

# finally a fair hearing

Complaint 26-240C intake, screening, dismissal, and reconsideration communications

---

Release-review packet generated from preserved MDE communications and source renders. Family PII and selected sensitive school-location terms were redacted from derivative pages using the packet redaction control list. Red boxes indicate packet-applied redactions; black boxes, if present, are pre-existing source or District redactions. Native email/thread renders are surfaced for manual disposition and should not be treated as final public-release copies until reviewed.

Generated	2026-06-25
Redaction controls	38 packet terms and OCR/source variants
Redaction legend	
Disposition	RELEASE_REVIEW - manual native-render review still required

## Packet Contents

A-01	Gmail thread render: 26-240C opened, five-day window, pre-dismissal wrapper, June 1 response native Gmail/thread render; manual disposition	p. 3
A-02	MDE June 1 protected-message contents: timeliness and non-enrollment screening rationale protected-message content render; manual disposition	p. 7
A-03	Focused Gmail render: June 1 response asking MDE to address the pleaded nonpublic Child Find issue native Gmail/message render; manual disposition	p. 11
A-04	Gmail thread render: June 2 closure/dismissal protected wrapper and same-day amended-decision request native Gmail/thread render; manual disposition	p. 14
A-05	MDE June 2 closure letter for Complaint 26-240C MDE closure-letter attachment/render; standard review	p. 17
A-06	Gmail render: June 6 follow-up on pending reconsideration/amended-decision request native Gmail/message render; manual disposition	p. 19
A-07	Gmail render: June 16 final request for MDE written position native Gmail/message render; manual disposition	p. 21

## A-01

## Gmail thread render: 26-240C opened, five-day window, pre-dismissal wrapper, June 1 response

---

Source type	native Gmail/thread render
Source file	communications/evidence/mde_communications_2026-06-25/3577295718039605768_26-240c_received_thread_original.pdf
Why it matters	Shows MDE opened the complaint, identified the five-business-day contact window, then moved into timeliness/non-enrollment screening before the June 1 response preserved the nonpublic Child Find issue.
Redaction legend	Red boxes = packet-applied redactions; black boxes = pre-existing source/District redactions.
Redactions applied	51
Manual disposition	YES - native/protected render requires human release review



## [Encrypt] Special Education State Complaint Received 5.18.26 - #26-240C

5 messages

**Reiter, Karen (MDE)** <karen.reiter@state.mn.us>  
To: mcuka <mcuka@plsas.org>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Mon, May 18, 2026 at 4:12 PM

Reiter, Karen (MDE) ([karen.reiter@state.mn.us](mailto:karen.reiter@state.mn.us)) has sent you a protected message.




[Open MDE letterhead content](#)

[Learn about messages protected by Microsoft Purview Message Encryption.](#)

[Privacy Statement](#)

[Learn More](#) on email encryption.  
Microsoft Corporation, One [Microsoft Way](#), Redmond, WA 98052

 **message\_v4.rmsg**  
10675K

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
To: "Reiter, Karen (MDE)" <karen.reiter@state.mn.us>  
Cc: mcuka <mcuka@plsas.org>

Thu, May 21, 2026 at 11:55 PM

I am following up on the May 18 notice that Complaint 26-240C was opened and that a dispute resolution team member would be in contact within the next five business days. As we are approaching the end of that window, could you please confirm whether a team member has been assigned and whether I should expect outreach today or after the holiday weekend?

Thank you,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]


[Quoted text hidden]

**Reiter, Karen (MDE)** <karen.reiter@state.mn.us>  
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
Cc: "VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE)" <sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us>

Fri, May 22, 2026 at 3:55 PM

simpl=msg-f.186556220610442550... 1/3

---

 **message\_v4.rpmsg**  
29K

---

**VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE)** <sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us>  
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Mon, Jun 1, 2026 at 10:09 AM

VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE) ([sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us](mailto:sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us)) has sent you a protected message.



[Open MDE letterhead content](#)

---

[Learn about messages protected by Microsoft Purview Message Encryption.](#)

[Privacy Statement](#)

[Learn More](#) on email encryption.  
Microsoft Corporation, One [Microsoft Way](#), Redmond, WA 98052

---

 **message\_v4.rpmsg**  
47K

---

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
To: sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us

Mon, Jun 1, 2026 at 9:19 PM

Dear Sage,

Thank you for reviewing the complaint and supplemental materials. I am writing to respectfully ask MDE to reconsider or clarify the dismissal rationale you described. As I understand your message, MDE is treating the relevant allegations as November 2024 and January 2025 events and concluding that PLSAS has no Child Find obligations because [REDACTED] is not currently enrolled in Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools.

That framing does not appear to address a central issue expressly raised in the May 18 complaint: PLSAS's parentally placed nonpublic Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] while she attended [REDACTED] in Prior Lake during the second half of the 2024-25 school year. The submitted complaint specifically asked MDE to determine whether PLSAS had parentally placed private-school Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] while she attended [REDACTED] and if so whether PLSAS failed to identify, locate, evaluate, or coordinate evaluation after actual prior notice of suspected disability-related educational need. See the complaint's Requested Corrective Action #3 and Count 4.

The complaint also submitted MDE's own Organization Reference page for [REDACTED]. That page identifies [REDACTED] as a "Nonpublic Schools in Independent Districts" organization located in Prior Lake and lists "Public Representative of Nonpublic - Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools." See Exhibit 17, MDE-EX1-0100 to MDE-EX1-0101. Under 34 C.F.R. 300.131, the LEA where the private school is located is responsible for locating, identifying, and [REDACTED].0750 similarly requires school lic school.

simpl=msg-f:186556220610442550... 2/3

For that reason, the fact that [REDACTED] is not currently enrolled in PLSAS does not answer the Child Find issue raised in the complaint. The complaint is not claiming that [REDACTED] enrollment automatically entitled [REDACTED] to the full public-school service package. The narrower issue is whether PLSAS, as the public representative / LEA for the nonpublic school location, had and failed to carry out Child Find obligations during [REDACTED] s [REDACTED] enrollment. That enrollment continued through the end of the 2024-25 school year, which is within the one-year lookback from MDE's May 18, 2026 receipt of the complaint.

I have attached a Bates-stamped supplemental evidence packet for MDE's review. The packet is submitted to support timeliness, delayed discovery, record reliability, and the need to address the parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue; it is not submitted as a request for MDE to adjudicate a standalone MGDPA or FERPA claim.

The attached packet includes Michael Thomas's January 24, 2025 response, which I am submitting as recently discovered supplemental evidence. The email was sent by Michael Thomas on January 24, 2025 with the attached response letter and was forwarded in a January 26, 2025 thread. In that response, addressing records documenting actions taken to ensure [REDACTED] s safety, Dr. Thomas stated that any further response would be only as directed by an applicable Department of Education (MDE-SUP-0025 - MDE-SUP-0026). This matters to timeliness because it shows the District was not merely passively silent; it affirmatively deferred further engagement on the safety/access record issue to outside-agency direction while also controlling the source records needed for a timely, source-supported complaint.

Relatedly, PLSAS has still not even acknowledged receipt of a records request sent on May 18, 2026 seeking Child Find, special education, Section 504, safety/reentry, academic-continuity, prior-written-notice, procedural-safeguards, and related records. This embodies the obstructive delay tactics the District has employed throughout this process. As of June 2, 2026, ten business days have passed from that request, excluding the May 25 Memorial Day holiday. I am not asking MDE to decide an MGDPA or FERPA violation in this special education complaint. I am asking MDE not to treat the District's control of, delay in producing, or failure to even acknowledge the relevant records request as a reason to dismiss the special education complaint that those records are needed to support.

This is especially important because a number of the District-produced records we have reviewed contain materially misleading or false statements about the same facts now being used to screen the complaint, including enrollment/withdrawal posture, timing of safety concerns, parent participation, record completeness, and whether responsive records exist. For example, we identified 26 different errors that warrant correction in the Jan 24th email alone. We have been working with the District to correct or reconcile those inconsistencies before filing or supplementing agency complaints. That process was not delay for delay's sake; it was an effort to avoid filing an unsupported or inaccurate complaint while the District controlled the records needed to verify the facts. If MDE dismisses now on timeliness without accounting for that record posture, the result effectively rewards the District's delay and incomplete/misleading production by allowing the very delay it caused to defeat review of the Child Find issue.

If MDE reviews the [REDACTED] / PLSAS nonpublic Child Find issue and determines on the merits that PLSAS met its obligation or that no obligation existed, I understand that MDE may make that finding. What I struggle to understand is an outright dismissal that appears not to account for the submitted [REDACTED] public-representative evidence, the parentally placed private-school Child Find regulation, the within-window end-of-school-year [REDACTED] enrollment period, and the District's record-access posture.

Please confirm whether MDE considered the parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue and the [REDACTED] public-representative evidence in Exhibit 17. If MDE maintains dismissal, I respectfully request that the dismissal identify whether MDE is rejecting that issue on timeliness grounds, jurisdictional grounds, or on the merits of PLSAS's nonpublic Child Find obligation.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

On Mon, 1 Jun 2026 15:09:13 +0000, "VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE)" [sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us](mailto:sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us) wrote:

VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE) ([sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us](mailto:sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us)) has sent you a protected message.

[Open MDE letterhead content](#)

[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **MDE\_26-240C\_Record\_Obstruction\_Supplemental\_Packet.pdf**  
1167K

## A-02

## MDE June 1 protected-message contents: timeliness and non-enrollment screening rationale

---

Source type	protected-message content render
Source file	final-complaints/MDE_26-240C_Response/MDE_26-240C_Sage_Protected_Message_Render_2026-06-01.pdf
Why it matters	Shows the actual screening rationale MDE gave the day before dismissal: older event dates and current non-enrollment, without visibly addressing the pleaded nonpublic Child Find theory.
Redaction legend	Red boxes = packet-applied redactions; black boxes = pre-existing source/District redactions.
Redactions applied	17
Manual disposition	YES - native/protected render requires human release review


# RE: [Encrypt] Spe 240C



VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE) <sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us>

6/1/2026 3:09:13 PM

To: [REDACTED] ↕

 Reply All | ▾

 Encrypt: This message is encrypted. Recipients can't remove encryption.

[REDACTED]

I understand from the notes left by my colleague that you do not wish to receive telephone calls.

I have reviewed your complaint and the additional documentation you sent. The one-year statute of limitations still applies. The events regarding your allegations occurred in November 2024 and January 2025, which is more than one year prior to the receipt of your complaint on May 18, 2026. Further, your student is not enrolled in Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools, so that district would have no child find obligations with regard to your student.

Best,

**Sage Van Voorhis**

Staff Attorney

651-582-8571 | [sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us](mailto:sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us)

**Minnesota Department of Education**

Office of General Counsel – Dispute Resolution

400 NE Stinson Blvd., Minneapolis, MN 55413

[education.mn.gov](http://education.mn.gov)

This e-mail is intended to be read only by the intended recipient. This e-mail may be legally privileged or protected from disclosure by law. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination of this e-mail or any attachments is strictly prohibited, and you should refrain from reading this e-mail or examining any attachments. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this e-mail and any attachments. Thank you.

---

**From:** Reiter, Karen (MDE) <karen.reiter@state.mn.us>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 22, 2026 3:56 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE) <sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us>  
**Subject:** RE: [Encrypt] Special Education State Complaint Received 5.18.26 - #26-240C

Good afternoon, Mr. [REDACTED] MDE complaint #26-240C has been assigned to investigator Sage Van Voorhis. Sage's contact information is [sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us](mailto:sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us) or 651-582-8571. Sage is currently out of the office. Please expect to hear from her after she returns June 1.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 21, 2026 11:55 PM  
**To:** Reiter, Karen (MDE) <karen.reiter@state.mn.us>  
**Cc:** mcuka <mcuka@plsas.org>  
**Subject:** Re: [Encrypt] Special Education State Complaint Received 5.18.26 - #26-240C

**This message may be from an external email source.**

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

---

I am following up on the May 18 notice that Complaint 26-240C was opened and that a dispute resolution team member would be in contact within the next five business days. As we are approaching the end of that window, could you please confirm whether a team member has been assigned and whether I should expect outreach today or after the holiday weekend?

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Reiter, Karen (MDE) ([karen.reiter@state.mn.us](mailto:karen.reiter@state.mn.us)) has sent you a protected message.



[Read the message](#)


[Learn about messages protected by Microsoft Purview Message Encryption.](#)

[Privacy Statement](#)

[Learn More](#) on email encryption.

Microsoft Corporation, One Microsoft Way, Redmond, WA 98052

---

 Message Encryption by Microsoft Office 365

## A-03

## Focused Gmail render: June 1 response asking MDE to address the pleaded nonpublic Child Find issue

---

Source type	native Gmail/message render
Source file	final-complaints/MDE_26-240C_Response/Gmail_2026-06-01_Reconsideration_Email_MDE_26-240C.pdf
Why it matters	Shows the same-day response asking MDE to reconsider or clarify the screening rationale and identify whether it considered the pleaded nonpublic Child Find issue.
Redaction legend	Red boxes = packet-applied redactions; black boxes = pre-existing source/District redactions.
Redactions applied	27
Manual disposition	YES - native/protected render requires human release review



## [Encrypt] Special Education State Complaint Received 5.18.26 - #26-240C

<[REDACTED]>  
To: sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us

Mon, Jun 1, 2026 at 9:19 PM

Dear Sage,

Thank you for reviewing the complaint and supplemental materials. I am writing to respectfully ask MDE to reconsider or clarify the dismissal rationale you described. As I understand your message, MDE is treating the relevant allegations as November 2024 and January 2025 events and concluding that PLSAS has no Child Find obligations because [REDACTED] is not currently enrolled in Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools.

That framing does not appear to address a central issue expressly raised in the May 18 complaint: PLSAS's parentally placed nonpublic Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] while she attended [REDACTED] in Prior Lake during the second half of the 2024-25 school year. The submitted complaint specifically asked MDE to determine whether PLSAS had parentally placed private-school Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] while she attended [REDACTED] and if so whether PLSAS failed to identify, locate, evaluate, or coordinate evaluation after actual prior notice of suspected disability-related educational need. See the complaint's Requested Corrective Action #3 and Count 4.

The complaint also submitted MDE's own Organization Reference page for [REDACTED]. That page identifies [REDACTED] as a "Nonpublic Schools in Independent Districts" organization located in Prior Lake and lists "Public Representative of Nonpublic - Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools." See Exhibit 17, MDE-EX1-0100 to MDE-EX1-0101. Under 34 C.F.R. 300.131, the LEA where the private school is located is responsible for locating, identifying, and evaluating parentally placed private-school children with disabilities. Minnesota Rule 3525.0750 similarly requires school districts to develop systems to identify pupils with disabilities attending public and nonpublic school.

For that reason, the fact that [REDACTED] is not currently enrolled in PLSAS does not answer the Child Find issue raised in the complaint. The complaint is not claiming that [REDACTED] enrollment automatically entitled [REDACTED] to the full public-school service package. The narrower issue is whether PLSAS, as the public representative / LEA for the nonpublic school location, had and failed to carry out Child Find obligations during [REDACTED]'s [REDACTED] enrollment. That enrollment continued through the end of the 2024-25 school year, which is within the one-year lookback from MDE's May 18, 2026 receipt of the complaint.

I have attached a Bates-stamped supplemental evidence packet for MDE's review. The packet is submitted to support timeliness, delayed discovery, record reliability, and the need to address the parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue; it is not submitted as a request for MDE to adjudicate a standalone MGDPA or FERPA claim.

The attached packet includes Michael Thomas's January 24, 2025 response, which I am submitting as recently discovered supplemental evidence. The email was sent by Michael Thomas on January 24, 2025 with the attached response letter and was forwarded in a January 26, 2025 thread. In that response, addressing records documenting actions taken to ensure [REDACTED]'s safety, Dr. Thomas stated that any further response would be only as directed by an applicable Department of Education (MDE-SUP-0025 - MDE-SUP-0026). This matters to timeliness because it shows the District was not merely passively silent; it affirmatively deferred further engagement on the safety/access record issue to outside-agency direction while also controlling the source records needed for a timely, source-supported complaint.

Relatedly, PLSAS has still not even acknowledged receipt of a records request sent on May 18, 2026 seeking Child Find, special education, Section 504, safety/reentry, academic-continuity, prior-written-notice, procedural-safeguards, and related records. This embodies the obstructive delay tactics the District has employed throughout this process. As of June 2, 2026, ten business days have passed from that request, excluding the May 25 Memorial Day holiday. I am not asking MDE to decide an MGDPA or FERPA violation in this special education complaint. I am asking MDE not to treat the District's control of, delay in producing, or failure to even acknowledge the relevant records request as a reason to dismiss the special education complaint that those records are needed to support.

This is especially important because a number of the District-produced records we have reviewed contain materially misleading or false statements about the same facts now being used to screen the complaint, including enrollment/withdrawal posture, timing of safety concerns, parent participation, record completeness, and whether responsive records exist. For example, we identified 26 different errors that warrant correction in the Jan 24th email [REDACTED] s before filing or supplementing [REDACTED] iling an unsupported or

8&siml=msg-a:r-35772957180396... 1/2

inaccurate complaint while the District controlled the records needed to verify the facts. If MDE dismisses now on timeliness without accounting for that record posture, the result effectively rewards the District's delay and incomplete/misleading production by allowing the very delay it caused to defeat review of the Child Find issue.

If MDE reviews the [REDACTED] / PLSAS nonpublic Child Find issue and determines on the merits that PLSAS met its obligation or that no obligation existed, I understand that MDE may make that finding. What I struggle to understand is an outright dismissal that appears not to account for the submitted [REDACTED] public-representative evidence, the parentally placed private-school Child Find regulation, the within-window end-of-school-year [REDACTED] enrollment period, and the District's record-access posture.

Please confirm whether MDE considered the parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue and the [REDACTED] public-representative evidence in Exhibit 17. If MDE maintains dismissal, I respectfully request that the dismissal identify whether MDE is rejecting that issue on timeliness grounds, jurisdictional grounds, or on the merits of PLSAS's nonpublic Child Find obligation.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

On Mon, 1 Jun 2026 15:09:13 +0000, "VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE)" [sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us](mailto:sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us) wrote:

VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE) ([sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us](mailto:sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us)) has sent you a protected message.

[Read the message](#)

[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **MDE\_26-240C\_Record\_Obstruction\_Supplemental\_Packet.pdf**  
1167K

## A-04

## Gmail thread render: June 2 closure/dismissal protected wrapper and same-day amended-decision request

---

Source type	native Gmail/thread render
Source file	communications/evidence/mde_communications_2026-06-25/4039106210999151959_26-24 0c_closure_thread_original.pdf
Why it matters	Shows the official dismissal transmission followed by the same-day request for an amended decision identifying the dates and legal basis MDE used.
Redaction legend	Red boxes = packet-applied redactions; black boxes = pre-existing source/District redactions.
Redactions applied	28
Manual disposition	YES - native/protected render requires human release review



## [Encrypt] Minnesota Department of Education Dismissal Letter #26-240C

2 messages

Reiter, Karen (MDE) <karen.reiter@state.mn.us>

Tue, Jun 2, 2026 at 1:49 PM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>, mcuka <mcuka@plsas.org>

Cc: "VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE)" <sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us>

Reiter, Karen (MDE) ([karen.reiter@state.mn.us](mailto:karen.reiter@state.mn.us)) has sent you a protected message.




[Open MDE letterhead content](#)

[Learn about messages protected by Microsoft Purview Message Encryption.](#)

[Privacy Statement](#)

[Learn More](#) on email encryption.

Microsoft Corporation, One [Microsoft Way](#), Redmond, WA 98052

 **message\_v4.rpmsg**  
128K

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Tue, Jun 2, 2026 at 5:44 PM

To: "Reiter, Karen (MDE)" <karen.reiter@state.mn.us>

Cc: mcuka <mcuka@plsas.org>, "VanVoorhis, Sage (MDE)" <sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us>

Dear Sage,

Thank you for the June 2, 2026 closure letter for Special Education Complaint 26-240C. I am writing to respectfully request reconsideration or, at minimum, an amended closure decision that addresses the specific within-window issue raised in the May 18 complaint.

The closure letter states that the complaint "does not allege a violation of federal or state special education law occurring within the past calendar year." I understand MDE's one-calendar-year complaint period. My concern is that the closure letter does not address the complaint's separate parentally placed nonpublic Child Find allegation for [REDACTED] while she attended [REDACTED] in Prior Lake during the second half of the 2024-25 school year. That issue appears in the submitted complaint packet at, among other places, MDE-COMP-0001, MDE-COMP-0002, MDE-COMP-0003 to MDE-COMP-0004, MDE-COMP-0007, MDE-COMP-0008, and MDE-EX1-0100 to MDE-EX1-0115.

ntified "parentally placed  
nt in Prior Lake" as a timely

simpl=msg-f.186691213240162395... 1/2

issue. See MDE-COMP-0001. The Legal Basis section cited 34 C.F.R. 300.131 for the LEA-of-location duty for parentally placed private-school students. See MDE-COMP-0002. The Relevant Source Facts section then explained PLSAS's knowledge of the [REDACTED] placement, MDE's public-representative listing, and continuing [REDACTED] period school-functioning concerns. See MDE-COMP-0003 to MDE-COMP-0004.

Count 4 asked whether PLSAS located, identified, and evaluated a parentally placed private-school student at [REDACTED] whom it already knew had suspected disability-related school-access needs. See MDE-COMP-0007. Requested Corrective Action #3 asked MDE to determine whether PLSAS had parentally placed private-school Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] while she attended [REDACTED] in Prior Lake, and if so whether PLSAS failed to identify, locate, evaluate, or coordinate evaluation after actual prior notice of suspected disability-related educational need. See MDE-COMP-0008.

The complaint also submitted MDE's own Organization Reference page for [REDACTED] as Exhibit 17. That exhibit identifies [REDACTED] as a nonpublic school located in Prior Lake and lists "Public Representative of Nonpublic - Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools." See MDE-EX1-0100 to MDE-EX1-0101. The pleaded theory was not that private-school enrollment automatically entitled [REDACTED] to a full public-school IEP or services. The narrower issue was PLSAS's Child Find duty to locate, identify, and evaluate under 34 C.F.R. 300.131 and Minnesota Rule 3525.0750.

Because the complaint was received May 18, 2026, the one-calendar-year lookback includes the end of the 2024-25 school year. The submitted packet identified continuing school-functioning concerns during the [REDACTED] period, including April and May 2025 support/grade/functioning concerns and the June 2025 end of the school year. See MDE-COMP-0003 to MDE-COMP-0004. The packet also included the July 2025 neuropsychological evaluation as within-window clinical corroboration of disability-related school functioning and IEP/504 evaluation need. See MDE-EX1-0102 to MDE-EX1-0115.

For that reason, I respectfully request that MDE withdraw or amend the June 2 closure decision and address the parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue on its actual pleaded basis. If MDE maintains closure, please issue an amended decision identifying the specific basis for rejecting that issue:

1. whether MDE concludes the [REDACTED] nonpublic Child Find allegation was not actually pleaded;
2. whether MDE concludes the allegation is outside the one-calendar-year complaint period, and if so, what date range MDE used for that determination;
3. whether MDE concludes PLSAS had no Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] under 34 C.F.R. 300.131 or Minnesota Rule 3525.0750;
4. whether MDE concludes the allegation is within MDE's authority but fails on the merits; or
5. whether MDE is relying on some other grounds.

This request is not intended to waive, extend, or delay any appeal deadline. I am asking MDE to correct or clarify the final agency action so the decision addresses the issue actually raised in the filed complaint.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]  
[Quoted text hidden]

## A-05

## MDE June 2 closure letter for Complaint 26-240C

---

Source type	MDE closure-letter attachment/render
Source file	final-complaints/MDE_26-240C_Response/MDE_26-240C_Closure_Letter_2026-06-02.pdf
Why it matters	Shows the closure letter's operative rationale: MDE closed the file because it said no special-education-law violation was alleged within the past calendar year.
Redaction legend	Red boxes = packet-applied redactions; black boxes = pre-existing source/District redactions.
Redactions applied	12
Manual disposition	No native-render disposition flag



*Via encrypted email*

June 2, 2026

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

Re: Special Education Complaint 26-240C

Dear [Redacted]

This letter is in response to special education complaint 26-240C that you submitted to the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) on May 18, 2026, on behalf of [Redacted] (Student) against Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools 0719-01 (District).

Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, MDE has limited authority to investigate complaints regarding alleged violations of federal and state special education law occurring within the past calendar year. As explained to you by email, the complaint you submitted to MDE does not allege a violation of federal or state special education law occurring within the past calendar year; therefore, MDE does not have the authority to investigate your complaint.

As of the date of this letter, your complaint file is closed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sage Van Voorhis'.

Sage Van Voorhis  
Staff Attorney  
Office of the General Counsel  
Minnesota Department of Education  
400 Northeast Stinson Boulevard  
Minneapolis, MN 55413

SV/kr

c: Michelle Cuka, Special Education Director

## A-06

## Gmail render: June 6 follow-up on pending reconsideration/amended-decision request

---

Source type	native Gmail/message render
Source file	communications/evidence/mde_communications_2026-06-25/1867243035227733393_26-240c_june6_followup_original.pdf
Why it matters	Shows the post-closure follow-up asking MDE to address or deny the pending reconsideration/amended-decision request instead of leaving the issue unanswered.
Redaction legend	Red boxes = packet-applied redactions; black boxes = pre-existing source/District redactions.
Redactions applied	12
Manual disposition	YES - native/protected render requires human release review



## Complaint 26-240C - Follow-up on pending reconsideration/amended decision request

1 message

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Sat, Jun 6, 2026 at 5:28 AM

To: karen.reiter@state.mn.us, sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us

Cc: MDE.Dispute-Resolution@state.mn.us, mde.commissioner@state.mn.us, mde.datapractices@state.mn.us

Dear Ms. Reiter and Ms. VanVoorhis,

I am following up on two pending complaint-disposition requests:

- my June 1, 2026 response to MDE's pre-dismissal position, asking MDE to address the parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue for the [REDACTED] placement; and
- my June 2, 2026 request for reconsideration or, at minimum, an amended closure decision after MDE issued the closure letter for Complaint 26-240C.

I received MDE Data Practices' June 3, 2026 acknowledgment of my separate Minn. Stat. 13.04 challenge, stating that MDE will review that submission and respond within 30 days. I have not received a substantive response to the June 1 complaint-merits response or the June 2 reconsideration / amended-decision request.

That timing matters in the full procedural context. In the first complaint, MDE gave me a compressed period to respond before dismissal; I responded within that period and raised concerns and mitigating factors. MDE then dismissed without directly addressing those points and told me to refile. I did refile, specifically targeting the narrower lanes MDE had identified. In this second complaint, MDE again asked for clarification on the lookback issue; I provided that clarification within roughly 24 hours. MDE then dismissed again without addressing the source-based clarification I had just provided. After I immediately requested reconsideration or an amended decision, a full week has now passed without even acknowledgment of that pending complaint-disposition request. That does not seem like a respectful or orderly way to handle the record. I am not asking for special treatment; I am asking for a clear and comparable procedural response.

To avoid uncertainty about the procedural posture, please confirm whether MDE intends to issue a substantive response or amended closure decision. If MDE maintains the June 2 closure without amendment, please confirm in writing that my June 2 reconsideration / amended-decision request is denied and identify the basis for rejecting the [REDACTED] parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue, including whether MDE's position is that:

1. the issue was not pleaded;
2. the issue is outside the one-calendar-year complaint period;
3. PLSAS had no Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] under the cited authorities;
4. the issue is within MDE's authority but fails on the merits; or
5. MDE is relying on some other ground.

This follow-up is not intended to waive, extend, toll, or delay any appeal period, data-challenge deadline, reconsideration position, or other remedy. I am preserving all rights and asking only for a clear written answer to the pending complaint-disposition request.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

## A-07

## Gmail render: June 16 final request for MDE written position

---

Source type	native Gmail/message render
Source file	communications/evidence/mde_communications_2026-06-25/1868169924699431585_26-240c_june16_final_position_original.pdf
Why it matters	Shows the final written-position request asking MDE to say plainly whether it would address the nonpublic Child Find issue or stand on the closure without further explanation.
Redaction legend	Red boxes = packet-applied redactions; black boxes = pre-existing source/District redactions.
Redactions applied	15
Manual disposition	YES - native/protected render requires human release review



## Complaint 26-240C - Final request for MDE's written position on pending reconsideration / amended-decision request

1 message

[REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Tue, Jun 16, 2026 at 11:01 AM

To: karen.reiter@state.mn.us, sage.vanvoorhis@state.mn.us

Cc: MDE.Dispute-Resolution@state.mn.us, mde.commissioner@state.mn.us, mde.datapractices@state.mn.us, sara.winter@state.mn.us

Dear Ms. Reiter and Ms. VanVoorhis,

I am making one final written request for MDE's position on my pending complaint-disposition request in Special Education Complaint 26-240C.

This is not another general follow-up. I am asking MDE to either issue a substantive written response or confirm that MDE is maintaining the June 2, 2026 closure letter without amendment and without further explanation.

The relevant sequence is short:

1. On June 1, 2026, before MDE issued the closure letter, I responded to MDE's stated dismissal rationale and asked MDE to address the complaint's pleaded [REDACTED] parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue.
2. On June 2, 2026, MDE issued a closure letter stating that the complaint did not allege a federal or state special education-law violation occurring within the past calendar year.
3. On June 2, 2026, I requested reconsideration or, at minimum, an amended closure decision addressing the specific [REDACTED] issue.
4. On June 6, 2026, I followed up and asked MDE to confirm whether it would issue a substantive response or amended closure decision, or whether the reconsideration / amended-decision request should be treated as denied.
5. The only response I have received to that June 6 follow-up is an automatic out-of-office reply.

After my experience with ISD 719, I had hoped MDE's complaint process would provide a clearer and more neutral forum for identifying the actual issue and giving a reasoned answer. That is why the lack of a written answer to the specific [REDACTED] Child Find issue is so concerning.

To be clear, I am not asking MDE Data Practices to decide the special education merits, and I am not asking this email to toll, extend, waive, or delay any appeal period, data-challenge deadline, reconsideration position, due-process option, or other remedy. I am asking MDE, in its complaint-disposition capacity, to state its final written position on the pending request.

If MDE maintains the June 2 closure letter, please identify whether MDE's position is that:

1. the [REDACTED] parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue was not pleaded;
2. the issue was pleaded but is outside the one-calendar-year complaint period;
3. PLSAS had no Child Find responsibility for [REDACTED] under 34 C.F.R. 300.131, Minnesota Rule 3525.0750, or the nonpublic-school framework;
4. the issue is within MDE's authority but fails on the merits;
5. the issue cannot be addressed through the state complaint process for some other identified reason; or
6. MDE is maintaining the closure letter without further explanation.

I understand that MDE may maintain the June 2 closure letter without amendment or further explanation. But after submitting timely written responses and a written reconsideration / amended-decision request, I believe I am at least entitled to an acknowledgment of those requests and a clear statement whether MDE intends to respond.

If MDE does not intend to issue any further written response, please say that clearly. If MDE does not respond to this final request, I will proceed on the understanding that MDE is maintaining the June 2 closure letter without amendment, is not issuing a separate written denial of reconsideration, and is not providing a written basis for rejecting the [REDACTED] parentally placed nonpublic Child Find issue beyond the existing June 2 closure text.

simpl=msg-f:1868169924699431585 1/2

