

**BEFORE THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

In the Matter of Three Rivers School District	) ) ) ) )	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS, AND FINAL ORDER Redacted Case No. 08-054-013
--	-----------------------	---

**I. BACKGROUND**

On April 2, 2008, the Oregon Department of Education (Department) received a letter of complaint from the parent of a student attending school and residing in the Three Rivers School District (District). The parent requested that the Department conduct a special education complaint investigation under OAR 581-015-2030. Under federal and state law, the Department must investigate written complaints that allege violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and issue a final order within 60 days of receiving the complaint, unless exceptional circumstances require an extension. There were no exceptional circumstances warranting an extension, and this order is issued within 60 days of receipt of this complaint.

On April 14, 2008, the Department sent a *Request for Response* to the District identifying the specific allegations in the complaint the Department would investigate. The District submitted its timely *Response* to the allegations, and made a copy available to the parent. The Department’s complaint investigator contacted both the parent and the District’s special education director by telephone and discussed the issues in this complaint, and the facts and circumstances. The Department’s complaint investigator reviewed all of the information submitted by the parent and the District, and determined it was not necessary to conduct on-site interviews to resolve the issues in this complaint.

**II. ALLEGATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The Department has jurisdiction to resolve this complaint under 34 CFR 300.151-300.153 and OAR 581-015-2030. The allegations and the Department’s conclusions are set out in the chart below. The Department based its conclusions on the Findings of Fact (Section III) and the Discussion (Section IV).

<b>#.</b>	<b>Allegations</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>
(1)	<b><u>IEP Progress Reports:</u></b>  The parent alleged that the District only provided progress reports for the speech-language goals in her daughter’s April 10, 2007 IEP.	<b>Not Contested.</b>  The District acknowledged its failure to provide progress reports as required in the student’s IEP. See Stipulated Corrective Action.

#.	Allegations	Conclusions
(2)	<p><b><u>Implementation of April 10, 2007 IEP:</u></b></p> <p>(a) The parent alleged that the District did not implement her daughter's April 10, 2007 IEP in a timely manner. Specifically, the parent alleged that the District did not implement the IEP until after 5/24/07; and</p> <p>(b) The parent alleged that the District did not provide all of the services required by her daughter's IEP. Specifically, the parent alleged that the District did not fully implement the services described in the April 10, 2007 IEP until 12/6/07.</p>	<p><b>Not Contested.</b></p> <p>The District acknowledged the allegations concerning implementation of the student's April 10, 2007 IEP.</p> <p>The District has provided compensatory education services to the student and training to the staff. See Stipulated Corrective Action.</p>
(3)	<p><b><u>IEP Team Composition:</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District's IEP team did not include a member who could interpret the instructional implications of the evaluation results (her daughter's identification as a child with autism spectrum disorder).</p>	<p><b>Not substantiated.</b></p> <p>The parent acknowledged that an autism specialist was a member of the student's IEP team, and could interpret the instructional implications of her daughter's evaluation results.</p>
(4)	<p><b><u>IEP Meeting Notices:</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District did not provide her with written notice for IEP meetings on 11/5/07, 11/14/07, and 12/6/07.</p>	<p><b>Substantiated.</b></p> <p>OAR 581-015-2100 requires that a District must provide a written notice for an IEP meeting sufficiently in advance to allow parents to attend. The requirement is not affected by whether or not a meeting ultimately does not occur. The District did not provide written notice for the November 5 and November 14, 2007 meetings. Although District files contained a written meeting notice for the December 6, 2007 meeting, the District did not dispute that the parent received the notice after the meeting was held. See Corrective Action.</p>
(5)	<p><b><u>Copy of IEP:</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District did not timely respond to her requests for a</p>	<p><b>Not contested.</b></p> <p>The District acknowledged that it did not timely provide the parent with a copy of the</p>

#.	Allegations	Conclusions
	revised copy of her daughter's IEP with amendments following a 12/6/07 meeting.	student's IEP with revisions from the 12/06/07 meeting. See Corrective Action.
(6)	<p><b><u>Access to Records:</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District did not provide her with timely access to her daughter's education records. Specifically, the parent alleged that she requested access to weekly data on her daughter's progress at a 12/6/07 IEP meeting which has not been made available to her.</p>	<p><b>Not contested.</b></p> <p>The District acknowledged that it did not provide the parent with timely access to the educational records requested at the 12/06/07 meeting. See Corrective Action.</p>
(7)	<p><b><u>Review and Revision of IEP:</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District did not timely review and revise her daughter's IEP to address a lack of expected progress towards the annual goals.</p>	<p><b>Not contested.</b></p> <p>The District acknowledged that it did not timely review and revise the student's IEP to address a lack of expected progress towards the annual goals. See Stipulated Corrective Action.</p>
(8)	<p><b><u>Measuring Student Progress:</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District did not develop or implement services to measure student's progress towards the annual goals on IEP.</p>	<p><b>Not contested.</b></p> <p>The District acknowledged that it did not develop or implement services to measure the student's progress towards the annual goals. See Stipulated Corrective Action.</p>
(9)	<p><b><u>Appropriate Services:</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District did not implement appropriate special education services, based on empirically validated instructional strategies and programs.</p>	<p><b>Substantiated.</b></p> <p>The District purchased curriculum intended to meet the needs of the student and to support the provision of appropriate special education services. The District did not implement the newly purchased curriculum or fully implement the student's April 10, 2007 IEP until after December 12, 2007. See Stipulated Corrective Action.</p>
(10)	<p><b><u>IEP Implementation: Accommodations</u></b></p> <p>The parent alleged that the District did not implement the accommodations specified in the revised December 6, 2007 IEP. Specifically, the parent alleged that the educational assistants did not take meaningful baseline and</p>	<p><b>Partially Substantiated.</b></p> <p>The Department finds that the District did not provide the parent with weekly data collection for each goal on the student's IEP. The District did provide the adult assistance in the regular classroom to take data on assignments and report to the special</p>

#.	Allegations	Conclusions
	intervention data to measure progress on IEP goals. In addition, the parents alleged that the educational assistants enabled, rather than furthered, the student's goals in organization, advocacy and study skills.	education teacher, consistent with the IEP.

### III. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The student resides within the District, is enrolled in the eleventh grade, and attends a District school. The District provided services for the student for most of the 2006-07 school year as a child with a communication disorder. On April 10, 2007, the District held a meeting and determined that the student was eligible for special education and related services as a child with autism spectrum disorder (related to her diagnosed Asperger's Syndrome condition).

#### **2006-07 School Year (April 10, 2007 IEP)**

2. The District developed a new IEP for the student dated April 10, 2007, with goals and objectives addressing the student's communication needs, but not her needs in other areas. The District therefore scheduled another IEP meeting for May 5, 2007 to address the student's needs in the areas of organization and study skills. The District actually convened the meeting on May 8, 2007, but a regular education teacher was not present. The District then reconvened the IEP team on May 15, 2007 and completed the IEP
3. The student's April 10, 2007 IEP provided for specially designed instruction in the areas of self-advocacy, study skills, and organization, with resource room services in each area to begin May 8, 2007, together with autism consultation and other services. The student's case manager, however, did not implement the new program for the student at that time due to conflicts with student projects and final exam preparation. The new case manager also requested training in program implementation. The new case manager intended to begin implementation of the student's IEP on May 24, 2007, but instead later changed the dates on the student's April 10, 2007 to state services were to begin on September 4, 2007. The student completed the 2006-07 school year with a GPA of 3.3, earning all credits.
4. An autism specialist with experience and training in the area of autism spectrum disorder, and who could interpret the instructional implications of the student's evaluation results, attended the April 10, 2007, May 8, 2007, and May 15, 2007 IEP meetings. The parent agreed that the autism specialist participated in each of these meetings, and had the experience and training necessary to interpret the instructional implications of the student's evaluation results for the team. The parent clarified that her complaint concerned the assigned case manager not having the necessary training and experience to provide the services her daughter needed.

5. The District reviewed its files and found that while District records contained progress reports for June 2007, November 2007, February 2008, and April 2008, the special education teacher completed these progress reports late and, except for the February 2008 and April 2008 reports did not send them to the parent.

### **2007-08 School Year**

6. In the early fall, the District allocated substitute time and curriculum so that staff could train and practice for implementing the "Adjusting the Image" curriculum purchased by the District as part of the student's educational program.
7. At the request of the parent, the District scheduled meetings for November 5, 2007, and November 14, 2007, to review and revise the student's IEP. The District did not provide the parent with written notice for either of these meetings in advance. However, meetings were not actually held on either of these dates due to bomb threats that occurred at the high school on those dates. The case manager for the student indicated that email exchanges occurred between himself, the parent, and the District's director of special education services regarding the difficulties of scheduling a meeting prior to December 6, 2007 due to school wide disturbances and holidays.
8. The District held an IEP meeting on December 6, 2007 to review and revise the student's IEP. The team including the parent discussed a number of issues concerning implementation of the student's IEP and providing services the student required and wrote an addendum to the IEP. The autism specialist participated in the December 6, 2007 IEP meeting, as did both the student's parents. District records included a copy of the written notice of team meeting for the December 6, 2007 meeting which was dated November 26, 2007. The parent asserted, however, that she did not actually receive the written meeting notice until after the December 6, 2007 meeting. The parent also asserted that she requested access to copies of weekly data reports concerning her daughter's progress, in addition to a copy of the revised IEP at the December 6, 2007 meeting.
9. The December 6, 2007 revision of the student's IEP added two accommodations. The first accommodation required the District to provide adult assistance in the regular classroom to take data on assignments and report to the special education teacher. The second accommodation required the District to provide weekly data to the parent on the data collection for each goal.
10. The District developed a data-tracking sheet for the educational assistant to use in collecting data for each goal on the student's IEP. The parent contends, however, that the data the educational assistant actually kept was not meaningfully related to the goals and objectives on the student's IEP.

11. The District asserts that the educational assistant was directed to observe and record the data concerning the student's performance, and to not further the student's dependency on adult assistance. The District reported that it provided training for the educational assistant that included instruction and modeling by a second special education teacher of appropriate data-taking techniques.
12. The educational assistants assigned to implement the data-taking provisions on the student's IEP used anecdotal notes of their observations, and used a data-tracking form listing the student's objectives by annual goal, with places to record daily data. The anecdotal notes generally kept track of the student's classroom assignments, provided information on what the class is doing, and provided observations of the student.
13. The data tracking sheets the educational assistants used with the student consisted of a monthly form for each of the student's annual goals, listing each of the student's objectives by goal, with space for an entry each day. For example, the student's annual goal for her advocacy services stated: "[The student] will demonstrate self advocacy skills by discussing her specific learning needs, her IEP goals and why she is working on them, and comparing and contrasting differences in educators." The first of three related objectives stated: "[The student] will discuss her specific learning needs and necessary accommodations in the intervention session and with 2 unfamiliar adults (one of them being the school counselor) in 2 out of 3 consecutive trials each on separate days." The January 2008 data-tracking sheet contained one entry for the month concerning this objective, noting for January 22, 2008: "Discussion 20 minutes." There were no entries for the second objective, and two entries for the third objective. Most of the data-tracking sheets are similarly incomplete, with no entries for most objectives, and the entries made not reflecting the student's performance on the objective.
14. On December 12, 2007, the autism specialist, District special education coordinator, and case manager/special education teacher developed lesson plans, data tracking forms, and calendar usage program to use with the student.
15. The parent expressed concern that the special education teacher had failed to implement special education instruction or a plan to measure the student's progress. The parent also expressed concern that the District had not trained the educational assistant adequately to take data documenting student's progress toward IEP goals.
16. The parent made repeated requests to the case manager for a copy of the revised December 6, 2007 IEP addendum, including a February 26, 2008 email request. The case manager mailed the revised December 6, 2007 IEP to the District's offices on April 17, 2008, and the District mailed a copy of it to the parent on April 18, 2008.
17. On April 1, 2008, the District provided the parent with written notice that it was having an IEP meeting for the student on April 7, 2008. The District held the April 7,

2008 meeting and developed a new IEP for the student. The autism specialist participated in the April 7, 2008 meeting.

18. The District acknowledged substantially all of the allegations made by the parent in this complaint, and already had taken several steps to compensate for its failure to provide services to the student before this complaint was filed. The District provided additional educational assistant time for the student in the regular classroom to collect data and report performance to the case manager/special education teacher. The District provided assistance to the case manager, and educational assistants assigned to the student, in planning, collecting data, and recording data. In February 2008, the District purchased and provided tape recorders for the student to record her regular education courses.
19. The District also determined before this complaint was filed that compensatory education services were appropriate. From January 2008 through March 2008, the District provided over 43 hours of compensatory education services with a different special education teacher as instructor for the student for services lost in 2007.

## **IV. DISCUSSION**

### **A. Obligation of School Districts to Develop and Implement IEPs**

Under the IDEA, school Districts must develop and implement an IEP for each eligible student.<sup>1</sup> An IEP must be in effect for each eligible student at the beginning of each school year.<sup>2</sup> The student's IEP must describe how a student's progress towards meeting the annual goals will be measured and when periodic reports on the progress the student is making toward meeting the annual goals (such as through the use of quarterly or other periodic reports, concurrent with the issuance of report cards) will be provided.<sup>3</sup> School Districts also must timely reconvene IEP teams to review and revise a student's IEP to address any lack of expected progress towards the annual goals.<sup>4</sup>

The District must provide the special education and related services to a child with a disability in accordance with an IEP.<sup>5</sup> School Districts must also ensure that: a) the IEP is accessible to each regular education teacher, special education teacher, related service provider and other service provider who is responsible for its implementation, and (b) inform each teacher and provider of his or her specific responsibilities for implementing the child's IEP and the specific accommodations, modifications and supports that must be provided for or on behalf of the child in accordance with the IEP.<sup>6</sup> School Districts are responsible for the supervision of staff responsible for providing the services on a student's IEP, and must provide necessary training and supervision for

---

<sup>1</sup> OAR 581-015-2220

<sup>2</sup> OAR 581-015-2220

<sup>3</sup> OAR 581-015-2200(1)(c) Content of IEP (Progress reports toward annual goals)

<sup>4</sup> OAR 581-015-2225 Review and Revision of IEPs

<sup>5</sup> OAR 581-015-2220.

<sup>6</sup> OAR 581-015-2220.

educational assistants assigned to work with students.<sup>7</sup>

The parent's uncontested allegations in this complaint concerned several issues related to IEP implementation. The District acknowledged its errors with respect to progress reports, and implementation of the student's April 10, 2007 IEP, including not providing the services required by the IEP, not implementing the data collection systems to measure the student's progress, and not timely reviewing and revising the student's IEP to address a lack of expected progress towards the IEP goals.

## **B. IEP Team Composition**

OAR 581-015-2210 specifies the required participants in an annual IEP meeting including a student's parents, and, an IEP team member who can interpret the instructional implications of the evaluation results for the student.<sup>8</sup> The parent alleged the District failed to include a member on the IEP team who could interpret the instructional implications of the evaluation results for the team. The parent later clarified that that her complaint concerned the assigned case manager not having the necessary training and experience to provide the services her daughter needed. The parent subsequently agreed with the District's position that the inclusion of the autism specialist met this requirement. Therefore, the Department does not substantiate this allegation.

## **C. IEP Meeting Notices**

School Districts must provide one or both parents with an opportunity to participate in meetings with respect to their child's identification, evaluation, IEP development and implementation, and education placement.<sup>9</sup> A District must provide written notice "sufficiently in advance to ensure that one or both parents will have an opportunity to attend."<sup>10</sup>

The parent alleged that the District did not provide her with written notice of IEP meetings scheduled for November 5, 2007, November 14, 2007, or December 6, 2007. The District indicated that the two November meetings did not actually take place due to bomb threats at the high school, and that there was a copy of the meeting notice for the

---

<sup>7</sup> OAR 581-037-0015 (Assignment, Direction, and Supervision of Educational Assistants); OAR 581-037-0025 (Training of Educational Assistants)

<sup>8</sup> OAR 581-015-2210 IEP Team IEP Team (1) School Districts must ensure that the IEP Team for each child with a disability includes the following participants: (a) One or both of the child's parents, except as provided in OAR 581-015-2195; (b) The child where appropriate; (c) At least one regular education teacher of the child, if the child is or may be participating in the regular education environment, consistent with section (4) of this rule; (d) At least one special education teacher of the child or, if appropriate, at least one special education provider of the child; (e) A representative of the school District, who may also be another member of the team, who is: (A) Qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction; (B) Knowledgeable about the general education curriculum; (C) Knowledgeable about District resources; and (D) Authorized to commit District resources and ensure that services set out in the IEP will be provided. (f) An individual who can interpret the instructional implications of the evaluation results (who may also be another member of the team); (g) Other individuals, including related services personnel as appropriate, invited by: (A) The parent, whom the parent determines to have knowledge or special expertise regarding the child; or (B) The school District, whom the school District determines to have knowledge or special expertise regarding the child; and (h) Transition services participants, as described in section (2) of this rule.

<sup>9</sup> OAR 581-015-2190(1).

<sup>10</sup> OAR 581-015-2190(2).

December 6, 2007 IEP meeting in the District's files. The parent reported that she did not actually receive the written notice for the December 6, 2007 IEP meeting until after the meeting took place. However, the parent was aware of the meeting and did attend.

Whether or not a meeting ultimately occurs does not affect the District's obligation to provide written notice of the meeting in advance. In this case, the District should have provided the parents with advance notice of the two November meetings. The Department noted that District files contained a copy of the meeting notice for the December 6, 2007 meeting which was dated November 26, 2007. However, the Special Education Director did not dispute the parent's statement that she received the notice after the meeting took place. The Department concludes that the District violated the written meeting notice requirement, but that the violation did not prevent the parent from participating in the meeting. However, the District must ensure that notices are provided to parents in advance of an IEP meeting. See Corrective Action.

#### **D. Copy of Revised IEP**

OAR 581-015-2225(3)(b) requires that the school District provide a parent with a revised copy of the IEP upon the request of the parent. The parent alleged and the District acknowledged that the District did not timely respond to the parent's request for a revised copy of the student's IEP following the December 6, 2007 meeting. After the parents made repeated requests for a copy of the revised IEP, the District mailed out a copy on April 18, 2008. See Corrective Action.

#### **E. Access to Records**

School District must give parents of children with disabilities "an opportunity to examine all student education records . . ." <sup>11</sup> Districts must comply with a records request from the parent for access to records:

- (a) Within a reasonable period of time and without unnecessary delay;
- (b) For children with disabilities under OAR 581-015-0051, before any meeting regarding an IEP, or any due process hearing, or any resolution session related to a due process hearing; and
- (c) In no case more than 45 days after it has received the request.

The parent alleged, and the District did not contest that the parent was not provided timely access to the copies of the weekly data reports she requested at the December 6, 2007 meeting. See Corrective Action.

#### **F. Appropriate Services**

The parent's complaint also included an allegation that the District failed to implement appropriate special education services for the student, based on empirically validated instructional strategies and programs until several months following the completion of the April 10, 2007 IEP. The IEP dated April 10, 2007, required specially designed

---

<sup>11</sup> OAR 581-015-2300, and OAR 581-021-0270.

instruction in self-advocacy, study skills and organization skills. In its *Response*, the District disputed the parent's allegation, pointing to its purchase of the "Adjusting the Image" curriculum for the student which had been recommended by the autism specialist.

The Department concludes that, while the "Adjusting the Image" curriculum may meet the requirements for an empirically validated instructional program which meets the needs of the student, District staff did not develop lesson plans, data tracking forms, and a calendar usage program for the "Adjusting the Image" curriculum until December 12, 2007. Therefore, the District was unable to fully implement specially designed instruction to teach the student self-advocacy, study skills, organizational skills, and communication until after December 12, 2007. The Department substantiates this allegation. See Stipulated Corrective Action.

### **G. IEP Implementation: Accommodations**

The parent alleged that the District did not implement the accommodations specified in the revised December 6, 2007 IEP relating to use of the adult assistance and data collection. Specifically, the parent alleged that the educational assistants did not take meaningful baseline and intervention data to measure progress on IEP goals. In addition, the parent alleged the educational assistants enabled the student rather than furthered the student's goals in organization, advocacy and study skills.

The December 6, 2007 addendum contained two accommodations to the student's IEP. The first accommodation required the District to provide adult assistance in the regular classroom to take data on assignments and report to the special education teacher. The second accommodation required the District to provide weekly data to the parent on the data collection for each IEP goal. The educational assistants kept detailed anecdotal records on the student's activities in the regular classroom, but made few entries on the student's performance for each goal in the IEP. The issue here is that the District did not fully implement the second accommodation from the revised December 6, 2007 IEP because the educational assistants did not provide the parent with weekly data collection for each goal as required.

The Department finds that the District did not provide the parent with weekly data collection for each goal on the student's IEP as required by the December 6, 2007 addendum to the IEP. The Department also finds, however, that the District did provide adult assistance in the regular classroom to take data on assignments and report to the special education teacher consistent with the IEP. Thus, the Department only partially substantiates this allegation. See Stipulated Corrective Action.

### **H. Impact of Violations**

In resolving a complaint in which the State has found a failure to provide appropriate services, the Department, pursuant to its general supervisory authority under IDEA, Part B, must address the failure to provide appropriate services, including as appropriate

(such as compensatory services or reimbursement) and appropriate future provision of services for all children with disabilities.<sup>12</sup> The District submitted a proposed Stipulated Corrective Action to the Department that was agreed upon by the District and parent. The Department has reviewed the proposal and has identified appropriate submissions as evidence of completion and the due dates for those submissions.

## V. CORRECTIVE ACTION<sup>13</sup>

*In the Matter of Three Rivers School District*  
Case No. 08-054-013

#	Action Required	Submissions	Due Date
<b><u>Stipulated Corrective Action</u></b>			
1.	<p><u>a. Compensatory Education Services (2007-2008)</u></p> <p>As stipulated, the District shall complete its agreement to provide, by June 30, 2008, the Compensatory Education services in progress since April 15, 2008.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 50 minutes per week specially designed instruction;</li> <li>b. 30 minutes per week teacher development time to be provided to the special education teacher by a special education consultant; and</li> <li>c. 5 hours autism training to be provided to staff by the regional autism consultant.</li> </ul>	<p>The District shall submit to the Department, with a copy to the parent, written evidence of completion of the 2007-2008 compensatory education services.</p>	<b>July 1, 2008</b>
.	<p><u>b. Compensatory Education Services (2008-2009)</u></p> <p>As stipulated, the District shall provide the student with the following compensatory education services during the first 5 weeks of the 2008-09 school year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 50 minutes per week specially designed instruction;</li> <li>ii. 30 minutes per week teacher development time to be provided to</li> </ul>	<p>The District shall submit to the Department, with a copy to the parent, written evidence of completion of the 2008-2009 compensatory education services.</p>	<b>November 7, 2008</b>

<sup>12</sup> 34 CFR §300.151(b); OAR 581-015-2030.

<sup>13</sup> The Department's order shall include corrective action. Any documentation or response will be verified to ensure that corrective action has occurred.. OAR 581-015-2030 (13). The Department requires timely completion. OAR 581-015-2030 (15). The Department may initiate remedies against a party who refuses to voluntarily comply with a plan of correction. OAR 581-015-2030 (17 & 18).

#	Action Required	Submissions	Due Date
	<p>the special education teacher by a special education consultant;</p> <p>iii. 1 hour training for the student's regular education teachers provided by the regional autism specialist (prior to the start of the school year); and</p> <p>iv. 3 hours of autism training for special education teacher and staff provided by the regional autism specialist (prior to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of the school year).</p> <p>The District and parent may agree in writing to modify any of the provisions of the compensatory education services.</p>	<p>The District shall submit any written agreement to modify the provisions of this compensatory education plan within a week of the agreement.</p>	<p><b>Within a week of the District/parent agreement.</b></p>
2.	<p><u>Staff Training:</u> As stipulated, the District will provide 4 hours of training to appropriate staff on the "Adjusting the Image" curriculum from the regional autism specialist. This training will occur during in-service week prior to the 2008-09 school year.</p>	<p>The District shall submit documentation of completed training, including agenda, sign-in sheet, and training materials.</p>	<p><b>Due October 1, 2008</b></p>
3.	<p><u>Progress Monitoring:</u> As stipulated, for the remainder of the 2007-08 school year and for the first two months<sup>14</sup> of the 2008-09 school year the District will hold a monthly meeting to discuss the student's progress towards achieving the annual goals on her IEP. Participants invited to the meeting will include the student's parents, special education teacher, regional autism consultant/specialist, and the District's special education director.</p>	<p>The District shall submit a copy of any meeting notices, minutes, or prior written notices resulting from meetings held:</p> <p>a. April – June 2008 b. September 2008 c. October 2008</p>	<p>a. <b>June 30, 2008</b> b. <b>October 7, 2008</b> c. <b>November 7, 2008</b></p>
<b>Other Corrective Action</b>			
1.	<p>Staff Training The District shall provide information to appropriate staff on the following:</p>	<p>The District shall submit documentation of completed training,</p>	<p><b>September 30, 2008</b></p>

<sup>14</sup> September and October, 2008

#	Action Required	Submissions	Due Date
	a. Requirement for written IEP meeting notices; b. Procedures for providing timely copies of IEPs; and c. Procedures for responding to requests for student education records.	including materials used, agenda, and sign-in sheet or email distribution list.	

If the parent and District agree, the Department will reimburse the District for the use of a neutral facilitator for a meeting. For more information, contact Valerie Miller, (503) 947-5705.

Corrective action plans and related documentation as well as any questions about this corrective action should be directed to Rae Ann Ray, Oregon Department of Education, 255 Capitol St. NE, Salem, Oregon 97310-0203; telephone – (503) 947-5722; e-mail: [raeann.ray@state.or.us](mailto:raeann.ray@state.or.us); fax number (503) 378-5156.

Dated: June 2, 2008

---

Nancy J. Latini, Ph.D.  
 Assistant Superintendent  
 Office of Student Learning & Partnerships

Mailing Date: June 2, 2008

**APPEAL RIGHTS:** You are entitled to judicial review of this order. Judicial review may be obtained by filing a petition for review within 60 days from the service of this Order with the Marion County Circuit Court or with the Circuit Court for the County in which you reside. Judicial review is pursuant to the provisions of ORS 183.484.