

BEFORE THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

In the Matter of Portland SD 1J

)
)
)
)

Order on Reconsideration
Case No. 13-054-012

I. BACKGROUND

On March 26, 2013, the Oregon Department of Education (Department) received a letter of complaint from the parent (Parent) of a student (Student) residing in the Portland Public School District (District). The Parent requested that the Department conduct a special education investigation under OAR 581-015-2030. The Department confirmed receipt of this complaint on March 26, 2013. The Parent provided a copy of the complaint letter to the District.

The Department issued a timely order for this complaint on May 23, 2013. The Parent requested a reconsideration of the Final Order pursuant to OAR 581-015-2030 on May 28, 2013. The District was allowed to respond to this request, and responded by a letter dated June 6, 2013. Pursuant to the reconsideration of the responses provided by both parties and the response of the complaint investigator, the Department has revised the Final Order as follows. No Corrective Action was necessary or stayed in light of this reconsideration pursuant to State and Federal requirements.

II. RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS

The first reconsideration item requested is a revision to Finding of Fact (FOF) 16. Parent alleges that Student did not participate in the Oregon Connections Academy (ORCA) online program due to a sleep disorder not an "inability to sit at a desk and use a computer." However, during the personal interview with the complaint investigator, the Parent never mentioned a sleep disorder as being a problem for the Student's schooling. Rather, during the interview, Parent stated that the Student could not use a computer at a regular desk and this is why Student had not received any grades from ORCA nor had participated in the ORCA program. Parent further noted that she was trying to obtain grant funding for a tablet so that Student could better do school work without a desk. Complainant drew the attention of the investigator to how the Student was seated at the table, noting that it was difficult for the Student to sit for a period of time at a table or desk to use a computer. Due to these facts which were relayed during the interview, the Finding of Fact 16 will not be revised.

The second allegation does not provide a basis of fact for reconsideration by the Department. Rather, it demonstrates the Parent's confusion regarding the meeting held on February 12, 2013. The District properly sent a meeting notice to Parent to describe the meeting and school staff discussed the process for the Student moving into the District with an IEP. Therefore, FOF 20 will not be revised.

The third allegation relates again to information relayed to investigator in the interview, FOF 23 states that "...Student had severe anxiety with attending school and that the Student suffered physical problems due to the anxiety, e.g. chronic constipation and an exacerbation of the Student's sleep disorder." This FOF does not speak to the Student's underlying health problems or history so no revision is necessary.

For the fourth allegation, school staff stated in an interview that they were concerned about controlling the Student "physically in the future," which is reflected in FOF 24. The District also noted that at the February 12, 2013 meeting staff observed the Student swat at and spit on the Parent. The District explains that these behaviors will be more difficult to respond to as Student gets older.

Truancy is defined as the act of being absent without leave, especially from school. The District noted their concerns that the Student has not attended school. Notably here, is that the Student did not attend any school at the time of the complaint, nor did Student attend school from May 2012 to the middle of September 2012, and the Parent did not provide any evidence of notification to the ESD of any intention to homeschool a student pursuant to ORS 339.030 at the time of this investigation. No revision is necessary.

The fifth allegation requests to change FOF 26. It is noteworthy here that it is irrelevant as to who cancelled the meeting. During the interview, the complaint investigator was told by District staff that the Parent cancelled meeting. In the District's response to the request for reconsideration, the District agrees that the second meeting was rescheduled due to staff unavailability. As such, FOF 26 is modified accordingly.

The sixth allegation looks to FOF 28. However, the request made is not a factual item for reconsideration, but rather a disagreement between Parent and District regarding riding the Power Pumper at school. No revisions are necessary.

The seventh allegation states that "[D]istrict adding my name is not evidence of my participation." However, this is a stated opinion rather than an item of fact for reconsideration. Additionally, the record is replete with evidence that Parent participated in both meetings, one via phone and one in person. No changes are necessary.

The eighth allegation states that Parent would be willing to provide transportation for Student to use Power Pumper in the school gym and alleges that Parent was not included in transitioning Student to school environment. However, the evidence in the record does not support this argument. No change is necessary.

The ninth allegation again refers to using the preferred activity in the parking lot, but District has noted willingness to allow this activity in the gym. This again highlights the disagreement between the parties not an item to amend factually in this Order on Reconsideration. The District has displayed a willingness to consider any medical needs of the Student but has noted that Parent has not provided any documentation of medical needs that would require District to provide the most restrictive educational setting to the Student. Without documentation of a medical condition preventing school attendance, the District's proposal of a short trial period of attempts to transition Student to school environment was reasonable. No changes are necessary.

The tenth allegation speaks to a Parent request for Student participation in on-line program for elementary students. The District agrees that Parent did not make this request in the context of these IEP meetings. As such, this item will be revised accordingly.

The eleventh allegation speaks to a statement that says "[S]tudent never attended ORCA and that they moved prior to transfer being complete." Parent indicated at February 12, 2013 IEP meeting that ORCA had not been initiated. Parent also stated during interview that Student never attended school or received any grades. No changes are necessary.

The twelfth allegation speaks to the record of placement from Springfield School District and the Springfield IEP's nonparticipation justification statement and placement page. This was the IEP in effect when Student transferred into the District. The District properly held an IEP and placement meeting to address concerns with this IEP and to make a new placement decision. No changes are necessary.

The thirteenth allegation argues that District did not offer comparable services to the Student. However, based on the investigations and the evidence of the record, the Department declines to revise this statement. No change is necessary.

The fourteenth allegation makes an incorrect statement about the IDEA rather than a FOF or law that may be reconsidered. There is no disagreement with the fact that the meeting actually took place on February 20, 2013 rather than February 19, 2013. The District should have corrected the dates on these documents and the District has offered to make this correction so that the records will line up accurately. No changes are necessary.

The fifteenth allegation states that emails from the District show a predetermined placement for the Student. However, the record shows these messages were not predetermination but rather suggestions or planning for a proposal, which is permitted under the IDEA. No revisions are necessary.

Finally, in its response, District points out it does not have an online charter school for high school students, but rather it offers a program called "Virtual Scholars," which provides access to online curriculum for students enrolled in District schools. As such the statement referring to an online charter high school provided by the District will be removed.

Only factual items and statements are being revise, not the underlying conclusions of law. Therefore, no corrective action is necessary at this time as no violations of the IDEA have been substantiated in either the Final Order or the Order on Reconsideration. The amended facts and analysis are as follows.

III. REVISED FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Student is eight (8) years old and currently resides in the Portland Public School District.
2. The Student is diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder for purposes of the Student's initial IEP. The Student is also diagnosed with sensory integration disorder, global development delay, a sleep disorder and obesity.
3. The Student attended kindergarten and a majority of the Student's first grade year in the Oregon City School District (OCSD) until approximately April 2012.
4. The Student came home from school during the second semester of the first grade year at OCSD with bruises.
5. The Student developed severe anxiety related to attending school during the spring of 2012. This anxiety manifested in chronic constipation which allegedly exacerbated the Student's sleep disorder
6. The Student had an initial IEP from OCSD dated April 5, 2011 which was subsequently modified on March 2, 2012. The revised IEP was created in response to the Student's extended absence from school due to the Parent's allegation of physical intrusion by peers (scratching, pinching, and excessive touching) and subsequent Student anxiety. But, the Prior Written Notice dated March 2, 2012 states that "Student is unwilling to return to school

after being out due to illness. A team met and developed a transition plan that should support Student returning to school based services."

7. The revised March 2, 2012 IEP sought to transition the Student safely back into a school environment.¹
8. These revisions to the Student's initial IEP were as follows:

Services	Frequency Revision (3/2/12)	Frequency Original IEP (4/5/11)
Communication	90 min/month	150 min/mo
Math	1 hr/week	5 hrs/week
Social/Behavioral	1 hr/week	2 hrs/week
Reading	1 hr/week	5 hrs / week
Language Arts	1 hr/week	Not previously included
ESY Math	4 hrs/week	Not previously included
Related Services:		
Occupational Therapy	20 minutes/month	Not previously included
Specially designed services		
ESY Reading	3.5 hrs/week	Not previously included
ESY Fine Motor Skills	4 hrs/week	Not previously included

9. In April, 2012, Parent moved from Oregon City to Springfield, Oregon and enrolled the Student in Springfield Public School District (SPSD).
10. Parent met with a school psychologist and speech pathologist in the Springfield District to determine whether the Student could tolerate a regular classroom setting or if an on-line program would be more suitable for the Student.
11. Parent enrolled the Student in Connections Academy through SPSP, but later withdrew the Student because the Parent reported that she was informed there would be no special education services available through the District's particular on-line program.
12. Parent enrolled the Student in the Oregon Connections Academy (ORCA) to obtain special education services specifically through ORCA while the Student was home schooled using the on-line program.
13. On October 9, 2012, Parent had an IEP team meeting with SPSP to integrate the ORCA program into the Student's IEP.
14. The October 9, 2012 IEP contained the following related services for Special Education:

Services	Frequency
Mathematics	180 min/wk
Social Skills	120 min/wk
Reading	300 min/wk
Physical Therapy	30 min/month

¹ Although the Revised IEP from March 2012 falls slightly outside the dates of this investigation which are permitted under OAR 581-015-2030, it is relevant to this investigation in that it was the current IEP when the Student transferred into the Springfield School District in 2012, and is further relevant in that it was a "transitional" IEP designed to reintegrate the Student back into a classroom comparable to the IEP developed by Portland Public Schools upon the student's enrollment.

Occupational Therapy	30 min/month
Speech/Language Therapy	15 min/week
Individual and small group interaction	All instructional times
Care Coordination	15 min/month
Autism Consultation	120 min/year

15. The October 9, 2012 IEP contained a Placement Determination that allowed for the Student to be home schooled while receiving some supports at the Student's local school.
16. The Parent stated that despite the IEP created by SPSPD, the Student did not participate in the on-line program through ORCA, due to "[the Student's] inability to sit at a desk and use a computer."
17. Parent moved to Portland in December, 2012 and contacted the District in January, 2013 to ascertain whether the District would give special education services to the Student if the Student was being home schooled.
18. Parent spoke with the District staff specifically for the feeder schools. Parent resided in the Wilson High School service area.
19. The District explained to the Parent that the Student would need to be registered with the District in order for special education services to be explored. Parent then enrolled the Student in the District at the Student's neighborhood school.
20. On February 12, 2013, Parent, the Student and two District Representatives met to discuss the Student's IEP and to discuss placement options for the Student within the District. The Student's Multnomah County Service Coordinator was also present.
21. Parent initially requested home instruction with an end goal being the Student's eventual return to school given the Student's anxiety and medical issues with attendance. No specific written notice of placement had been generated at the February 12, 2013 meeting, but at that time, the District offered only the Communication Behavioral (CB) Classroom at the elementary school as a placement choice based on the needs of the Student and the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE). A notice of IEP meeting was sent on February 1, 2013 and the notes from District indicate that an IEP meeting took place on February 12, 2013.
22. The District had drafted a Notice of Placement that included only regular classroom and the CB Classroom at the elementary school. The draft of the Notice of Placement was dated February 12, 2013, the same day the first IEP meeting took place.
23. Parent was interested in other placements and transition plans that would enable the Student's return to physical attendance at a school. Parent disclosed that the Student had severe anxiety with attending school and that the Student suffered physical problems due to the anxiety, e.g. chronic constipation and an exacerbation of the Student's sleep disorder.
24. The District was concerned that if the Student's placement did not include physical attendance at school (rather than an on-line school or home instruction), the Student would not return to school again based upon the Student's truancy record. Further, the District was concerned with whether the Student could be controlled physically in the future given the Student's size if socialization skills were not imparted at an early age and in a school setting. The District felt it was imperative that the Student personally attend classes in a CB Classroom as soon as practicable and among peers.
25. Parent proposed a transition process to the District where the Student would be home schooled with a special education instructor coming to the house for initial instruction. After the Student had built a rapport with the special education teacher, the lessons would be moved to a more public place and then eventually back to a school setting.

26. A second IEP meeting had been scheduled for February 19, 2013 with two District staff and Parent, but was cancelled due to scheduling problems. This IEP meeting was rescheduled and held via telephone on February 20, 2013.
27. Parent again related to the District that the Student had anxiety issues with peers and was unable to tolerate a regular classroom environment. However, her goal was still to have the Student return to the classroom on at least a part time basis.
28. The District proposed that the Student visit the elementary school to engage in a series of "preferred activities" wherein the Student would become comfortable with a teacher or para-educator and then eventually move into a classroom. Parent alleges there was never any discussion of a "gentle transition" with "preferred activities."²
29. The District mailed Parent a copy of an IEP dated February 19, 2013 which was an exact copy of the SPSD IEP from October 9, 2012 without any modifications to the former IEP other than the cover page.
30. The District mailed Parent a copy of the Prior Written Notice of Placement on or about February 22, 2013 that proposed a change to the Student's placement from the SPSD placement. Rather than attending an on-line program, the Student would be placed in the CB Classroom at a District elementary school.
31. The District does not have an on-line elementary school program. The February 2013 IEP was a Move-in IEP adopted by the District as a current Oregon IEP from another Oregon district.
32. On or about February 22, 2013, the classroom teacher from the elementary school contacted Parent to set up a time for the Student to begin transitioning into the CB Classroom. Parent alleges the District initiated a full hour of transition time for the Student whereas the District alleges there was no time limitation on the initial transition meetings.
33. The email from District dated February 19, 2013 to Parent indicated that Parent should contact District with "a specific hour or so that will be a good time to have [Student] transition back to a school setting." This email was sent to Parent at 8:48 am on February 19, 2013, several hours prior to the time set for the second IEP meeting (which was subsequently rescheduled for the following day).
34. Parent withdrew the Student from school on February 26, 2013 because she did not agree with the placement decision of the District.
35. In the email message to District, dated February 26, 2013, Parent stated "It was not my intent to enroll [Student] in the first place..." In this email Parent further states Parent has "serious concerns about the fact that [District] apparently decided on classroom placement for [Student] without my knowledge, consent or signature...." Note that the Parent's name is written on many of the District's documents regarding placement, which include: a Prior Written Notice dated February 22, 2013, meeting notes regarding placement from February 20, 2013, and a February 19, 2013 IEP which notes Parent participation.
36. The District received copies of the Student's records from Oregon City during the first week of March. Since the Student was no longer enrolled, the school filed away the Oregon City IEP.

² The District proposed a "gentle transition" that would allow the Student to engage in a "preferred activity" while on school premises, either the gym or playground. Parent had discussed how the Student preferred using a Power Pumper. The District allegedly proposed that the Student would visit the playground at the elementary school and use the Power Pumper while in the presence of Parent and the CB teacher. This activity could occur over a period of time until the child was comfortable with the CB teacher and willing to enter the classroom with the CB teacher.

IV. DISCUSSION

1. Placement

Parent alleges that the District failed to consider the Student's IEP and placed the Student without consideration of the IEP or the Parent's input (OAR 581-015-2250 and 34 CFR 300.116 and 34 CFR 300.327).

School districts must ensure that the placement of the student is determined by a group of persons, including the parents and other persons knowledgeable about the student, the meaning of the evaluation data and the placement options.³ The placement must also be made based on the student's current IEP and is made in conformity with the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) provisions of OAR 581-015-2240 through 581-015-2255.⁴ In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the student or the quality of services that he or she needs.⁵ Ultimately, placement determinations must be based on the student's IEP,⁶ but each public agency must ensure that a parent of a student with a disability is a member of any group that makes decisions on educational placement.⁷ While parent preference may be one factor that is considered in determining the overall outcome with respect to placement, it is not the predominant or overriding force in making a final placement decision or in deciding any matters that individually comprise placement.⁸ It is reasonable for school personnel to make these decisions without the agreement of the parent, providing they reflect the consensus of the multidisciplinary team.⁹

When the Student transferred into the District, the District reviewed and adopted the Student's current IEP from Springfield School District, dated October 9, 2012. This IEP was reviewed by the District for placement purposes at a meeting held on February 12, 2013. The Notice of Team Meeting dated February 1, 2013 is addressed to the Parent and it notes the purpose of the meeting is to develop or review an IEP and placement for the Student. The IEP meeting minutes dated February 12, 2013 note that the Parent was in attendance at the meeting where placement and the IEP were discussed. These notes further document that the team agreed that the Student was an in-state transfer student with an existing IEP. The team went over the Springfield IEP together at the meeting. The notes indicated the Parent expressed that they would like home instruction with support coming to the home, but that the team had a conversation about federal laws and the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) requirements. The notes further indicate Parent wanted Student to "start school gently" and the shared goal was to introduce the Student to school in a safe way. The CB Classrooms were explained to Parent at this time, and Parent shared Student's preferred activity choice.¹⁰ The notes from this meeting also indicate the Parent said she would be able to bring the Student to the school for the transition period. While the team did not agree to placement at this meeting and agreed to meet again, the record indicates Parent did participate at this meeting by offering input and the IEP was considered at this time. The record also indicates the District worked with Parental input regarding preferred activities of the Student.

³ OAR 581-015-2250(1)(a)

⁴ OAR 581-015-2250(1)(b)

⁵ 34 CFR 300.116(d)

⁶ 34 CFR 300.116(b)(2)

⁷ 34 CFR 300.501(c)

⁸ *Letter to Bina*, 18 IDELR 582 (OSERS 1991)

⁹ *Letter to Coleman*, 211 IDELR 269 (OSEP 1981)

¹⁰ The Meeting notes indicate student responds well to "choice of Power Pumper opportunities".

Next, a follow up meeting was held on February 20, 2013 via phone conference. The meeting notes for this meeting indicate the Parent participated via phone and again offered input on placement. The discussion revolved around ways to transition Student back to school safely. The team considered Parent input by allowing Parent to help gauge the appropriate length of time initially, by allowing the Student to be involved with a preferred activity, and noting that staff could work with the Student and the preferred activity the Parent had mentioned in the prior meeting as a way to create a gentle transition to the school environment. The notes indicate the Parent would be involved with the District to create a transition plan for Student. The notes from this meeting also state the Parent continued to advocate for home instruction, but District and the rest of the team noted that home based instruction is the most restrictive placement option for this Student and that the District needs to have the opportunity to meet the Student's needs in an appropriate less restrictive school setting designed for students with high levels of needs as noted in the Student's IEP and paperwork. Finally the notes indicate the Parent would be able to review the transition process with District after the school has had some time to work with the Student. As such, there is ample evidence that the Parent participated in the meetings and offered input despite disagreeing with the District, and that the team acted as a majority when it decided on the placement for the Student, in conformity with the current IEP and LRE requirements. Parent's allegation that her input was not taken into consideration is therefore not substantiated.

2. IEP Team Considerations and Special Factors

Parent alleges that the District failed to consider the Parent's concerns regarding the enhancing the education of the Student when developing, reviewing, or revising the IEP (OAR 581-015-2205(1) and 34 CFR 300.324).

In developing, reviewing and revising a student's IEP, the IEP team must consider the (a) strengths of the child; (b) the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child; (c) the results of the initial or most recent evaluation of the child; and (d) the academic, developmental and functional needs of the child (See OAR 581-015-2205).

As noted above, the evidence provided in the record is replete with instances and examples of when the District considered the Parent's input to enhance the education of the Student. For example, the District clearly included the Parent's suggestion for a preferred activity as a tool to transition Student to the school, by offering to allow Student to have Power Pumper opportunities with District staff. District also allowed Parent the ability to determine the times when Student could initially transfer into the school, as further detailed in the prior section. The District offered sufficient evidence to show that District considered and addressed Parental concerns. Parent's allegation is not substantiated.

3. When IEPs must be in effect/IEP Implementation

Parent alleges the District placed the Student in an inappropriate setting for the Student which was not supported by the Student's initial IEP (OAR 581-015-2220 and 34 CFR 300.323).

School districts must provide special education and related services to a child with a disability in accordance with an IEP (See OAR 581-015-2220).

In this case, the Student had a current IEP from Springfield School District when the Student transferred into the District. That IEP noted that the Student attended an on-line charter school program and the Student received services for PT, OT, and SLP at the resident school.

When the Student entered the District, the Parent requested that the Student be home schooled and receive special education services. Oregon law does not consider home schooling a form of private school or charter school, and in Oregon, District responsibility for home schooled students under the IDEA is only for Child Find and Evaluation.¹¹ A district may consider offering IEP services to home schooled students who are enrolled in the district, but state rules only require districts to consider such an offer, not necessarily to provide IEP services to home school students.¹²

The District was correct to note that the IEP in effect when the Student transferred into Portland Public School District had an incorrect placement recommendation of "on-line charter school." This placement was inadequate for two reasons; first, Portland Public School District does not offer an on-line program for elementary aged students. The District's on-line school program is only available to high school students through the "Virtual Scholars" program. Next, and more importantly, a charter school is a parental school choice option, not a placement option for IDEA purposes. An on-line charter school would typically be considered a general education placement for IEP purposes. The District accordingly reviewed the IEP as noted in the allegations above to discuss an appropriate placement for the Student upon transfer to their District, with all of the appropriate parties.

The Student never attended ORCA. It should be noted that the Springfield IEP was never implemented or adopted by ORCA, reportedly due to the Student's inability to use the computer at a desk. Prior to the completed transfer to ORCA, the Parent relocated to the Portland area. The Student did not attend any formal education program after leaving the Oregon City School District in April 2012.

The Portland Public School District did not have any other information at the time of the two IEP meetings to ascertain if a transitional IEP had previously been developed for the Student that addressed the Student's anxiety. The District was clearly at a disadvantage to implement the current IEP which did not reflect the transitional status of the Student and which did not contain a valid placement option available in this particular District.

Further, Parent withdrew the Student from school on February 26, 2013 before the District could obtain the Student's records from Oregon City. The District received copies of the Student's records from Oregon City during the first week of March, but they were filed away without review due to the Student's prior withdrawal by Parent.

The District adopted the current IEP for the Student when the Student transferred in, and did not alter service levels. The District created a listing of placement options designed to give the Student access to all the services the Student required pursuant to the existing IEP. Further, the District complied with Federal guidelines in transitioning the Student to a Least Restrictive Environment at a local elementary school.

Finally, the District's attempt at placing the Student at the elementary school was not entirely in opposition to the Student's Springfield IEP which contains a Placement Determination stating that the Student will attend one class at the Student's local school. The October 2012 IEP also includes numerous measurable annual goals for Social/Behavior skills including taking turns with others, interacting with others/play partners, and participating in conversations. This IEP also includes numerous communication goals including increasing receptive and expressive language skills and writing goals which include making writing legible to unfamiliar adults. These

¹¹ See OAR 581-015-2080(2)(f)

¹² See OAR 581-021-0029

goals and all others from the October 2012 IEP were considered by the District when determining an appropriate placement. The specific goals detailed above, are goals that the District could reasonably work with more appropriately in a school based placement than in the more restrictive home instruction placement.

The allegation that the District failed to consider the Student's initial IEP from the previous District is not substantiated under these facts.

4. Transfer Student

Parent alleges the District did not provide FAPE (including services comparable to those described in the IEP from the previous in-state school district) until either adopting the IEP of the previous district or developing a new IEP for the Student (OAR 581-15-2230 and 34 CFR 300.323).

If a child with a disability (who had an IEP that was in effect in a previous school district in Oregon) transfers to a new district in Oregon, and enrolls in a new school within the same school year, the new school district (in consultation with the child's parents) must provide a free appropriate public education to the child (including services comparable to those described in the child's IEP from the previous district), until the new district either: (a) Adopts the child's IEP from the previous school district; or (b) Develops, adopts and implements a new IEP for the child (OAR 581-15-2230).

The Student had been previously enrolled in Springfield School District during the 2012-2013 school year when the Student transferred to the Portland Public School District in January, 2013. The Student transferred with a current IEP from Springfield School District.

The District adopted the Springfield IEP. Under the previous Springfield IEP, the Student was to receive special education services, more specifically 30 minutes of physical therapy per month and 30 minutes of Occupational Therapy per month. The Springfield IEP was subsequently fully incorporated into the District IEP. The District did offer comparable services to the Student. The District also fully adopted the Springfield IEP's "Related Services." The question here is not whether the Parent was consulted or whether the IEP was suitable, but rather the question is whether the District adopted the previous IEP and if so, did the District offer the same services to the Student as previously offered in Springfield. To this the answer is yes. The District did adopt, fully, the previous IEP from Springfield and did offer the same services to the Student as were offered in the previous IEP. Therefore the Parent's allegation is not substantiated.

V. CORRECTIVE ACTION¹³
In the Matter of Portland School District
Case No. 13-054-012

Based on the facts provided, the Department did not find violation of the IDEA, and no corrective action is ordered.

Dated: this 9th Day of July, 2013



Sarah Drinkwater, Ph.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Office of Student Learning & Partnerships

Mailing Date: July 9, 2013

¹³ 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).