Student Services Dean did not describe referencing or adhering to any prescribed University policy; instead, she noted that the timing of the decision required her to make an "executive decision" without consulting with other University officials.

After first indicating that the University did not have a specific policy for requiring XXXX assessments, the Student Services Dean later alluded to a procedure in the University's Code of Student Conduct (the Code) by which the University may require a XXXX assessment. The Code provides for the requirement of medical documentation at two stages in the process of emergency action suspension or emergency withdrawal. Prior to a hearing, a student who has been subjected to an emergency action suspension or involuntary administrative withdrawal "must provide medical documentation from a licensed physician to the Dean of Student Services, as stipulated in the withdrawal notice." After a hearing on the emergency action suspension or involuntary withdrawal, if the University decides that the suspension or withdrawal is to remain in place, the University will communicate the length of the suspension or withdrawal and any stipulations governing the student's return, including but not limited to "providing the University with written documentation from a certified healthcare professional indicating that the student is able to return."

The procedures outlined in this Code provision were not applied by the Student Services Dean in requiring the Complainant to undergo XXXX assessment. The Student Services Dean's XXXX requirement that the Complainant undergo an assessment does not fit within the pre- or post-hearing procedures outlined in the Code. The XXXX letter, in which the Student Services Dean required the assessment, makes no mention of an emergency action suspension or involuntary withdrawal, either of which could have triggered the procedure for pre-hearing medical documentation. Nor did the Student Services Dean mention either of these procedures when interviewed by OCR. Similarly, the post-hearing assessment requirement mentioned in the Code was inapplicable to this request since the University did not contend that the Complainant had been subjected to involuntary withdrawal or had participated in a hearing prior to the XXXX assessment requirement. Therefore, OCR determined that the Student Services Dean could not have applied the Code in deciding to require the Complainant to undergo a XXXX assessment because the relevant language in the Code is inapplicable. Rather, as first explained by the Student Services Dean, the University did not have an existing policy that was considered in requiring the Complainant to undergo the assessment.

### ***March 2015 Requirement***

Like the Student Services Dean, the Associate Dean relied upon the Complainant's past behaviors, which he described as unprofessional and disruptive, in placing the Complainant on involuntary medical leave and requiring a XXXX assessment in XXXX. Although the Associate Dean did not identify a policy for requiring XXXX assessments, and the University indicated in its response to OCR that it "does not have a written policy explicitly requiring a student to undergo a XXXX assessment," OCR reviewed the University's policies and procedures as outlined in the University's Code and the Medical School's Manual to determine whether any procedures provided for the involuntary medical leave and assessment condition imposed on the Complainant.

OCR identified a potentially relevant procedure for requiring medical documentation in the Code. The Code does not provide for a separate process for placing a student on involuntary medical leave; instead, the placement of a student on involuntary medical leave appears to fall within the involuntary administrative withdrawal and emergency action suspension category. For instance, one of the University's stated reasons for requiring the assessment of the Complainant – disruption of the operation of the University's functions – could fall under the following involuntary administrative withdrawal category: "This policy will be instituted in the event that a student . . . (c) demonstrates behavior, due to mental, emotional, or medical incapacitation, which poses an imminent danger of causing significant property damage, or directly and substantially impedes the lawful activities of others or interferes with the educational process."

However, the University did not apply this involuntary administrative withdrawal provision of the Code in placing the Complainant on involuntary leave and requiring the XXXX assessment. First, the University official responsible for the assessment requirement did not describe the requirement as an involuntary administrative withdrawal in the XXXX letter or in interviews with OCR. The XXXX letter indicated that the College of Medicine was placing the Complainant on "medical leave of absence", and the Associate Dean did not mention an involuntary administrative withdrawal provision when generally describing the policies or practices under which the University may require XXXX assessments, or when specifically identifying the potential bases for the Complainant's assessment requirement. Second, the University did not follow the procedures for applying an involuntary withdrawal. While the University requested medical documentation after notifying the Complainant of his involuntary leave and right to appeal, the University did not provide any documentation of notifying the Complainant of or holding a hearing within thirty days of the involuntary withdrawal notice, as is required by the Code. The University's failure to follow the hearing procedure outlined in the Code suggests that it was not relying on the involuntary administrative withdrawal procedure when it placed the Complainant on involuntary leave and required a full XXXX assessment.

Unlike the Code, which contains a potentially applicable procedure, the Medical School's Manual does not provide for any procedure relevant to the involuntary leave and assessment requirement imposed on the Complainant. The Manual only references administrative withdrawal put into place because of a student's failure to achieve satisfactory academic progress

and does not provide for any process by which a student would be placed on involuntary medical leave or administratively withdrawn due to disruptive behavior.

The Associate Dean added that another perhaps lesser consideration would have been the Complainant's medical leave documentation. The medical leave documentation reflected that the Complainant was seeking treatment for anxiety, and his leave was extended on at least one occasion. The Associate Dean told OCR that the documentation could be read to suggest that the Complainant was not responding to treatment. Although offered only as a secondary reason for requiring the assessment, OCR notes that the Assistant Dean's assumptions as to the status of the Complainant's conditions based on documentation provided for voluntary medical leave would not constitute a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the assessment requirement.

With both the XXXX and XXXX requirements to undergo a XXXX assessment, the University was unable to identify any existing policy that was considered at the time of the requests. And the policies identified by University officials as potentially supporting XXXX requirements were either inapplicable or not properly implemented in imposing the XXXX requirement.<sup>5</sup>

In sum, OCR found that University officials did not point to a legitimate explanation for requiring a XXXX assessment from the Complainant and, even if the reasons offered by the University could have constituted a legitimate justification, the University failed to follow procedures outlined in potentially applicable policies. Because the University did not follow any applicable policy for when it may require a student to undergo a XXXX assessment on the basis of past disruptive behavior, OCR found that the University failed to offer a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for requiring the Complainant to undergo a XXXX assessment. Therefore, OCR concluded that there was sufficient evidence to find that the University discriminated against the Complainant on the basis of disability when it required him to undergo the assessment and treatment before resuming his studies.

### *Application to other students*

Along with the documentation of the University's policies and procedures, the University provided a list of students who had been required to undergo an assessment, as was required of the Complainant. During the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years, the University required twenty students to undergo a XXXX assessment in order to return to the University. After OCR inquired as to the disability status of students who had been required to undergo a XXXX assessment as a condition of return, the University indicated that every student required to undergo the assessment was a student with a disability registered with Student Services. The University listed the conditions and symptoms for which students were required to undergo the XXXX assessment. <XXXX PARAGRAPH REDACTED XXXX> This response raised further concern about whether the University was requiring an overbroad assessment of students with disabilities and whether the disruption of University functions was a pretext for unlawful discrimination on the basis of disability.

---

<sup>5</sup> The lack of a formal procedure identified as applicable to requiring psycho-diagnostic assessments also deprived students of the due process rights – participating in a hearing and filing an appeal – afforded to students placed on emergency suspension or involuntary administrative withdrawal.

In addition to the lack of clear policies and procedures by which the University may require a psycho-diagnostic assessment, OCR is concerned that the return conditions set by the University for the Complainant and other students with disabilities may be overbroad and inconsistent with Section 504. For example, it is unclear how the assessment required of the Complainant is related to the behaviors and concerns for which he was placed on medical leave and it is not specified what the University would look for in documentation from the Complainant's physician to determine whether he was fit to return to courses.

### **Allegation 1: Retaliation**

When analyzing a claim of retaliation, OCR will look at: 1) whether the Complainant engaged in a protected activity (e.g., filed a complaint or asserted a right under a law OCR enforces); 2) whether the University took a materially adverse action against the Complainant; and 3) whether there is some evidence that the University took the adverse action as a result of the Complainant's protected activity. If all these elements are present, this establishes an initial, or *prima facie*, case of retaliation. OCR then determines whether the University has a legitimate, non-retaliatory reason for its action. Finally, OCR examines whether the University's reason for its action is a pretext, or excuse, for unlawful retaliation.

OCR first considered whether the Complainant engaged in a protected activity. An individual engages in a protected activity if he opposes an act or policy that he reasonably believes is unlawful under one of the laws that OCR enforces, makes a complaint, or participates in any manner in an investigation or proceeding conducted under any of the laws that OCR enforces. Here, the Complainant filed a complaint with OCR in XXXX, and University officials were made aware of the complaint. By filing a complaint with OCR, the Complainant both made a complaint and participated in an investigation under the laws enforced by OCR; therefore, he engaged in a protected activity. In addition to his complaint, the Complainant had repeatedly, during the 2013-2014 academic year and at the start of the 2014-2015 academic year, complained about the provision of his approved accommodations. These actions also constituted a protected activity.

Because the Complainant engaged in a protected activity, OCR considered whether the request for a XXXX assessment constituted an adverse action. An adverse action is something that could deter a reasonable person from engaging in further protected activity. The Complainant was burdened by the requirement to undergo the assessment and put at risk of not being able to continue his studies at the University. OCR finds that the XXXX assessment requirement could deter a reasonable person from engaging in future protected activity.

OCR then considered whether there is some evidence that the University required the XXXX assessments of the Complainant on XXXX because of the Complainant's advocacy. OCR first reviewed whether there is some evidence that the XXXX assessment requirement was imposed because of the Complainant's advocacy. The advocacy identified by the Complainant, his filing of an OCR complaint, took place on XXXX, after the first XXXX assessment was imposed on the Complainant on XXXX. Since the Complainant filed his OCR complaint after the first assessment requirement was imposed, the timing of the assessment requirement (before the OCR complaint) did not offer support for a finding that the assessment requirement was imposed

because of the OCR complaint. Moreover, the Student Services Dean did not make any statements or indicate in writing that she was aware of any OCR complaint to be filed or otherwise biased against the Complainant because of any protected activity.

Before the Complainant was required to undergo the assessment in XXXX, the Complainant had engaged in advocacy around his approved accommodation for a quiet testing room. As discussed above, it was as a result of these interactions with administrators that the Student Services Dean became concerned about the Complainant's perceived disability and disruption of University operations. The Student Services Dean then relied on these behaviors and her desire to have the Complainant address his perceived disability in imposing the XXXX assessment requirement. Although the University did not follow proper procedure in imposing the requirement, which formed the basis for the disability discrimination finding analyzed above, OCR did not find evidence that the XXXX assessment requirement was imposed because of the Complainant's December OCR complaint or his earlier advocacy.

OCR next considered whether there is some evidence that the XXXX assessment requirement was imposed because of a protected activity. While the second assessment requirement was imposed after the Complainant filed his OCR complaint, the XXXX requirement only reasserted the conditions imposed on XXXX assessment requirement required a full XXXX assessment, along with information about treatment and progress, for the University to make a decision as to the Complainant's readiness and suitability to continue his matriculation in the XXXX. The XXXX letter required similar documentation, while also placing the Complainant on involuntary medical leave.<sup>6</sup> The documentation provided by the Complainant and the University did not reflect that the Complainant engaged in any further advocacy after the XXXX assessment requirement. Although the Complainant provided documentation reflecting his attempts to reschedule exams in XXXX, including a XXXX letter requesting to reschedule exams to the end of a XXXX course, the Complainant did not appear to engage in any further advocacy relating to his approved accommodations or disability rights more generally. OCR did not find evidence that the Complainant engaged in further advocacy after the XXXX assessment and before the XXXX assessment requirement, which could have served as circumstantial evidence of a connection because the advocacy would have been shortly before the XXXX assessment and after the initial assessment requirement. Likewise, OCR did not find direct evidence of a causal connection: no University official involved in deciding on the XXXX assessment requirement expressed bias against the Complainant because of any protected activity. Therefore, as with the XXXX assessment requirement, OCR did not find evidence that the University imposed the XXXX assessment requirement and involuntary leave of absence because of the Complainant's protected activity.

With both the XXXX and XXXX assessment requirements, OCR found that there is insufficient evidence to find that the University required assessments (or imposed involuntary leave in the case of the XXXX letter) because of the Complainant's advocacy.

---

<sup>6</sup> If the involuntary leave requirement is viewed as a separate, adverse action against the Complainant, the University offered a legitimate, non-retaliatory reason for imposing the involuntary leave: the Complainant's eight-week absence caused him to miss instruction necessary to moving on to the third year of medical school. Notably, the University provided documentation reflecting that none of the other students who had been placed on leave and asked to undergo a XXXX assessment had advocated for a right under the laws enforced by OCR.

## **Conclusion**

While OCR finds that there is insufficient evidence to support a finding of retaliation, OCR finds that the evidence is sufficient to find that the University discriminated against the Complainant and other students with disabilities when it required them to undergo a XXXX assessment before resuming their studies at the University.

On XXXX, the University agreed to implement the enclosed Resolution Agreement (Agreement), which commits the University to take specific steps to address the identified areas of noncompliance. The Agreement entered into by the University is designed to resolve the issues of noncompliance. Under Section 303(b) of OCR's *Case Processing Manual*, a complaint will be considered resolved and the University deemed compliant if the University enters into an agreement that, fully performed, will remedy the identified areas of noncompliance (pursuant to Section 303(b)). OCR will monitor closely the University's implementation of the Agreement to ensure that the commitments made are implemented timely and effectively. OCR may conduct additional visits and may request additional information as necessary to determine whether the University has fulfilled the terms of the Agreement and is in compliance with Section 504 and Title II with regard to the issues raised. As stated in the Agreement entered into by the University on June 3, 2016, if the University fails to implement the Agreement, OCR may initiate administrative enforcement or judicial proceedings, including to enforce the specific terms and obligations of the Agreement. Before initiating administrative enforcement (34 C.F.R. §§ 100.9, 100.10) or judicial proceedings, including to enforce the Agreement, OCR shall give the University written notice of the alleged breach and sixty (60) calendar days to cure the alleged breach.

This concludes OCR's investigation of the complaint. This letter should not be interpreted to address the University's compliance with any other regulatory provision or to address any issues other than those addressed in this letter. This letter sets forth OCR's determination in an individual OCR case. This letter is not a formal statement of OCR policy and should not be relied upon, cited, or construed as such. OCR's formal policy statements are approved by a duly authorized OCR official and made available to the public. The complainant may have the right to file a private suit in federal court whether or not OCR finds a violation.

Please be advised that the University must not harass, coerce, intimidate, discriminate, or otherwise retaliate against an individual because that individual asserts a right or privilege under a law enforced by OCR or files a complaint, testifies, or participates in an OCR proceeding. If this happens, the individual may file a retaliation complaint with OCR.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, it may be necessary to release this document and related correspondence and records upon request. If OCR receives such a request, we will seek to protect personally identifiable information that could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy if released, to the extent provided by law.

We appreciate the University's cooperation in the resolution of this complaint. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Judy Briggs, the OCR Senior Investigator assigned

to this complaint, at 202-453-5902 or [judy.briggs@ed.gov](mailto:judy.briggs@ed.gov), or Marcelo Quiñones, the OCR attorney assigned to this complaint, at 202-453-6567 or [marcelo.quinones@ed.gov](mailto:marcelo.quinones@ed.gov).

Sincerely,

/S/

Alessandro Terenzoni  
Supervisory Attorney, Team II  
Office for Civil Rights  
District of Columbia Office

Enclosure

cc via email: Adonna Bannister Green, Esq.