

BEFORE THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

In the Matter of)	FINDINGS OF FACT,
Winston-Dillard School District 116)	CONCLUSIONS,
)	AND FINAL ORDER
)	Case No. 18-054-042

I. BACKGROUND

On October 22, 2018, the Oregon Department of Education (Department) received a written request for a special education complaint investigation (Complaint) from the Parent (Parent) of a student (Student) who receives special education services in the Winston-Dillard School District (District). The Department confirmed receipt of the Complaint on the same day and forwarded it to the District.

The Department has jurisdiction to resolve this Complaint.¹ Under state and federal law, the Department must investigate written complaints that allege violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and issue an order within sixty days of receipt of the complaint. This timeline may be extended if the Parent and the District agree an extension to engage in mediation or local resolution of the complaint, or for extenuating circumstances. The parties in this matter mutually agreed to extend the issuance date of this order by three weeks to participate in mediation.

A complaint must allege a violation that occurred not more than one year before the date the complaint was received by the Department.² Based on the date the Department received the complaint, the relevant period for this investigation is October 23, 2017 through October 22, 2018.

On October 26, 2018, the Department’s Special Education Legal Specialist and investigator in this matter (Investigator) sent a *Request for Response* (RFR) to the District identifying the specific allegations in the Complaint to be investigated and establishing a *Response* due date of November 9, 2018.

On November 8, 2018, the District responded to the Parent’s Complaint and submitted a packet of materials to the Investigator. These materials are listed in the chart below:

Document Title	Date
1. District Response Letter	11/8/2018
2. List of District Staff Knowledgeable about the allegations	11/6/2018
3. Student IEP, September 19, 2018	9/19/2018
4. Prior Written Notice	9/18/2018

¹ 34 CFR §§ 300.151-153; OAR 581-015-2030.

² OAR 581-015-2030(5).

5. Notice of Team Meeting	9/4/2018
6. Student IEP, September 28, 2017	9/28/2017
7. Prior Written Notice	10/6/2017
8. Specific Learning Disability Eligibility	9/28/2017
9. Consent for Initial Provision of Special Education Services	9/28/2017
10. Eligibility Summary Statement	9/28/2017
11. Prior Written Notice	9/28/2017
12. Douglas Education Service District Psycho-Educational Evaluation	9/18/2017
13. Checklist for the Initial Evaluation Planning Meeting	5/17/2017
14. Notice of Team Meeting	9/19/2017
15. Prior Written Notice	6/1/2017
16. Parent/Guardian Consent for Individual Evaluation	6/1/2017
17. Douglas High School Student Schedule	2018-2019
18. Student Grade Details	2018-2019
19. Douglas High School Student Attendance Profile	2018-2019
20. Student Middle School Attendance Profile	2017-2018
21. Department Official Scoring Guide, Writing	Undated
22. Student Works Samples	2017-2018
23. IEP Progress Report	6/14/2018
24. Email Correspondence	2018

On November 13 and 14, 2018, the Parent emailed the Investigator written replies to the District's *Response*. The Investigator forwarded the Parent's replies on to the District. The Investigator determined that on-site interviews were necessary. On November 28, 2018, the Investigator interviewed the Parent, two District Special Education Teachers, and an Evaluation Specialist for the Douglas Education Service District.

The Investigator reviewed and considered the previously-described documents, interviews, and exhibits in reaching the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in this order.

II. ALLEGATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Parent's allegations and the Department's conclusions are set out in the chart below. These conclusions are based on the Findings of Fact in Section III and on the Discussion in Section IV.

	Allegations	Conclusions
1.	<p>When IEPs Must Be in Effect</p> <p>The Parent alleges the District did not implement the Student's IEP correctly when the Student entered high school for the 2018-2019 school year.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p> <p>The Student's 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 IEPs do not clearly describe how much of the Student's school day is to be spent removed from the general</p>

	(34 CFR § 300.323; OAR 581-015-2220)	education environment. This lack of clarity rises to a violation of IDEA.
2.	IEP Content The Parent alleges that the District did not make appropriate changes to the Student's IEP for the 2018-2019 school year regarding Resource Room services and also failed to provide appropriate educational assistant support in general education classes. (34 CFR § 300.320; OAR 581-015-2200)	Substantiated in Part The District made appropriate changes to the Student's IEP regarding resource room services for the 2018-2019 school year. Also, the District provided appropriate educational assistant support to the Student. <u>Additional Finding</u> - The District violated the IDEA when it failed to update the Student's present levels in the Student's September 19, 2018 IEP.
3.	Parent Participation The Parent alleges the District violated the IDEA when it did not incorporate comments the Parent submitted for addition to the Student's IEP and ignored the Parent's input regarding the importance of an educational assistant to the Student's educational program. (34 CFR § 300.501; OAR 581-015-2190)	Not Substantiated The Parent was an active participant in each of the Student's IEP Team Meetings. The Parent interacted with District staff regarding the Student's educational program and the District acknowledged and addressed the Parent's input regarding educational assistant support. The District incorporated Parent comments into the Student's IEP. The Department does not substantiate this allegation.
4.	Placement of the Child The Parent alleges the District violated the IDEA when it improperly placed the Student in the District Resource Room/"LRC" for too few class periods during the 2018-2019 school year. (34 CFR § 300.116; OAR 581-015-2250)	Substantiated Between August 27, 2018 and September 26, 2018, the Student was incorrectly removed from the general education environment for one class period, out of compliance with the Student's IEP. The Department substantiates this allegation.

Requested Corrective Action

The Parent proposed the following solutions to resolve the Complaint:

1. Provide reminders to Winston Middle School staff that any changes to programming of students on IEPs be documented in writing. This is particularly important for students who will be transitioning to the high school the following year;
2. Provide education to the special education staff and the administration at Douglas High School about the importance of honoring the spirit of the IEPs of incoming students. Provide education to the special education staff and administration at Douglas High School about the importance of responding in a timely fashion when a parent expresses concerns about their child's special education programming. Develop a plan to ensure that transitions between Winston Middle School and Douglas High School go more smoothly in the future. Increase the communication between DHS and WMS special education staff so that services that were being provided at WMS are duplicated as much as possible at DHS, OR that if changes to services are being proposed, that parents are invited to individual meetings to discuss the proposed changes before students start attending classes;
3. Hire additional Instructional Assistants so that Douglas High School is able to provide students on IEPs who have significant academic delays with support in their academic mainstream classes. This support is needed so they will be able to learn and progress in these academic areas, not just be given Cs and passed on while instruction goes over their heads. I am certain [the Student] is just one of many incoming freshmen on IEPs who is experiencing a significant loss of crucial special education supports now that [the Student] is at the high school. Providing students this very reasonable accommodation during their first years of high school could end up making the difference in their academic progress that ultimately determines whether they end up on a standard diploma track or on a modified diploma down the road;
4. Include parent input in finalized IEP. Disregard the so-called Final IEP I received on [the Student] until parent input has been included.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Student is fifteen years old and a ninth grade student at the District's high school. The Student is described as quiet, but social with peers and active in sports, playing both basketball and soccer. The Student picks up new concepts quickly, will not ask for help frequently, and has made significant advancements in critical thinking over the past two years.
2. In Spring 2017, near the end of the Student's seventh grade year, the Student was referred for an initial special education evaluation. On June 1, 2017, the Parent consented to an evaluation and after the summer break, a Douglas Education Service District Evaluation Specialist conducted a psycho-educational evaluation. The Evaluation Specialist remarked that the Student had been referred for "concerns about

[] academic skills” and noted that the Student had a history of low grades and high absenteeism.

3. The Evaluation Specialist used assessments conducted with the Student from April 2017, along with a May 2017 file review, September 2017 observation, and September 14, 2017 cognitive assessment to reach conclusions about the Student’s educational needs.
4. The Evaluation Specialist noted the Student demonstrated low verbal ability and suggested instructional accommodations, such as the use of simple instructions, methods for acquisition of new vocabulary, and the use of a dictionary or thesaurus.
5. The Evaluation Specialist provided the Student’s Individualized Education Program (IEP) Team with information suggesting the Student’s eligibility for special education under the category of specific learning disability.
6. On September 28, 2017, the Student’s initial IEP Team convened. The Student and Parent both participated. The Evaluation Specialist presented the Student’s psycho-educational evaluation findings and the IEP Team agreed unanimously that the Student met the disability criteria for specific learning disability and needed special education. The IEP Team developed three goals in the areas of math, reading, and writing.
7. The IEP Team also decided that between September 28, 2017 and September 27, 2018, the Student would be removed from the general education environment for a total of 106 minutes per day to work on written language, mathematics, and reading.
8. The September 28, 2017 IEP’s Statement of Non-Participation Justification notes the Student would spend “106 minutes or 2 periods in a resource classroom to receive specially designed instruction for Language Arts and Math.”
9. The September 28, 2017 IEP’s Special Education Placement Determination notes the placement option selected for the Student, specifically that the Student “will spend three periods or 159 minutes in a resource classroom to receive specific instruction in a small group environment. This will be done in Math for one period, Language Arts for one period, and then a Resource period to receive additional assistance with all other class materials.”
10. The Student’s IEP Team considered the need for related services, supplementary aids/services, modifications, and accommodations, and determined none were needed.
11. During the 2017-2018 school year, the Student’s middle school schedule involved removal from the general education classroom for three periods per day. The Student worked on Language Arts and Math with a Special Education Teacher in a small classroom environment (approximately 4-8 students). The Student’s Special Education Teacher had the support of an educational assistant to work with students.

The Student also attended a resource classroom where the Student worked on IEP goals.

12. During the 2017-2018 school year, the Student's academic achievement improved significantly. The Student's grades improved. The Student's writing rubric scores increased consistently. The Student's reading content quiz scores improved, and in the area of math, the Student was able to correctly solve problems of increasing complexity as the year progressed.
13. The Student would not seek out help from the Special Education Teacher or educational assistant. The Student was not incentivized by the Special Education Teacher's established reward systems. Rather, the Student was motivated by field trips such as on-campus parties and off-campus excursions.
14. On August 27, 2018, the Student began ninth grade at the District high school. The Student's class schedule included one period of removal from the general education environment for a resource room class.
15. The District's high school Special Education Teacher was new to the District for the 2018-2019 school year. As a consequence, the Special Education Teacher did not participate in any "transition" IEPs for eighth grade students in the District moving from middle school to high school.
16. On September 19, 2018, the Student's IEP Team convened for an annual IEP Team Meeting. The Summary of Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (Strengths of Student, Parent Concerns, Current Info, and Present Levels of Developmental and Functional Performance) narratives in the September 19, 2018 IEP are identical to those in the Student's September 28, 2017 IEP.
17. The September 19, 2018 IEP Team decided that the Student would be removed from the general education environment for a total of 106 minutes per day to work on written language, mathematics, and reading.
18. The September 19, 2018 IEP's Statement of Non-Participation Justification notes the placement option selected for the Student, specifically that the Student "will spend ~~406~~ 110 minutes or 2 periods in a resource classroom to receive specially designed instruction for Language Arts and Math." The typewritten "106" is scratched out and replaced with a handwritten "110". Typical District high school classes are 55 minutes long.
19. The September 19, 2018 IEP Special Education Placement Determination notes the placement option selected for the Student, specifically that the Student would spend "[t]wo periods in the resource room daily."
20. After the IEP Team Meeting on September 19, 2018, the Parent sent the District high school Special Education Teacher emails with items to be added to the IEP. The Parent had additional Parent concerns as well as additional supplementary

aids/services suggestions (check for understanding, shortened written responses, consider alternative modes (to writing) to demonstrate knowledge), and mentioned her preference that the IEP include additional adult support in content area classes. The following day, the Parent sent the high school Special Education Teacher another email asking that the IEP include that the Student will receive help on content area class assignments in a resource room.

21. Hand-written additions of “check for understanding” and “shortened written responses” were added to the Student’s IEP. The Student’s Conference Summary, which was signed by the Parent, contains the following handwritten recommendations: “Extra aide in room was requested. Modified diploma discussed. Extra accommodations – shortened written answers. Check for understanding. Has made a lot of progress over the last year. Doing OK in Science. Dropping Algebra 1 – extra time in resource room. [The Parent] wants request checked by one week.” The remaining proposed additions sent by Parent on September 19 and 20, 2018 were not incorporated into the Student’s IEP.
22. Between August 27, 2018 and September 26, 2018, the Student was removed from the general education environment for one class period per day. After September 26, 2018, the Student was removed from the general education environment for two class periods per day. On September 26, 2018, the Student was removed from a general education math class and placed in a math class with the high school Special Education Teacher. The Student also transferred from general education English class to another, the latter of which had fewer students.
23. An educational assistant works with the Student and others in the Student’s special education math class. The high school Special Education Teacher consults with the Student’s English Teacher regarding the Student’s progress and works with the Student on writing skills during the Student’s time in a resource room. Since the beginning of the 2018-2019 school year, the Student has made positive progress in writing.
24. Besides math class, the Student does not receive assistance from an educational assistant in any other class.
25. On October 22, 2018, the Department received this Complaint.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. When IEPs Must Be In Effect

The Parent alleges the District did not implement the Student’s IEP correctly when the Student entered high school for the 2018-2019 school year. At the beginning of each school year, a school district must have in effect an IEP for each student with a disability within the school district’s jurisdiction, and additionally must provide special education

and related services in accordance with that IEP.³ It is appropriate for an IEP Team to discuss a range of possible placements and services at IEP Team Meetings. However, after discussing potential appropriate placements and services, “the school district must take the final step and clearly identify an appropriate placement from the range of possibilities.”⁴ A school district violates the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) when it fails to articulate a clear, coherent offer of FAPE that a parent can reasonably evaluate and decide to accept or challenge.

1. Eighth Grade – 2017-2018

For implementation between September 28, 2017 and September 27, 2018, the District developed an internally inconsistent and unclear IEP. Specifically, the District did not clearly describe how often the Student would be removed from the general education environment during eighth grade. The Service Summary of the Student’s IEP notes the Student would be removed from the general education environment for a total of 106 minutes per day⁵ to work on written language, mathematics, and reading. The Student’s IEP’s Statement of Non-Participation Justification aligns with the Service Summary, noting that the Student would spend “106 minutes or 2 periods in a resource classroom to receive specialized designed instruction for Language Arts and Math.” Meanwhile, the same IEP also states that the placement team selected the following removal from the general education environment—“three periods or 159 minutes in a Resource Classroom to receive specific instruction in a small group environment. This will be done in Math for one period, Language Arts for one period, and then a Resource period to receive additional assistance with all other class materials.” During the 2017-2018 school year, the Student was actually removed from the general education environment for three periods or 159 minutes to work with a District Special Education Teacher and educational assistant. The September 28, 2017 IEP’s internal inconsistencies regarding placement are in conflict and cannot be reconciled.

It is important to note the Student made significant academic progress during the 2017-2018 school year. The Student’s academic achievement improved, as evidenced by improved grades, writing rubric scores, reading content quizzes, and accurate completion of mathematics assignments of increasing complexity. However, the fact remains that the Student’s September 28, 2017 IEP, as developed, was non-compliant because it did not signal to the Parent or District staff a clear indication of how much of the Student’s school day would be spent removed from the general education environment—two class periods or three class periods. The Department substantiates this allegation and orders corrective action.

2. Ninth Grade – 2018-2019

The Student’s internally inconsistent IEP carried over into ninth grade. The Student began high school with only one class period of removal from the general education environment. This amount of removal does not align with either of the two placements

³ 34 CFR § 300.323; OAR 581-015-2220.

⁴ *Glendale Unified Sch. Dist. v. Almasi*, 122 F.Supp.2d 1093, 1108 (C.D. Cal. 2000).

⁵ A District middle school class period duration is 53 minutes.

described in the Student's IEP—two class periods or three class periods. On September 19, 2018, the Student's IEP Team convened for an annual IEP Team Meeting. There, the Student's IEP Team decided that for the 2018-2019 school year, the Student would be removed from the general education environment for a total of 106 minutes per day to work on written language, mathematics, and reading. The Student's IEP's Statement of Non-Participation Justification notes the placement option selected for the Student, specifically that the Student "will spend ~~406~~ 110 minutes or 2 periods in a resource classroom to receive specially designed instruction for Language Arts and Math." The typewritten "106" is scratched out and replaced with a handwritten "110". Beginning September 26, 2018, the Student was removed from the general education environment for two class periods (approximately 110 minutes) per day.

Between September 26, 2018 and the Department's receipt of the Parent's Complaint on October 22, 2018, the District removed the Student from the general education environment in an amount that aligns with the Student's operative IEP. However, between August 27, 2018 and September 26, 2018, the District did not sufficiently remove the Student from the general education environment for either of the potential amounts described in the Student's IEP. The Department substantiates this allegation and orders corrective action.

B. IEP Content

The Parent alleges that the District did not make appropriate changes to the Student's IEP for the 2018-2019 school year regarding resource room services and also failed to provide appropriate educational assistant support in general education classes.

A school district must develop an IEP for a child with a disability that contains, among other components, "[a] statement of the child's **present** levels of academic achievement and functional performance, including how the child's disability affects the child's involvement and progress in the general education curriculum."⁶ Each school district must ensure the IEP Team reviews and revises the child's IEP, as appropriate, at least on an annual basis.⁷

1. Resource Room Services in the September 19, 2018 IEP

The District made appropriate changes to the Student's IEP regarding resource room services. The Student's September 19, 2018 IEP's Statement of Non-Participation Justification notes that the Student "will spend . . . 2 periods in a resource classroom to receive specially designed instruction for Language Arts and Math." Additionally, the Student's Service Summary notes that between September 20, 2018 and September 18, 2019, the Student would be removed from the general education environment for a total of 106 minutes per day to work on written language, mathematics, and reading. Indeed, the Student has made academic progress with two periods of removal from the general education environment. The high school Special Education Teacher has developed a rapport with the Student and consults with the Student's general education English

⁶ 34 CFR § 300.320; OAR 581-015-2200 (Emphasis added).

⁷ 34 CFR § 300.324; OAR 581-015-2225.

Teacher to work toward improving the Student's reading and writing abilities. The District correctly updated the Student's IEP to reflect a plan for ninth grade, which materialized, wherein the Student was removed from the general education environment for two class periods. The Department does not substantiate this allegation.

2. Educational Assistant Support

The District provided appropriate educational assistant support to the Student. Neither the September 28, 2017 IEP nor the September 19, 2018 IEP include 1:1 assistance, educational assistant support, or anything comparable as a supplementary aid or service. Against the Student's preferences, the Student received educational assistant support as part of the Student's middle school academic program. This assistance did prove helpful to the Student's academic growth. Upon entering high school, the Student received small class instruction during two resource room classes. The Student's math class has approximately 11 students where the Student receives instruction from the Special Education Teacher and an educational assistant. The Student does not have educational assistant support in the other resource room class, nor any general education classes. Nevertheless, after rearranging the Student's class schedule to better accommodate the Student's needs in math and English, the Student has made academic progress in the absence of educational assistant support. The Department does not substantiate this allegation.

3. Additional Finding - Present Levels in the Student's September 19, 2018 IEP

The District violated the IDEA when it failed to update the Student's present levels. The Student's September 19, 2018 IEP contains the same narrative in the following "Summary of Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance" sub-categories: (1) Strengths of Student (Academic, Functional, Behavior, Learning characteristics, etc.); (2) Concerns of the parent(s) for enhancing the education of the student; (3) Current Info; and (4) Present level of developmental and functional performance (including results of initial or most recent evaluations.) Outdated information is repeated, such as, "[the Student] socially interacts with [] peers a lot more than . . . last Spring," which appears in both the 2017 and 2018 IEP.

Given the significant academic, behavioral, and functional progress the Student made during the 2017-2018 school year, within the same District no less, it is incongruent and contrary to the IDEA's "present" level IEP content requirement that no changes would be made to the Student's IEP in this area. For this reason, the Department makes this additional finding and orders corrective action.

C. Parent Participation

The Parent alleges the District violated the IDEA when it did not incorporate comments the Parent submitted for addition to the Student's IEP and ignored the Parent's input regarding the importance of an educational assistant to the Student's educational program. School districts must provide parents with an opportunity to participate in meetings with respect to the identification, evaluation, IEP, and educational placement of

the child.⁸ The IDEA does not require a school district to include additional information in a student's IEP beyond what is explicitly required.⁹

The Parent actively participated in the September 28, 2017 and September 19, 2018 IEP Team Meetings. At the September 28, 2017 IEP, the Parent—who had been involved in the Student's evaluative process—asked questions and was able to provide input regarding the Student's proposed placement and overall class schedule. Additionally, the Parent was receptive to input shared with her about the Student's academic progress and evaluation results.

At the September 19, 2018 IEP, the Parent's request for educational assistant support in the classroom prompted discussion about the Student's reluctance to ask for help and whether additional adult support was needed. The Parent made recommendations for accommodations such as shortened written responses and checking for understanding, which the District incorporated into the Student's IEP.

After the September 19, 2018 IEP Team Meeting, the Parent sent the District high school Special Education Teacher emails requesting additional information be included in the IEP document, including additional parent concerns and additional supplementary aids/services (check for understanding, shortened written responses, consider alternative modes (to writing) to demonstrate knowledge), and mentioned her preference that the IEP include additional adult support in content area classes. The following day, the Parent sent the high school Special Education Teacher another email asking that the IEP include that the Student will receive help on content area class assignments in a resource room. The high school Special Education Teacher hand-wrote the following additional accommodations into the Student's IEP: check for understanding and shortened written responses. The Student's Conference Summary, which was signed by the Parent, contains the following handwritten recommendations: "Extra aide in room was requested. Modified diploma discussed. Extra accommodations – shortened written answers. Check for understanding. Has made a lot of progress over the last year. Doing OK in Science. Dropping Algebra 1 – extra time in resource room."

The Student academic record demonstrates that the Parent meaningfully participated in the IEP process. The Department does not substantiate this allegation.

D. Placement of the Child

The Parent alleges the District violated the IDEA when it improperly placed the Student in the District Resource Room/"LRC" for too few class periods during the 2018-2019 school year. School districts are responsible for ensuring that the educational placement of a child with a disability is made in conformity with IDEA's least restrictive environment provisions and is based on the student's current IEP.¹⁰

⁸ OAR 581-015-2190(1).

⁹ 34 CFR § 300.320; OAR 581-015-2200.

¹⁰ 34 CFR § 300.116; OAR 581-015-2250.

Between September 26, 2018 and the Department’s receipt of the Parent’s Complaint on October 22, 2018, the District removed the Student from the general education environment for two class periods—an amount that aligns with the Student’s operative IEP. However, between August 27, 2018 and September 26, 2018, the District did not correctly remove the Student from the general education environment for either of the potential amounts described in the Student’s IEP. Placement was not based on the Student’s current IEP. The Department substantiates this allegation and orders corrective action.

V. CORRECTIVE ACTION¹¹
In the Matter of Winston-Dillard School District
 Case No. 18-054-042

	Action Required	Submissions¹²	Due Date
1.	Confer with the Department to identify the District’s Policy and Procedures to be reviewed in the following areas: a. Enrollment; b. Timelines for implementing IEPs; c. Evaluation, eligibility, and IEP development for students transferring into the District or between District schools; d. Responding to a Parent’s requests related to special education matters.	Submit to the Department for review and approval the District’s identified policies and procedures.	January 30, 2019
2.	Following the Department’s review, meet with designated staff to review and revise the applicable policies and procedures.	Evidence of completed meeting, including notes and revised documents.	March 15, 2019
3.	With review and approval of Department staff, provide written guidance to District staff regarding timely review and implementation of IEPs and the revised policies and procedures.	Evidence of distribution of completed written guidance, including a list of recipients.	April 15, 2019

¹¹ The Department’s order shall include any necessary corrective action as well as documentation to ensure that the corrective action has been completed (OAR 581-015-2030(13)). The Department expects and requires the timely completion of corrective action and will verify that the corrective action has been completed as specified in any final order (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)).

¹² Corrective action submissions 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: raeannray@state.or.us; fax number (503) 378-5156.

Dated: this 11th day of January 2019

Candace Pelt, Ed.D

Candace Pelt, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Office of Student Services

Mailing Date: January 11, 2019

Appeal Rights: Parties may seek judicial review of this Order. Judicial review may be obtained by filing a petition for review within sixty days from the service of this Order with the Marion County Circuit Court or with the Circuit Court for the County in which the party seeking judicial review resides. Judicial review is pursuant to the provisions of ORS § 183.484. (OAR 581-015-2030 (14).)