BEFORE THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS STATE OF OREGON for the SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE EDUCATION OF

FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL

Student and Oregon Department of Education

Case No.: DP 11-102B

HISTORY OF THE CASE

The parent of the student on January 10, 2011 filed a due process complaint and request for due process hearing against the Brookings-Harbor School District (District) and the Oregon Department of Education (ODE).

The matter was referred to the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) on January 13, 2011. The case was assigned to Senior Administrative Law Judge Ken L. Betterton.

On January 25, 2011, ODE filed a motion to challenge the sufficiency of the request for due process hearing and to dismiss ODE as a party.

On January 31, 2011, I issued a ruling finding the request for due process sufficient, and deferring ruling on the motion to dismiss ODE as a party.

Parent on February 8, 2011 filed a response to ODE's motion to dismiss. ODE on February 15, 2011 filed a reply to parent's response.

A telephone pre-hearing conference was held on February 16, 2011. Attorney Diane Wiscarson represented parent. Senior Attorney General Gary Cordy represented ODE. The parties agreed to extend the 45-day deadline to April 13, 2011.

FACTS RELEVANT TO DETERMINATION

The due process complaint includes the following: The student's name and address; the name of the school the child is attending (Brookings-Harbor); facts alleging the parent's disagreement with the evaluation, educational placement, or special education services provided to the child; and the parent's proposed resolutions of the problems. (Due Process Complaint.) The allegations against ODE state:

That ODE failed to enforce the Stipulated Corrective Action ordered in Case No. 10-054-009, by failing to "discover or rectify" the lack of [the student's] receipt of transition services from the District as provided in the IEP.

That ODE has taken no action to ensure the District's compliance with the Stipulated Corrective Action ordered in Case No. 10-054-009.

That ODE failed to enforce the Corrective Action order in Case Nos. 10-054-022 and 10-054-027.

(Due Process Complaint at B7 and B9.)

OPINION

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) authorizes the parent of a child with a disability to request a due process hearing "with respect to any matter relating to the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free appropriate public education to such child." 20 USC ¶ 1415(b)(6)(A); see also OAR 581-015-2345(1)(a)(A).

OAR 581-015-2345(1)(a)(B) states that the request for a due process hearing must include the following:

(i) The child's name and address (or available contact information in the case of a homeless child);

(ii) The name of the school the child is attending;

(iii) A description of the nature of the problem of the child relating to the proposed or refused initiation or change, including facts relating to the problem; and

(iv) A proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available to the party at the time.

The request for due process hearing satisfies the requirements of OAR 581-015-2345(1)(a)(B) against the District.

ODE argues that it is not a proper party to the parent's complaint and request for due process hearing. ODE asserts that it lacks the power to enforce a school district's plan of correction, and that its authority is limited to imposing financial measures against a school district to induce the district to comply with a plan of correction. OAR 581-015-2030(17).

Parent argues that ODE is a proper party to the parent's complaint and request for due process hearing because the parent has alleged that student was denied FAPE (free appropriate public education) and the District has not complied with the plan of correction based on ODE's powers pursuant to OAR 581-015-2030(17).

OAR 581-015-2030(17) states:

If the respondent refuses to voluntarily comply with a plan of correction when so ordered, the Superintendent may take one or more of the following actions:

(a) Disapprove in whole or part, the respondent's application for federal funding;

(b) Withhold or terminate further assistance to the respondent for an approved project;

(c) Suspend payment, under an approved project, to a respondent;

(d) Order, in accordance with a final state audit resolution determination,

the repayment of specified federal funds; and

(e) Withhold all or part of a district's basic school support in accordance with ORS 327.103.

I agree with ODE that it is not a proper party to the parent's complaint and request for due process hearing. Oregon law does not give ODE the power to take over the administration of local school districts. ORS 332.072. Although school districts are required to operate a "standard" school district consistent with rules of the State Board of Education (ORS 327.006(8)), ODE can withhold state school funds when it finds deficiencies in standards. ORS 327.103.

OAR 581-015-2030(17) states that the Superintendent (*i.e.*, ODE) may take one of several actions when a district refuses to follow a plan of correction. ODE is not required to take any of the enumerated actions. The rule only gives ODE authority to impose financial penalties against a district for refusing to comply with a plan of correction. OAR 581-015-2030(17) does not give ODE authority to enforce a plan of correction.

The parent has alleged no other basis on which ODE could be responsible for any matter relating to the identification, evaluation, educational placement, or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the student. OAR 581-015-2345. Therefore, ODE is not a proper party to the parent's request for due process hearing. The request for hearing is dismissed as to ODE.

ORDER

The complaint and request for due process hearing against ODE is dismissed with prejudice.

Ken L. Betterton Senior Administrative Law Judge Office of Administrative Hearings

APPEAL PROCEDURE

NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES: If you are dissatisfied with this Order you may, within 90 days after the mailing date on this Order, commence a nonjury civil action in any state court of competent jurisdiction, ORS 343.175, or in the United States District Court, 20 U.S.C. §

1415(i)(2). Failure to request review within the time allowed will result in LOSS OF YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL FROM THIS ORDER.

ENTERED at Salem, Oregon this 2nd day of March, 2011 with copies mailed to:

Jan Burgoyne, Oregon Department of Education, Public Services Building, 255 Capitol Street NE, Salem, OR 97310-0203.

In the Matter of Student and Oregon Department of Education, FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL, DP 11-102B Page 4 of 4

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On this 2nd day of March, 2011, I served a copy of the Final Order of Dismissal for Case No. DP 11-102B

FIRST CLASS MAIL:

Parent(s) of Student 95987 N Brookside Drive Brookings, OR 97415

Diane Wiscarson, AAL Wiscarson Law PC 510 SW 3rd Avenue, Suite 439 Portland, OR 97204

Gary Cordy, AAG Department Of Justice 1162 Court Street NE Salem, OR 97301-4096

Susan Castillo, Superintendent Oregon Department of Education 255 Capitol Street NE Salem, OR 97310-0203

BY SHUTTLE MAIL:

Ty Manieri, Legal Specialist Oregon Department of Education 255 Capitol Street NE Salem, OR 97310

Joanne Call, Hearings Coordinator Office of Administrative Hearings

In the Matter of Student and ODE, FINAL ORDER OF DISMISSAL, DP 11-102B Certificate of Service