BEFORE THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

In the Matter of Beaverton School District 48J	)	FINDINGS OF FACT,
	)	CONCLUSIONS,
	)	AND FINAL ORDER
	)	Case No. 26-054-011

I. BACKGROUND

On January 26, 2026, the Oregon Department of Education (Department) received a written request for a special education complaint investigation from the parents (Parents) of a student (Student) residing in the Beaverton School District 48J (District). The Parents requested 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 Parents 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 February 9, 2026, 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 February 24, 2026.

The District submitted a *Response* on February 24, 2026 denying the allegations, providing an explanation, and submitting documents supporting the District's position. The District submitted the following relevant items:

1. Daily Attendance Profile, 2025-26 School Year
2. Report Card, 08/26/25-01/23/26
3. Title Page - 2024-25 School Year, no date
4. IEP, 05/08/24
5. Letter to the Principal, 12/11/25
6. Direct Messages, 10/23/25-01/21/26
7. Report Card, 06/16/25
8. The School Psychologist's response to interview questions, no date
9. Emails, 12/02/24-03/10/26

[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 Complaint Investigator interviewed the Parents on March 13, 2026. On March 10, 2026 the School Counselor and School Psychologist were interviewed. The Case Manager was interviewed on March 11, 2026. 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 Parents' 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 January 27, 2025, to the filing of this Complaint on January 26, 2026.

Allegations	Conclusions
Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) The Parents alleged the District violated the IDEA and denied the Student a FAPE by failing to deliver special education services from January 27, 2025 through the end of the 2024-25 school year and the beginning of the 2025-26 school year. (OAR 581-015-2040(1); 34 CFR §§ 300.17, 300.101(a)(c))	**Not Substantiated** During the time period of the Complaint, the Student was not eligible for special education and, therefore, not entitled to a FAPE. The Department does not make a determination as to whether the Student was properly exited from special education because that occurred more than one year prior to the filing of the Complaint and falls outside of the Department's jurisdiction.

REQUESTED CORRECTIVE ACTION
1. Provide the Parents with a clear understanding of what occurred and the options for the Student moving forward.

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 January 27, 2025. 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 eighth grade at a middle school in the District and is eligible for special education services under the category of Other Health Impairment (OHI).

2. An IEP dated May 8, 2024 outlined the following relevant information for the Student:
   a. The Student is described as "athletic, good at team sports, outgoing, friendly, funny, smart, kind, [and] thoughtful."
   b. Parent input: It was noted the Student needed help with organization and time management. The Parents were not "worried" about the Student academically. They stated the Student understood the work, but their disorganization kept them from turning in assignments.
   c. Writing goal: "Given a writing assignment, [the Student] will complete a single-paragraph essay to include an introduction, three reasons to support, elaborations to explain each reason, and a concluding sentence on 3 out of 4 opportunities, as measured by work samples and data collection." Baseline: 0 out of 4.
   d. Self-Direction goal: "[The Student] will use effective strategies to complete and hand in 90% of [their] assignments to maintain passing grades in all core classes (social studies, language arts, math, and science) as evidenced by progress and grade reports or teacher observation."
   e. Specially designed instruction (SDI) from May 8, 2024 to May 7, 2025:
      i. Writing: 120 minutes monthly in the "provider's space." The provider was listed as the LEA, and the person responsible for monitoring was listed as the "special education teacher/provider."
      ii. Self-direction: 120 minutes monthly in the "provider's space." The provider was listed as the LEA, and the person responsible for monitoring was listed as the "special education teacher/provider."
   f. Accommodations:
      i. Frequent teacher check-ins daily throughout the day.
      ii. Extended time to complete tests/assessments and assignments as predetermined by the teacher.
      iii. Preferential seating at the teacher's discretion, away from distractions.
      iv. Access to a quiet, alternate workspace as needed.
      v. Break tasks down into steps throughout the day.
      vi. Notes provided before the lesson is taught as needed.
      vii. Access to a smaller testing environment as needed.
      viii. Do not call on the Student to write in front of peers, throughout the day, unless the Student volunteers.
      ix. Access to writing tools: graphic organizers, voice typing, word prediction, and editing software, for all assigned writing.
      x. Scaffolded notes and word bank when note-taking for all classes.
      xi. Access to a scribe for scored work on paper.
   g. Support for school personnel: Consultation with the teacher for 120 minutes per year.
   h. Nonparticipation justification: "[The Student] will be removed from the general education setting for 1 period out of an 8-period schedule."
3. An email exchange occurred between the Case Manager and the Parents on December 2, 2024 as follows:
   a. The Case Manager wrote, "I'm following up on our prior conversation regarding your desire to remove [the Student] from IEP support. Could you please reply to this email confirming your desire to decline special education services [emphasis added in original]?" The Case

Manager also stated, "Would you like me to reach out to [the Student's] school counselor regarding setting up a meeting to discuss possible 504 support?"

b. The Parents replied to the Case Manager, "Yes, we would like to stop [special education] services but would like a 504 with some accommodations in place."

4. PWN dated December 2, 2024 was completed by the Case Manager and documented the following:
   a. "This notice informs you of the following action: We have received your email on 12/02/24 declining special education services."
   b. Which is a "refusal" to "initiate" "Identification" and "Provision of a free, appropriate public education (includes IEP)."
   c. The action was proposed because: "We have received your email on 12/02/24 declining special education services."
   d. This action is based on: "Based on parent email dated 12/02/24."
   e. Other options considered: "Meeting to discuss continuing eligibility for services under OHI criteria."
   f. We rejected these options because: "We have received your email on 12/02/24 declining special education services."
   g. Other factors considered: "Parents are requesting a 504 meeting."

   In a follow-up to their interview with the Complaint Investigator, the Case Manager stated that according to their records, they drafted the PWN regarding the revocation of services on December 2, 2024 and gave the PWN to one of the Parents on December 19, 2024, which they reported was consistent with the day they uploaded the form to the online system. They recalled they were on their way to mail it, but encountered one of the Parents at the School and gave it to them instead. They were uncertain, but said it was possible they also mailed it. The Case Manager also stated that it was typically their practice to email a copy as soon as the PWN was created, but they were waiting for the School Counselor to contact the Parents, so that did not occur this time.

5. On December 3, 2024, the Case Manager emailed the Parents and said, "Your response is sufficient for me to remove [the Student] from [special education] services. If in [the] future [the Student] requires more support, you can always ask to meet to discuss an IEP. 504's are handled by school counselors so I will reach out to [the School Counselor] on your behalf. To be clear, 504's are not guaranteed so you need to have a meeting to discuss one. I'd suggest you say what you said to me during our conversation, i.e., that you feel [the Student] no longer needs the specially designed instruction and pull out that comes with an IEP, but [the Student] does benefits [*sic*] from accommodations and you'd like [the Student] to be on a 504 so that [they] could continue to receive the supports that have fostered [their] success."

6. Ten minutes after the Case Manager sent the above message, the Parents replied via email, "Well, I don't want the IEP removed if we can't get 594 [*sic*] services. Can we get that established prior to ending the IEP please. [*sic*]" The Case Manager answered via email the same date, "That's fine with me. I'll talk to [the School Counselor] and let [them] know you'd like to set up a meeting and we can keep the IEP in place in the meantime."

7. In a letter dated December 11, 2025, the Parents notified the Principal they had recently been

informed the Student's IEP had been terminated in December 2024. The Parents wrote, "I was informed that [the Student's] services had been revoked. This caught me completely off guard and was devastating news as a parent who has advocated [for] additional support for [the Student] since kindergarten. … I initially reached out to [the Case Manager] to discuss revoking the IEP, but after some back and forth, made the decision to keep the IEP in place while awaiting follow-up on getting a 504 established. The 504 meeting was not scheduled and I assumed [the Student] had remained on the IEP as I had not given permission to revoke it and had received no notification that the IEP was no longer in place."

8. On December 11, 2025, the School Psychologist emailed the School Counselor and the Case Manager to inform them that the Parents were "having some concerns and saying [they weren't] wanting the IEP removed." They also mentioned the Parents said the School Counselor told them they "absolutely recommended" they keep the IEP for the Student and so the Parents agreed. Because they heard nothing further, the Parents reportedly assumed the Student was still on an IEP. The School Psychologist said there was an email "revoking services" and then after the Parents talked to the School Counselor about a 504, they reportedly decided to keep the IEP. The School Psychologist also noted the Student had "almost straight A's" and they were unsure why the Student would need an IEP.

9. On January 5, 2026, the Principal emailed the Case Manager to inquire about the Student's IEP. They wrote, "I understand the IEP was discontinued sometime last year, and [the] parent has some questions about how that happened. Do you have some time this week to connect about this?"

10. On January 20, 2026, the Principal contacted the Parents via email to follow up on their December 2025 conversation regarding the discontinuation of the Student's IEP. The Principal stated, "I have spoken with [the Case Manager] and [the School Counselor], and it seems that there was a disconnect on our end in terms of communication between 'departments.' Which resulted in [the Student's] IEP being discontinued. Looking into this helped shed light on our entire process and where we need to shore up our systems, and I can share with you that that work is happening now. I am so sorry, though, that [the Student] has been impacted by this. If you are interested in reinstating [the Student's] IEP, you can submit a request to [the Case Manager] and [they] can begin that process again … . If you'd like to pursue [a 504], you can reach out to [the School Counselor]. I know you wanted to weigh your options and so there is no rush to make a decision about it right now, but please do reach out if and when you're ready."

    Later that day, the Parents responded via email, "Thank you so much for the updates with [the Student]. We are discussing [it] with [them] and while I believe we are all leaning towards the 504 I'm just going to take a couple days to think about it."

11. On January 26, 2026, the Parents filed this Complaint.

12. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, one of the Parents stated they did not recall receiving the PWN dated December 2, 2024 regarding the revocation of services, and stated they had never seen the document before. They further denied having a phone call with the Case Manager on January 28, 2025, during which the Case Manager claimed to have confirmed the

Student was no longer on an IEP. One of the Parents specifically refuted the Case Manager's report that they had declined testing or stated the Student did not need an IEP, maintaining that they never spoke with the Case Manager over the phone. They said, "I do not recall having any conversation with [the Case Manager] about getting rid of [the Student's] IEP." Communication with the Case Manager was reportedly limited to the email exchanges provided in the Complaint.

13. One of the Parents stated they first learned the Student was not on an IEP during a December 11, 2025, meeting for their other child, when the School Psychologist commented on how well the Student was doing without an IEP. One of the Parents reported having a "visceral reaction" to this news and became visibly upset during the meeting. When the School Psychologist cited an email in which the Parents had discussed ending the IEP, one of the Parents explained that the email was taken out of context and did not reflect where the conversation ultimately ended.

14. One of the Parents also stated that the Principal had previously acknowledged in writing that a miscommunication had occurred between the School Counselor and the Case Manager and had offered to put the IEP back in place or transition to a 504 Plan. However, one of the Parents stated their concern was that the Student had not received the hours of instruction they were supposed to receive and was still behind in writing. They also noted, "At that time, we kind of had the falling out because of the issues with my other [child], and I just felt like it would be better served to have an unbiased outside person come in and take a look at the situation." One of the Parents also emphasized that the Student's historical success was due to the interventions previously in place and questioned the District's implementation of special education procedures after finding no record of the PWN in their own emails.

15. One of the Parents reported that they did not communicate with the Student's new eighth-grade teachers at the start of the 2025-26 school year regarding an IEP or 504 plan because they assumed the IEP remained active while awaiting the establishment of a 504 plan. The Student was reportedly under the same impression and believed they were utilizing accommodations such as late assignment submission and access to notes. One of the Parents noted the District is typically slow to reach out in the fall, so the School's lack of initial contact did not raise any concerns for them at that time.

16. Regarding the delivery of accommodations or other special education services during the time period in question, one of the Parents stated the Student reported never having met the Case Manager and did not know who that individual was. One of the Parents further confirmed the Student did not receive specialized instruction from any other providers during the period in question. While one of the Parents did not know whether specific conversations regarding accommodations occurred between teachers and the Student, they speculated that, because the Student had several familiar teachers, those instructors might have provided support "informally." When asked if they received IEP progress reports for the 2024-25 or 2025-26 school years, one of the Parents was unsure and noted that checking for them had not been on their "radar." One of the Parents acknowledged they did not know which specific accommodations were being used in class, as the Student's academic responsibility in the seventh and eighth grades allowed the Parents to take a "hands-off" approach. Consequently, the Parent noted they did not think to ask about the delivery of service minutes at the time because they assumed the School was managing the IEP implementation and would reach out when it was time to review

it.

17. In their written response to the Complaint Investigator's written questions, the School Psychologist explained they were in another meeting with the Parents for the Student's sibling in December 2025, during which a reference was made about the Student no longer needing IEP support. One of the Parents reportedly disputed that the Student no longer had an IEP, so the School Psychologist looked in the online records system and pulled up the December 2, 2024 email in which the Parents had revoked services. One of the Parents reportedly cried and said they had not revoked services, did not want the IEP removed for the Student, and was not aware it had been. This prompted the School Psychologist to email the School Counselor and the Case Manager and inform them of the discussion.

18. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, the Case Manager explained that they first discussed the Student's status with the Parents on October 17, 2024, during conferences to set up a three-year re-evaluation for the Student. They recalled one of the Parents stating something such as, "I don't think we want [the Student] on an IEP anymore. [The Student] doesn't like it. [They're] embarrassed." The Case Manager said they replied, "Well, we can do testing, or it's your right to decline services." One of the Parents allegedly said, "Yeah, I'll go with that and decline services." The Case Manager reported saying, "Well, that's fine. If you could just follow up with an email before we need to finish testing, that'd be great." Not hearing from the Parents, the Case Manager followed up with the December 2, 2024 email.

19. Regarding the December 3, 2024, email stating they would "keep the IEP in place," the Case Manager reported it was their understanding that this meant the Student would continue to have "access to accommodations during the expected short gap before a 504 meeting was held. The Case Manager stated they "didn't mean that [the Student] was going to go on indefinitely" under an IEP.

20. The Case Manager recalled inquiring with the School Counselor multiple times between December 3 and December 11, 2024, to confirm if the 504 meeting had been scheduled. While the School Counselor reportedly stated they were "taking care of it," no specific details were shared with the Case Manager. The Case Manager, being a special education teacher, was not considered part of the 504 process and mentioned the School Counselor had "always been very clear that that's not [special education's] purview." On January 11, 2025, following winter break, the Case Manager discovered during a team meeting that the 504 meeting had still not occurred. This discovery happened while the Case Manager was informing the team that the Student was no longer on an IEP. The Case Manager reported being a "little worried" because they had anticipated the 504 transition would be resolved in "a matter of days." Consequently, the Case Manager emailed the School Counselor again to prompt the scheduling of the 504 meeting.

21. The Case Manager also reported conducting a follow-up phone call with one of the Parents on January 28, 2025, at 1:38 p.m. (as reflected in their phone records) to confirm the Parents' understanding that the Student was no longer receiving IEP support. During this call, the Case Manager noted that a 504 plan was not yet in place and offered to conduct testing, an option previously suggested in October 2024, but the Parents reportedly declined, stating it was "unnecessary" and that "everything was fine." The Case Manager added, "The one [thing] that I

felt [was] most important was that I reached out to [one of the Parents] and called [them] to just offer anything because I was concerned that things did not follow the flow the way I thought there were going to flow, and I wanted to make sure that [one of the Parent's] needs were met. And [they] were gracious. [One of the Parents] said, "No, [the Student's] doing great." The Case Manager said they reminded one of the Parents that they could request an IEP in the future if needed, and that Parent thanked the Case Manager for the "sweet" check-in, promising to reach out if any issues arose.

22. The Case Manager, describing the provision of special education services to the Student prior to the termination of their IEP, reported the Student was not actively accessing accommodations because they felt "embarrassed" and "mad" about receiving direct services via the "push-in model." The Case Manager characterized most of the supports in the Student's IEP as "best practices" that were not "special and unique" to an IEP or 504 plan. Before services officially ceased, the Student reportedly refused to visit the Case Manager's room, prompting the Case Manager to provide support on a "holistic basis" in the general education classroom while they were supporting other students. Additionally, the Case Manager stated they encouraged the Parents to engage with the school team during conferences and reached out multiple times to offer assistance, but the Parents did not express any concerns. They recalled that special education services and progress reports were discontinued around the time progress reports were issued in December 2024.

23. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, the School Counselor clarified they were not a member of the Student's IEP team and did not keep track of the Student's IEP status throughout the year. The School Counselor did not recall the Case Manager stating in December 2024 that the Parents were requesting a 504 plan, though they did discuss the possibility of initiating the 504 eligibility process at one point, as is common when a student is being removed from an IEP. The School Counselor was "not at all" aware that the Parents had allegedly conditioned the removal of the Student's IEP on the successful establishment of a 504 plan.

24. The School Counselor also did not recall telling the Parents that they recommended keeping the IEP in place. However, they recalled an "exploratory" conversation with one of the Parents around the time of fall conferences in 2024. During this meeting, the School Counselor reportedly explained the 504 process and clarified that a 504 plan did not include a learning-strategies class (specialized instruction) or an outside-classroom placement. At one point, the School Counselor recalled one of the Parents stating that the Student did not want to be on an IEP or a 504 plan. The School Counselor stated the meeting ended with one of the Parents being "very concerned" about the Student's math support, but "not knowing what [they] wanted to do" regarding a 504 plan or an IEP. The School Counselor said they invited the Parents to follow up with any further questions, but the Parents did not reach out with concerns about the Student's academic experience for the remainder of the 2024-25 school year.

25. At no time did the School Counselor recall advising the School staff to either keep or remove the Student's IEP. The School Counselor reported hearing through "kid chats" with teachers that the Student was doing well academically and behaviorally, "maturing and growing out of things," and did not appear as a "red flag" or concern to general education staff.

26. In December 2025, after learning that the Parents were concerned about the discontinuation of special education services, the School Counselor reached out to the Parents to offer to start the 504 process. When one of the Parents asked to "just put [the Student] on one," the School Counselor explained they were required to follow the formal legal process. The School Counselor said they officially started the 504 process in late 2025/early 2026, but ultimately closed the file because the Parents did not respond to follow-up communications.

27. In an interview with the Complaint Investigator, the Principal stated that in December 2025, one of the Parents requested a meeting to understand why the Student's IEP had been discontinued. The Principal subsequently consulted with the special education department and the School Counselor to investigate the matter. They understood that the Case Manager had received written consent to end services while the Parent explored 504 plan options. The School Counselor was reportedly waiting for a medical statement from the Parents, which was never received. During their meeting with one of the Parents, the Principal offered to facilitate either the reinstatement of the IEP or the initiation of the 504 process. However, the Parent responded that they would like more time to consider the options and indicated they might pursue a 504 plan after further consideration. The Principal offered to help facilitate the process in either direction but did not hear back from the Parent after that exchange.

28. The Principal explained that they considered the "disconnect" as a building-level handoff process between the special education (IEP) and counseling departments (504) that was not as "clean" as desired. They indicated a need to "firm up" that process to ensure families feel a "warm handoff" when moving from one system to another. They acknowledged that the School could improve interdepartmental communication to make such transitions smoother for families. Additionally, the Principal explained that their apology regarding the Student being "impacted" referred to the potential interruption of services that occurred because the 504 process did not move along in a timely manner. However, they noted that the Student still did not have a 504 plan because the Parents had not pursued that route. They also confirmed the Student stopped receiving special education services after the Parents communicated their intent to revoke consent for those services.

IV. DISCUSSION

Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)

The Parents alleged the District violated the IDEA and denied the Student a FAPE by failing to deliver special education services from January 27, 2025 through the end of the 2024-25 school year and the beginning of the 2025-26 school year.

School districts must provide a FAPE to all school-age children with disabilities for whom the district is responsible. "School-age children" are children who have reached five years of age but have not yet reached 21 years of age on or before September 1 of the current school year. A FAPE is defined as special education and related services that are provided at public expense and in

conformity with an IEP. [3]

Under the IDEA, if a parent revokes consent in writing for the continued provision of special education and related services, the public agency may not continue to provide those services. The district must provide PWN before ceasing services but is not required to amend the student's records to remove references to the receipt of prior services. Once a parent revokes consent, the district is not in violation of the requirement to make a FAPE available for a failure to provide further services.[4]

The IDEA requires school districts to give parents PWN "a reasonable time" before it proposes or refuses to initiate or change anything related to the identification, evaluation, educational placement, or the provision of FAPE to a child with a disability. PWN must be both specific and explanatory, including:

a. A description of the action the school proposed or refused;
b. An explanation of why the school proposes or refuses to take the action;
c. A description of each evaluation procedure, assessment, record, or report the school used as a basis for the proposed or refused action;
d. A statement that the parents of a child with a disability have procedural safeguards under IDEA and how parents can obtain a copy of the procedural safeguards notice;
e. Sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the IDEA;
f. A description of other options considered and the reasons why those options were rejected; and
g. A description of other factors that are relevant to the school's proposal or refusal.

The purpose of such detailed PWN requirements is two-fold. First, it assists school personnel to consider options carefully and to make decisions on the basis of articulable criteria or reasoning. Second, it gives parents definitive statements of school district decisions and enables their understanding of exactly what considerations led to those decisions.

It is certainly questionable whether the Case Manager properly exited the Student from special education, given the Parent's clarification that their revocation of consent for services was conditioned on the Student receiving a 504 plan. Further, the PWN written by the Case Manager to notify the Parents that special education services would be terminated appears to be woefully inadequate. It is also unclear why the Case Manager waited more than two weeks after writing the PWN to deliver it to the Parents, if it was delivered at all, or why they did not follow their usual practice of emailing PWN to parents. Nevertheless, to the extent any violation of the IDEA occurred, it was more than 365 days prior to the filing of the Complaint and falls outside of the scope of the Department's jurisdiction to review.[5]

---

[3] OAR 581-015-2040(1); 34 CFR §§ 300.17, 300.101(a)(c)

[4] OAR 581-015-2090(4)(e); 34 CFR § 300.300(b)(4)

[5] While the Parents' allegations are time-barred under this complaint process, there are other avenues available to the Parents to have their grievances heard. The Parents may consult resources on the Department's website (see link below) to learn more about additional dispute resolution options.

The Department does not substantiate this allegation, but does not make a substantive determination as to whether the Student was properly exited from special education.

V. CORRECTIVE ACTION[6]

In the Matter of Beaverton School District 48J
Case No. 026-054-011

Based on the facts provided, no corrective action is ordered.

Dated: this 27 of March 2026



Ramonda Olaloye
Assistant Superintendent
Office of Enhancing
Student Opportunities
E-mailing Date: March 26, 2026

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).)

[6] The Oregon Department of Education, Dispute Resolution office offers Facilitated IEP, Mediation, Due Process and Complaint Investigations as options for resolving IDEA disputes. More information is located here: Oregon Department of Education : Dispute Resolution : Rules & Policies : State of Oregon