BEFORE THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

In the Matter of Hillsboro School District 1J	)	FINDINGS OF FACT,
	)	CONCLUSIONS,
	)	AND FINAL ORDER
	)	Case No. 25-054-073

I. BACKGROUND

On October 21, 2025, the Oregon Department of Education (Department) received a written request for a special education complaint investigation from the parent (Parent) of a student (Student) residing in the Hillsboro School District 1J (District). The Parent requested that the Department conduct a special education investigation under OAR 581-015-2030. The Department confirmed receipt of this Complaint and forwarded the request to the District.

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.[1] This timeline may be extended if the Parent and the District agree to the extension in order to engage in mediation or local resolution or for exceptional circumstances related to the complaint.[2]

On October 28, 2025, the Department's Complaint 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 12, 2025.

The District submitted a *Response* on November 12, 2025, denying the allegations, providing an explanation, and submitting documents supporting the District's position. The District submitted the following relevant items:

1. District's Written *Response* to Complaint
2. Progress Report, 2024-25
3. Kindergarten Assessments, 04/15/[24]-04/17/[24]
4. Emails between the District and the Parent dated 03/28/24-11/12/25
5. Comprehensive Evaluation, 10/23/24
6. 504 Accommodation Plan, 11/25/24
7. Report Card, 2024-25 School Year
8. Meeting Agenda and Notes, 03/14/25
9. Care Team Referral Notes from 24/25, 09/03/24-04/28/[25]
10. Progress Report, 2024-25 School Year

[1] OAR 581-015-2030(12) and 34 CFR § 300.152(a)
[2] OAR 581-015-2030(12) and 34 CFR § 300.152(b)

The Parent submitted documents in support of their position on November 12, 2025. The Parent submitted the following relevant items:

1. Request for Complaint, no date
2. Emails between the Parent and the District dated 01/10/25 to 01/13/25
3. Comprehensive Evaluation, 10/23/24

The Complaint Investigator interviewed the Parent on November 19, 2025. On November 24, 2025, the Complaint Investigator interviewed District personnel. The Complaint Investigator reviewed and considered all of these documents, interviews, and exhibits in reaching the findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in this order. This order is timely.

II. ALLEGATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Department has jurisdiction to resolve this Complaint under 34 CFR §§ 300.151-153 and OAR 581-015-2030. The Parent's allegations and the Department's conclusions are set out in the chart below. The conclusions are based on the Findings of Fact in Section III and the Discussion in Section IV. This Complaint covers the one-year period from October 22, 2024, to the filing of this Complaint on October 21, 2025.

Allegations	Conclusions
Child Find The Complaint alleged the District violated the IDEA by failing to identify and evaluate the Student, who was suspected of having a disability and in need of special education services. (OAR 581-015-2080(1)(2)(d); CFR § 300.111(a)(c)(1))	**Not Substantiated** The District identified the Student as a student with a disability and was providing services in the form of a 504 Plan and classroom accommodations.
Evaluation Requirements The Complaint alleged the District violated the IDEA by failing to conduct an initial evaluation despite the Parent's request and the existence of private evaluation information that suggested the Student had a disability. (OAR 581-015-2105(1)(a)(2-3); 34 CFR § 300.301(b))	**Not Substantiated** The District met with the Parent to consider the request for an evaluation and determined there was not sufficient need for an evaluation.
Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) The Complaint alleged the District violated the IDEA by denying the Student a FAPE when they did not evaluate the Student to determine eligibility for special education and the need for special education services.	**Not Substantiated** The District did not deny the Student a FAPE.

Allegations	Conclusions
(OAR 581-015-2040(1); 34 CFR §§ 300.17, 300.101(a)(c))	

REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION
● Provide additional training for teachers and staff. ● Provide reimbursement for private testing. ● Provide a tutor of the Parent's choice, paid for by the District.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

IDEA regulations limit complaint investigation to alleged violations occurring no more than one year before the Department's receipt of the special education complaint. This Complaint Investigation did not consider any IDEA violations alleged to have occurred before October 22, 2024. Any facts listed below relating to circumstances or incidents earlier than that date are included solely to provide the context necessary to understand the Student's disability and special education history.

1. The Student is in second grade and attended an elementary school in the District. They are described as very smart and wanting to learn.

2. The Student has a diagnosis of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and qualified for a Section 504 Plan.

3. A "Comprehensive Evaluation" report from an independent provider dated October 23, 2024, stated an academic evaluation was completed due to concerns about the Student's reading ability.
   a. It was reported that the Student "struggle[d] to read single words, put sounds together to read words accurately, and [put] words together to form sentences." It was noted the Parent wanted more diagnostic information in order to better support the Student.
   b. The report stated the Student was in first grade, and although the Student was not able to read, the School had not expressed any academic concerns. The Student was on a 504 Plan; however, they were not receiving interventions at the time of the evaluation.
   c. The report acknowledged diagnoses of ADHD, anxiety disorders, and a communication disorder.
   d. The report concluded the Student should remain on a 504 Plan and pursue accommodations specific to reading.

4. In an email to the Parent dated October 23, 2024, the School Counselor noted the Teacher had been sending home "checklists" for the Student. The School Counselor asked the Parent if they were "seeking another diagnosis" for the Student.

5. In an email on October 28, 2024, the Parent asked the Teacher to continue taking notes on the Student's behavior in order to give the information to the Student's medical team. The

Teacher responded the same day they would note times of day for behaviors and share the information at the next parent-teacher conference.

6. In an email exchange dated November 8, 2024 to November 11, 2024, the Parent informed the School Counselor they were sending the results of the independent evaluation to the School. The School Counselor responded they would accept the report and retrieve it from the Student's backpack.

7. On November 12, 2024, the Parent sent an email to verify the School Counselor had received the report and requested a "follow[-]up."

8. In an email to the School Psychologist on November 12, 2024, the School Counselor acknowledged they would add two recommendations from the report to the 504 plan. They asked to speak with the School Psychologist to verify whether they needed to hold an "SSP" [Student Support Plan] meeting before proceeding.

9. On November 13, 2024, the School Counselor emailed the Teacher inquiring about the Student's reading assessments and interventions. In a reply on November 14, 2024, the Teacher stated, "... [the Student] knew 23/26 letter names, 23/26 letter sounds, 5/10 nonsense CVC [consonant-vowel-consonant] words and 14/20 real CVC words." The Teacher described the Student as "average" for early first grade.

10. On November 20, 2024, the School Counselor emailed the Parent to inform them about the pending intervention for the Student. They asked to speak to the Parent during parent-teacher conferences.

11. In an email exchange on the morning of November 25, 2024, the School Counselor and the Parent discussed and agreed on a time to meet that day.

    A 504 Accommodation Plan, dated November 25, 2024, noted diagnoses of ADHD and anxiety, and included accommodations for preferential seating, use of fidgets, break cards, transition warnings, check-ins for understanding content, and breaking larger tasks down into "smaller chunks." The Parent electronically signed the document on November 26, 2024.

    In an email on the afternoon of November 25, 2024, the School Counselor thanked the Parent for meeting with them and sent a document for the Parent to review. The Parent responded on November 26, 2024, "Looks good to me."

12. On December 3, 2024, the Parent emailed the School Counselor inquiring about reading intervention groups for the Student. On December 11, 2024, the School Counselor informed the Parent the intervention groups would "officially" start on December 12, 2024, the Student would stay with the Teacher for interventions, and the Student was doing reading in a small group.

13. "Work Traits and Behavior Report" sheets dated December 4, 2024, through February 28, 2025, indicate progress for the Student.

14. On January 13, 2025, the Parent emailed the Teacher to inquire if reading intervention groups had started. The Teacher replied the groups started before winter break, and "mini-readers" had been sent home.

15. On January 20, 2025, the Parent emailed the School Counselor to ask about further options for academic support for the Student. They mentioned the daily reports from the Teacher indicated "academic struggles" and asked about beginning the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process. The next day, the School Counselor emailed the Principal and the Teacher for guidance. On January 22, 2025, the Principal replied to the School Counselor and the Teacher that they spoke to the Parent and explained assessments were taking place. The Principal expressed to the Parent the Student was receiving appropriate interventions, and they could review after assessments were completed.

16. On January 30, 2025, the Mental Health Care Coordinator emailed the Principal and the School Counselor, sharing that the Parent had called them to discuss transferring the Student. The Principal responded on February 3, 2025, confirming they had spoken with the Parent and were waiting for the Parent to decide about the transfer. They asked the School Counselor to schedule an "SSP meeting with the team and the Parent[.]"

17. On February 3, 2025, the Behavior & Support Specialist emailed the Parent, thanking them for bringing the Student to their attention, and acknowledged both the Parent's concerns and the accommodations in place. They stated, "Should academic barriers that warrant Special Education involvement arise in the future, this background information will be valuable."

18. In an email exchange on February 4, 2025, the School Counselor and the Parent scheduled the SSP meeting for March 3, 2025. On February 5, 2025, the School Counselor explained the team would discuss current interventions, review progress, and decide if other academic and social-emotional learning interventions were needed.

19. On February 7, 2025, the Principal asked the School Counselor to add the Director of Student Services to the SSP invitation. On February 10, 2025, the School Counselor informed the Principal they would need to reschedule the meeting so the Director of Student Services could attend. The Principal asked the School Counselor to contact the Parent to find a new date. On the same day, the Parent agreed to move the meeting to March 14, 2025.

20. In an email on February 14, 2025, the Director of Student Services asked to set up a phone call the following week with the Parent and the Principal regarding the Student.

21. In an email on February 26, 2025, the Parent stated they reviewed the Student's report card and acknowledged academic progress. They questioned the need for the SSP meeting, stating, "I feel as if this is the best that will get done currently as you all see no need to

implement an IEP." The Principal responded it was important to keep the meeting to share the Student's growth and confirmed the meeting would take place on March 14, 2025.

22. Meeting Notes dated March 14, 2025, indicate the Parent, the Elementary Resource Specialist, the Teacher, the Director of Student Services, the Student Success Coach, and the Principal were in attendance. The Teacher shared that the Student was participating in lessons more often and was working on social communication skills with the rest of the class. The Teacher noted the Student received 45 minutes total reading intervention per day across three sessions, focusing on CVC words, University of Florida Literacy Institute (UFLI) lessons, and "leveled readers." The Parent shared that the Student also practiced UFLI at home. The Parent expressed new concerns in math; however, the Teacher stated for math the Student was "[v]ery normal for first grade." The notes stated "[The Student was] doing really well." Notes stated no meetings were needed "moving forward."

23. On April 21, 2025, the Parent emailed the Teacher to inform them the Student had started a new ADHD medication. The Parent asked the Teacher if they had noticed any differences in the Student. The Teacher reported the Student "didn't blurt out as much and interrupt during lessons."

24. In an email dated May 22, 2025, the Teacher reached out to the Parent to share the Student's progress. They shared increased participation and engagement in lessons. They noted "[The Student's] biggest area to improve on [was] organization."

25. A First Grade Report Card for the 2024-25 school year indicated the following:
    a. For semesters 1 and 2, the Student demonstrated effort "consistently" in Science, Social Studies, and Art, and "usually" in English Language Arts (ELA), Math, and Health.
    b. For semester 1, the following benchmarks were recorded:
        i. Reading Foundations: 2/4 met; 2/4 nearly met.
        ii. Reading Literature: 4/4 met.
        iii. Reading Informational Text: 3/4 met; 1/4 unscored.
        iv. Writing: 1/3 nearly met; 2/3 unscored.
        v. Speaking and Listening: 2/2 met.
        vi. Language: 1/2 met; 1/2 nearly met.
    c. For semester 2, the following benchmarks were recorded:
        i. Reading Foundations: 1/4 met; 2/4 nearly met; 1/4 not yet met.
        ii. Reading Literature: 3/4 met; 1/4 not yet met.
        iii. Reading Informational Text: 3/4 met; 1/4 nearly met.
        iv. Writing: 2/3 met; 1/3 nearly met.
        v. Speaking and Listening: 2/2 met.
        vi. Language: 1/2 met; 1/2 nearly met.
    d. The Teacher noted that daily reading practice would benefit the Student, acknowledged the Student's favorable decoding skills, and indicated progress throughout the year. They recommended a summer reading program to build skills.

26. According to the Student's 2024-25 Progress Report, scores indicated the following:

a. Behavior
    i. Quarter 1: 1/5 met, 3/5 nearly met, and 1/5 not yet met.
    ii. Quarter 2: 2/5 met, and 3/5 nearly met.
    iii. Quarter 3: 3/5 met, and 2/5 nearly met.
b. Reading
    i. Quarter 1: 1/5 met and 4/5 nearly met.
    ii. Quarter 2: 2/5 met and 3/5 nearly met.
    iii. Quarter 3: 1/4 met and 3/4 nearly met.
c. Math
    i. Quarter 1: 2/5 met and 3/5 nearly met.
    ii. Quarter 2: 4/5 met and 1/5 nearly met.
    iii. Quarter 3: 4/5 met and 1/5 nearly met.
d. Writing
    i. Quarter 1: 2/5 met 2/5 nearly met, and 1/5 not yet met.
    ii. Quarter 2: 3/5 met 2/5 nearly met.

27. On October 21, 2025, the Parent filed this Complaint.

28. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, the Parent stated reading and writing were their academic concerns for the Student. They shared they had been requesting academic testing and intervention since kindergarten. At that time, the Student's doctor diagnosed the Student with ADHD and anxiety, and the Parent provided the diagnosis to the District. They reported the Student had an IEP for speech in Kindergarten, and a 504 Plan in first grade for ADHD.

29. The Parent shared they again expressed concern the Student could not read at the beginning of first grade. They stated they reported these concerns to the District. According to the Parent, the District "ignored" them.

30. The Parent stated they sought private academic testing, which showed what they described as "below average and average scores." They confirmed they gave the private evaluation report to the District on or around November 4, 2024. They stated the District did not recommend private testing, nor did the District reimburse the Parent for the private testing.

    The Parent acknowledged they did not officially request academic testing from the District in first grade, expressing "after three failed attempts" in kindergarten, "I realized … I needed to do more … since they're not taking me seriously."

31. The Parent confirmed the District updated the Student's 504 Plan to better accommodate their ADHD, "but nothing to the academic standards that may inhibit ADHD." They confirmed the Teacher began sending home "work trait and behavior" reports. They shared the purpose of the reports was to show the difficulties the Student was experiencing.

32. The Parent acknowledged interventions for the Student began in December 2024. They reported the District told them "We're supplying [the Student] the skills that [the Student]

needs." The Parent stated they never saw any progress reports or data related to the interventions. The Parent was not sure what curriculum or methods were used for the interventions.

The Parent reported the Student continued to struggle with reading and writing after interventions began, stating the Student "continued to decline to the point that I felt that more should have been done[.]"

The Parent shared that by February, the Student's struggles were "evident." They recalled emailing the Behavior & Support Specialist on February 3, 2025. They expressed they felt their concerns were "dismissed."

33. The Parent reported they changed districts, and the Student was not currently receiving special education services. However, the Student was receiving "tier two interventions," and the Parent believed progress was being made.

34. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, the Teacher was joined by the Director of Student Services. The Teacher stated they were the Student's first-grade teacher last school year.

35. The Teacher stated they supported the Student in class by allowing them to use a stuffed animal as a comforting tool to help with anxiety. Other accommodations included preferential seating closest to the Teacher, and access to two break cards. They added the Student came to school "happy and smiling," and described the Student as doing well most of the time.

36. The Teacher described "conflicting" information between what the Parent had shared and how the Student presented themselves at school. They stated the Parent had said the Student was having a "terrible morning" with crying and a lot of anxiety, but the Teacher witnessed the Student as being okay.

37. The Teacher recalled using a "smiley chart" to track the Student's behaviors because the Parent wanted an update on how the Student's day was. They stated coming to an agreement with the Parent about only sending updates when the Student had been upset about something, was frustrated, or cried, adding this occurred during conferences in November [2024]. The Teacher stated they clarified with the Parent, "no news was good news." The Teacher added the Student's behavior did not warrant "that level of 911 emergency intervention."

38. The Teacher recalled attending a meeting with the Director of Student Services, the Principal, the Special Education Teacher, and the Parent where they discussed the Parent's request for an evaluation of the Student. The Teacher reported the team reviewed the Student's assessments and discussed the data and the Student's progress. They described the Student performing as a "typical first grader" and was making growth. The Teacher stated at the meeting they were "under the impression" the Parent was satisfied with the Student's

growth, and the Teacher mentioned keeping an eye on the Student so that if anything changed, they could "revisit the idea" of further evaluation.

39. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, the School Counselor was joined by the Director of Student Services. The School Counselor stated they were the 504 Coordinator for the Student.

40. The School Counselor stated that when a family came to them with a diagnosis, they would take it to the team to determine the impact and the accommodations that might be needed. They stated that, if they decided to move forward, there were documents in the 504 protocol that they would go through. The School Counselor described needing to answer a list of questions, and if enough of them are checked, the team would move forward with the 504. They added this is what happened with the Student and how the Student received their 504 plan. They added the Student needed accommodations to sit near the speaker on a wobbly seat. They noted the Student also needed to be reminded to refocus.

    The School Counselor recalled the Parent bringing them an outside evaluation and immediately giving it to the School Psychologist and the Special Education Teacher. They added that, based on their requirements, they would let the School Counselor know "what direction to take." The School Counselor did not recall the Parent asking them directly for an evaluation for the Student.

41. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, the Principal was joined by the Director of Student Services. The Principal recalled receiving an email from the Parent requesting an evaluation. They stated the Parent had included medical documentation and reports. The Principal recalled setting up a meeting with the team, which included the special education team, School Counselor, the Parent and themselves. They described reviewing the Student's data in reading, math, and behavior to see the progress the Student made and to determine if the team suspected a disability that was impacting the Student's ability to learn at school. They added that, during the meeting, the team determined the Student was making growth, engaging in lessons, participating in small groups, and participating in interventions. The Principal stated the team chose not to move forward with an evaluation at that time and to continue with the supports on the Student's 504 plan.

42. The Principal described the Student's classroom supports as 15 minutes daily of phonics interventions and the interventions listed in the 504 plan. The Principal explained the phonics interventions were to see if the Student could make academic growth, and the 504 supported the Student with behavior accommodations. They added the phonics interventions began around October or November [2024] and stated they were already in place before the Parent requested an evaluation as part of the school's Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process.

43. The Principal recalled receiving "a lot of private evaluations" from the Parent. They clarified they had received at least three different types of evaluations or diagnoses from evaluators outside of the School. They stated they used the evaluation they received on October 23,

2024, to update the Student's 504 plan and added they were working towards holding an SST meeting next.

44. The Principal noted the initial meeting was between the Parent and the School Counselor. The next meeting was with the Director of Student Services, the Teacher, the Parent, the Student Success Coach, and themselves. During the meeting, the Principal stated they looked at where the Student was academically and what growth the Student had made behaviorally. The Principal recalled the Parent had the opportunity to provide input, and remembered the Parent also acknowledged the Student's growth.

45. The Principal confirmed the team decided not to move forward with an evaluation, citing the team didn't feel they had enough information to show a "suspected learning disability" based on the growth the Student was making.

46. The Principal remembered the Parent had asked to cancel the meeting before it was held, stating they knew the Student was making progress, and added, based on the Teacher's behavior data, they didn't need to meet. The Principal responded they did still need to meet to address the Parent's request.

47. Regarding an email the Director of Student Services sent in February 2025, requesting a phone meeting with the Parent and the Principal, both the Principal and the Director of Student Services could not recall if the phone meeting had occurred, but both agreed the in-person meeting had taken place on March 14, 2025.

48. The Principal stated they supported the Student indirectly through supporting the Teacher and the School Counselor with the 504 process, completing observations in the classroom, and identifying the needs of the Student. The Principal added they also supported by communicating with the Parent regarding the Student's performance.

49. The Principal indicated they communicated with the Parent more than what was typical for a student on a 504 plan. The Principal recalled after a phone call with the Parent, they would also send a follow-up email to "reiterate" what they had talked about. They added they attempted to be as thorough as possible when communicating with the Parent.

IV. DISCUSSION

Child Find

The Complaint alleged the District violated the IDEA by failing to identify and evaluate the Student, who was suspected of having a disability and in need of special education services.

The requirements of Child Find apply to all children unless they are no longer entitled to a FAPE. Pursuant to the laws, school districts must identify, locate, and evaluate all children with disabilities for whom they are responsible, regardless of the severity of the disability, who are in need of early intervention, early childhood special education, or special education services,

including children who are suspected of having a disability even though they are advancing from grade to grade.[3]

The Student was already identified as having disabilities, specifically ADHD and anxiety, which led to a Section 504 Plan being put in place. Concerns about the Student's academic progress, particularly in reading, were raised by the Parent and documented in a private comprehensive evaluation provided to the District in November 2024. The District acknowledged the private report, updated the Student's 504 Plan with new accommodations for their ADHD, and began reading interventions in December 2024 as part of the MTSS process. The District consistently described the Student's performance as "average" and stated that the Student was making expected "growth" for a first grader, suggesting they did not suspect a new, qualifying academic disability that necessitated a special education evaluation.

The Department does not substantiate this allegation.

Evaluation Requirements

The Complaint alleged the District violated the IDEA by failing to conduct an initial evaluation despite the Parent's request and the existence of private evaluation information that suggested the Student had a disability.

A public agency must conduct an evaluation process in accordance with regulations before determining that a child is a child with a disability. Consistent with consent requirements, a parent or public agency may initiate a request for an initial evaluation to determine if a child is a child with a disability. An initial evaluation must be conducted to determine if a child is eligible for special education services when a public agency suspects or has reason to suspect that the child has a disability that has an adverse impact on the child's educational performance, and the child may need special education services as a result of the disability.[4] The public agency must designate a team to determine whether an initial evaluation will be conducted. The team must include the parent and at least two professionals, at least one of whom is a specialist knowledgeable about and experienced in the evaluation and education of children with disabilities. The team may make this decision without a meeting. If a meeting is held, parents must be invited to participate.[5]

The District received a request for an evaluation from the Parent in first grade, when the Parent asked about beginning the IEP process in January 2025. Following this inquiry, the Principal convened an SSP meeting for March 14, 2025, to review the Student's data, progress, and current interventions, effectively addressing the Parent's concerns. At this meeting, attended by the Parent and key District personnel, the team reviewed the Student's growth, including their 45 minutes of daily reading intervention, and determined they did not have sufficient evidence to suspect a learning disability that would warrant moving forward with a formal special education evaluation at that time.

[3] OAR 581-015-2080(1)(2)(d); CFR § 300.111(a)(c)(1)
[4] OAR 581-015-2105(1)(a)(2); 34 CFR § 300.301(b)
[5] OAR 581-015-2105(3)

The Department does not substantiate this allegation.

Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

The Complaint alleged the District violated the IDEA by denying the Student a FAPE when they did not evaluate the Student to determine eligibility for special education and the need for special education services.

School districts must provide a FAPE to all school-age children with disabilities for whom the district is responsible to educate. Each State must ensure that a FAPE is available to any individual child with a disability who needs special education and related services, even though the child has not failed or been retained in a course or grade, and is advancing from grade to grade.[6] FAPE means special education and related services that are provided at public expense and in conformity with an IEP.[7]

The District maintained and the record reflects that the Student was receiving appropriate, effective interventions and was making adequate progress as a "typical first grader" through classroom interventions and behavior support from their 504 plan. The Student had already been identified as a student with a disability, and a 504 plan was in place, and was included in the MTSS process to receive tier two support in academics.

The Department does not substantiate this allegation.

Additional Finding: Prior Written Notice (PWN)

During the investigation, it was discovered that the District failed to provide the Parent with PWN indicating that it refused to evaluate the Student for special education eligibility.

Written notice must be given to the parents of a child with a disability a reasonable time before the public agency refuses to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child or the provision of a FAPE to the child. The notice must include a description of the action proposed or refused by the agency; an explanation of why the agency proposes or refuses to take the action; a description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the agency used as a basis for the proposed or refused action; a statement that the parents of a child with a disability have protection under the procedural safeguards of this part and, if this notice is not an initial referral for evaluation, the means by which a copy of a description of the procedural safeguards can be obtained; sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of this part; a description of other options the IEP Team considered and the reasons why those options were rejected; and a description of other factors that are relevant to the agency's proposal or refusal.[8]

[6] OAR 581-015-2040(1), 34 CFR § 300.101(a)(c)
[7] 34 CFR § 300.17
[8] OAR 581-015-2310(b)(3), CFR § 300.503(a)(b)

V. CORRECTIVE ACTION[9]

In the Matter of Hillsboro School District 1J
Case No. 025-054-073

Based on the facts provided, the following corrective action is ordered:

Action Required	**Submissions**	**As Soon As Possible But No Later Than Due Date**
1. The District must provide the Parent with a PWN indicating they are refusing to initiate an evaluation of the Student. The PWN must meet the requirements of OAR 581-015-2310.	The District shall submit the following: Documentation that the Parent was provided PWN.	 **January 9, 2026**
2. The District must develop and provide training to all staff responsible for providing PWN.	Training agenda/materials to ODE for review/approval. Sign-in sheet for training.	**March 15, 2026** **June 1, 2026**

Dated: this 19 Day of December 2025



_____

Ramonda Olaloye
Assistant Superintendent
Office of Enhancing Student Opportunities

E-mailing Date: December 19, 2025

Corrected Date: December 31, 2025

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

[9] 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)).

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).)