

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) adopts amendments to §§89.1150, 89.1175, 89.1195, and 89.1197, concerning special education services. The amendments to §§89.1150, 89.1175, and 89.1195 are adopted without changes to the proposed text as published in the January 23, 2026 issue of the *Texas Register* (51 TexReg 375) and will not be republished. The amendment to §89.1197 is adopted with changes to the proposed text as published in the January 23, 2026 issue of the *Texas Register* (51 TexReg 375) and will be republished. The adopted amendments clarify program practices and requirements relating to dispute resolution in accordance with House Bill (HB) 2 and Senate Bill (SB) 568, 89th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2025.

REASONED JUSTIFICATION: Section 89.1150 establishes general provisions for special education dispute resolution. The adopted amendment adds new subsection (b) to inform parents and school districts that TEA may share student-level information with an outside entity in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act for the purposes of facilitating local resolution of disputes related to special education.

Section 89.1175 establishes representation in special education due process hearings. The adopted amendment adds new subsection (d)(2) to establish a requirement for the non-attorney representative to have knowledge of all special education dispute resolution options available to parents to align with HB 2 and SB 568, 89th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2025. An adopted amendment to the figure in subsection (c) reflects the new requirement for alignment.

Section 89.1195 establishes provisions for special education complaint resolution. After careful consideration and a targeted focus on assisting school systems and families with preventing and resolving disagreements at the earliest stage possible, TEA is adopting the repeal of language that authorized a party to request a reconsideration process if the party felt that the agency made an error that was material to its decision or was incorrect in its determination. A reconsideration process is not required under federal or state law. Given the narrow scope of the reconsideration process and the absence of a legal requirement, the agency has determined that students' best interests are better served by prioritizing timely, consistent resolution of complaints through comprehensive, thorough, and accurate investigations and investigative reports.

The adopted amendment to §89.1197 updates the section title to align with HB 2 and SB 568. Further adopted changes to subsections (c) and (f)(2) allow statewide individualized education program (IEP) facilitation to be used prior to a potential dispute and when a dispute has arisen related to the provision of free and appropriate public education (FAPE). These changes align the rule with HB 2 and SB 568. Adopted updates to subsection (f) and (f)(3) provide clarity to school districts and parents regarding the process and timeline for when a request for a state-appointed facilitator must be filed. The timeline in subsection (f)(3) has been revised at adoption from ten calendar days to ten school days based on public comment.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND AGENCY RESPONSES: The public comment period on the proposal began January 23, 2026, and ended February 23, 2026, and included public hearings on February 12 and 13, 2026. Following is a summary of public comments received and agency responses.

§89.1150, General Provisions

Comment: The Texas Association of School Boards (TASB) requested clarification regarding whether the agency intends to provide additional notice when student-level information may be shared under proposed new §89.1150(b) in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Response: The agency provides the following clarification. Proposed new §89.1150(b) is intended to inform parties that the agency may share student-level information in accordance and in compliance with FERPA for purposes of facilitating local resolution of disputes. The agency does not intend to establish additional notice requirements beyond those provided in the rule text and applicable federal law.

Comment: The Texas School Alliance (TSA) commented in support of proposed new subsection (b), stating that transparent notice regarding information sharing promotes efficient dispute resolution.

Response: The agency agrees.

§89.1175, Representation in Special Education Due Process Hearings

Comment: TASB requested clarification on how the requirement that non-attorney representatives have knowledge of all special education dispute resolutions would be operationalized and enforced, including whether compliance would need to be required beyond the form adopted in subsection (c). TASB also requested clarification regarding the authority and role of hearing officers in assessing or enforcing this requirement.

Response: The agency clarifies that the requirement is met through the documentation referenced in §89.1175(c) and does not expand hearing officers' authority beyond their existing jurisdiction under current law.

Comment: TSA commented in support of the proposed requirement in §89.1175(d)(2), stating that ensuring non-attorney representatives are knowledgeable about dispute resolution options would enhance the effectiveness and professionalism of the due process resolution system.

Response: The agency agrees.

Comment: The Texas Council of Administrators of Special Education (TCASE) commented in support of the proposed addition of §89.1175(d)(2), stating it would improve informed parent representation and promote earlier collaboration between parents and districts to resolve disputes.

Response: The agency agrees.

§89.1195, Special Education Complaint Resolution

Comment: TCASE recommended amending §89.1195(b) to require that complaints involving a specific student be forwarded to the student's parent, guardian, or court-appointed special education advocate.

Response: The agency disagrees. The recommended amendment would place an additional requirement for filing a special education complaint that would be inconsistent with 34 CFR, §§300.151-300.153.

Comment: TCASE commented that §89.1195(e) does not provide districts with a meaningful opportunity to respond early in the complaint process and recommended clarifying that districts may communicate TEA earlier, propose resolutions, and receive recognition for voluntary correction.

Response: The agency disagrees. During the investigation timeline, parties may pursue early or local resolution options described in the complaint notices, and if a local education agency (LEA) corrects any noncompliance and submits documentation before issuance of the investigative report, the agency may choose not to issue a finding.

Comment: Seventeen individuals, Austin Independent School District (ISD), Richardson ISD, Lovejoy ISD, Caddo Mills ISD, Lubbock-Cooper ISD, Denton ISD, Plano ISD, Frisco ISD, Arlington ISD, Northwest ISD, Orenda Charter Schools, Disability Rights Texas (DRTx), TCASE, TASB, TSA, and legal counsel at Walsh Gallegos Kyle Robinson & De Los Santos, P.C. disagreed with the proposed deletion of §89.1195(f) and (j). Each commenter raised at least one concern that the reconsideration process serves as an important procedural safeguard, allows correction of factual or legal errors, supports accurate determinations, promotes fairness and public confidence, or that eliminating the reconsideration process could result in inaccurate findings, unnecessary corrective actions, or increased escalation to other dispute resolution processes.

Response: The agency disagrees. A separate reconsideration process is not required by state or federal law, and eliminating reconsideration supports timely and consistent resolution of complaints. Parties may submit information during the investigation, and parents and public education agencies retain access to other procedural safeguards, including mediation and due process.

Comment: Three individuals, Austin ISD, Richardson ISD, Lovejoy ISD, Caddo Mills ISD, Denton ISD, Frisco ISD, Arlington ISD, Orenda Charter Schools, TASB, and legal counsel at Walsh Gallegos Kyle Robinson & De Los Santos, P.C. raised at least one concern that special education complaint investigations rely heavily on investigator-requested documentation and may overlook relevant records not specifically requested, increasing the

risk of inaccurate findings, and identified the reconsideration process as one mechanism for submitting additional documentation or clarifying evidence to correct factual or legal errors before findings become final.

Response: The agency disagrees. Investigative reports are considered final, and parties are not limited in terms of what documentation they may submit for consideration during an investigation. While the agency requests documentation for an investigation based on the allegations raised in the complaint, LEAs and complainants may submit any documentation they want the agency to review. Complaint notices inform parties of their opportunity to submit additional information, orally or in writing, and LEAs are informed that they may provide a written response and any documentation that may assist the investigation.

Comment: Two individuals, Arlington ISD, Richardson ISD, Austin ISD, and Denton ISD disagreed with the removal of the reconsideration process for complaint determinations, stating that incorrect findings may result in resource-intensive corrective action plans and the implementation of unnecessary or inconsistent actions that divert time and resources away from affected students.

Response: The agency disagrees that a reconsideration process is necessary. Parties may submit any information during the investigation, and corrective actions are limited to addressing identified noncompliance. The agency monitors corrective action to ensure consistency with state and federal law while supporting timely resolution of complaints.

Comment: One individual, Richardson ISD, Caddo Mills ISD, Denton ISD, Frisco ISD, Northwest ISD, and legal counsel at Walsh Gallegos Kyle Robinson & De Los Santos, P.C. commented that eliminating the reconsideration process would remove an efficient, low-cost administrative process for correcting error and could increase escalation to more formal dispute resolution processes, increasing costs and resource demands.

Response: The agency disagrees. A separate reconsideration process is not required by state or federal law. Eliminating reconsideration supports timely and consistent resolution of special education complaints and allows the agency to focus resources on conducting comprehensive, thorough, and accurate investigations. Parents and public education agencies retain access to other procedural safeguards, including mediation, TEA-assisted resolution, and due process, consistent with state and federal law.

Comment: Two individuals and Arlington ISD disagreed with the proposed deletion of §89.1195(j), arguing that eliminating the appeal mechanism would allow incorrect findings and legally erroneous corrective actions to stand. The commenters cited recent reversals involving independent educational evaluation rights and evaluation timelines as evidence that oversight is necessary to prevent unlawful, systemwide policy changes and inconsistent guidance.

Response: The agency disagrees and clarifies that removing §89.1195(j) will not result in incorrect findings or unlawful corrective actions, as the agency maintains processes to ensure consistency and compliance with state and federal law.

Comment: Four individuals, Caddo Mills ISD, and Denton ISD questioned whether eliminating the reconsideration process is required to align with SB 568 or HB 2, noting that removal is not mandated by statute and reflects a policy choice.

Response: The agency provides the following clarification. Eliminating reconsideration is a policy determination within the agency's authority, as reconsideration is not required by state or federal law. The agency supports timely and final complaint resolution while maintaining required procedural safeguards.

Comment: TCASE requested clarification on whether Education Freedom Account IEP requirements in Texas Education Code (TEC), §29.3615(c) and (d), are subject to the state special education complaint process and recommended that TEC, Chapter 29, Subchapter J, be addressed separately from existing special education regulations.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of the proposed rulemaking.

Comment: One individual, Denton ISD, TCASE, and TASB opposed eliminating reconsideration and recommended retaining the process with limitations or clarifications, such as restricting requests to significant errors or establishing procedural parameters. DRTx similarly commented recommending improving understanding of the grounds for reconsideration rather than eliminating the process.

Response: The agency disagrees. A separate reconsideration process or separate administrative review process is not required by state or federal law, and eliminating reconsideration supports timely and consistent complaint resolution while preserving existing procedural safeguards.

§89.1197, State Individualized Education Program Facilitation

Comment: Three individuals, Arlington ISD, DRTx, TCASE, and TSA commented in support of expanding the TEA IEP Facilitation Program under §89.1197(c) and (f), stating that earlier access to TEA-facilitated admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) meetings may help resolve disputes related to FAPE and prevent escalation. TSA further supported a statewide IEP facilitation framework with clear procedures and timelines.

Response: The agency agrees.

Comment: Three individuals and Arlington ISD recommended revising §89.1197(f)(3) to change the timeline for requesting ARD facilitation from 10 calendar days to ten school days, stating that aligning the timeline with the 10-school-day period for scheduling a disagreement ARD under §89.1055(p)(1) would promote consistency, improve scheduling feasibility, and prevent timelines from tolling during school breaks when ARD committee meetings are not held.

Response: The agency agrees and has updated §89.1197(f)(3) at adoption to specify a timeline of 10 school days to request IEP facilitation.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY. The amendments are adopted under Texas Education Code (TEC), §29.001, which requires the agency to develop and modify as necessary a statewide plan for the delivery of services to children with disabilities that ensures the availability of a free appropriate public education to children between the ages of 3-21; TEC, §29.010, which establishes criteria for general supervision and compliance; TEC, §29.019, which establishes criteria for individualized education program (IEP) facilitation; TEC, §29.020, as amended by House Bill (HB) 2 and Senate Bill (SB) 568, 89th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2025, which establishes criteria for state-administered IEP facilitation; TEC, §29.0162, as amended by HB 2 and SB 568, 89th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2025, which establishes criteria for representation in a special education due process hearing; 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §300.149, which establishes the state educational agency responsibility for general supervision; 34 CFR, §300.151, which establishes the criteria for the adoption of state complaint procedures; 34 CFR, §300.152, which establishes the criteria for minimum state complaint procedures; 34 CFR, §300.153, which establishes the criteria for filing a complaint; 34 CFR, §300.504, which establishes the criteria for procedural safeguards notice; 34 CFR, §300.512, which establishes hearing rights; and 34 CFR, §300.600, which establishes criteria for state monitoring and enforcement.

CROSS REFERENCE TO STATUTE. The amendments implement Texas Education Code, §§29.001, 29.010, and 29.019; §29.020 and §29.0162, as amended by House Bill 2 and Senate Bill 568, 89th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2025; and §29.0162; and 34 Code of Federal Regulations, §§300.149, 300.151, 300.152, 300.153, 300.504, 300.512, and 300.600.

<rule>

§89.1150. General Provisions.

- (a) It is the policy and intent of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to encourage and support the resolution of any dispute that arises between a parent and a public education agency relating to the identification,

evaluation, or educational placement of or the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to a student with a disability at the lowest level possible and in a prompt, efficient, and effective manner.

- (b) To implement the policy and intent described by subsection (a) of this section and to offer opportunities for an alternative means of dispute resolution when a parent and a public education agency are in disagreement, TEA may disclose information to a representative as authorized by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act to assist with resolution efforts. Neither party would be required to engage in this process, and the information shared would only be for purposes of determining interest of either party in an alternative or early resolution process.
- (c) The possible options for resolving disputes include, but are not limited to:
 - (1) meetings of the student's admission, review, and dismissal committee, including individualized education program (IEP) facilitation if offered by the public education agency in accordance with §89.1196 of this title (relating to Individualized Education Program Facilitation);
 - (2) meetings or conferences with the student's teachers or providers;
 - (3) meetings or conferences, subject to the public education agency's policies, with the campus administrator, the special education director of the public education agency (or the shared services arrangement to which the public education agency may be a member), the superintendent of the public education agency, or the board of trustees of the public education agency;
 - (4) requesting state IEP facilitation in accordance with §89.1197 of this title (relating to State-Administered Individualized Education Program Facilitation);
 - (5) requesting mediation through TEA in accordance with 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §300.506;
 - (6) filing a complaint with TEA in accordance with 34 CFR, §300.153; or
 - (7) requesting a due process hearing through TEA in accordance with 34 CFR, §§300.507-300.514.

§89.1175. Representation in Special Education Due Process Hearings.

- (a) A party to a due process hearing may represent himself or herself or be represented by:
 - (1) an attorney who is licensed in the State of Texas; or
 - (2) an individual who is not an attorney licensed in the State of Texas but who has special knowledge or training with respect to problems of children with disabilities and who satisfies the qualifications of this section.
- (b) A party who wishes to be represented by an individual who is not an attorney licensed in the State of Texas must file a written authorization with the hearing officer promptly after filing the request for a due process hearing or promptly after retaining the services of the non-attorney representative. The party must forward a copy of the written authorization to the opposing party at the same time that the written authorization is filed with the hearing officer.
- (c) The written authorization must be on the form provided in this subsection.
Figure: 19 TAC §89.1175(c)
- (d) The written authorization must include the non-attorney representative's name and contact information and a description of the non-attorney representative's:
 - (1) special knowledge or training with respect to problems of children with disabilities;
 - (2) knowledge of all special education dispute resolution options available to parents, including due process hearings, state complaints, mediation, and individualized education program facilitation;
 - (3) knowledge of the rules and procedures that apply to due process hearings, including those in 34 Code of Federal Regulations, §§300.507-300.515 and 300.532, if applicable, and this division;
 - (4) knowledge of federal and state special education laws, regulations, and rules; and

- (5) educational background.
- (e) The written authorization must state the party's acknowledgment of the following:
 - (1) the non-attorney representative has been given full authority to act on the party's behalf with respect to the hearing;
 - (2) the actions or omissions by the non-attorney representative are binding on the party, as if the party had taken or omitted those actions directly;
 - (3) documents are deemed to be served on the party if served on the non-attorney representative;
 - (4) communications between the party and a non-attorney representative are not generally protected by the attorney-client privilege and may be subject to disclosure during the hearing proceeding;
 - (5) neither federal nor state special education laws provide for the recovery of fees for the services of a non-attorney representative; and
 - (6) it is the party's responsibility to notify the hearing officer and the opposing party of any change in the status of the authorization and that the provisions of the authorization will remain in effect until the party notifies the hearing officer and the opposing party of the party's revocation of the authorization.
- (f) If the non-attorney representative receives monetary compensation in exchange for representing the party in the due process hearing, the written authorization must affirm the following:
 - (1) the non-attorney representative has agreed to abide by a voluntary code of ethics and professional conduct during the period of representation; and
 - (2) the non-attorney representative and the party have entered into a confidential, written representation agreement that includes a process for resolving any disputes that may arise between the non-attorney representative and the party.
- (g) The written authorization must be signed and dated by the party.
- (h) An individual is prohibited from being a party's representative under subsection (a)(2) of this section if the individual has prior employment experience with the school district and the school district raises an objection to the individual serving as a representative based on the individual's prior employment experience. No other objections to a party's representation by a non-attorney are permitted under this section.
- (i) Upon receipt of a written authorization filed under this section, the hearing officer must promptly determine whether the non-attorney representative is qualified and meets the requirements to represent the party in the hearing and must notify the parties in writing of the determination. A hearing officer's determination is final and not subject to review or appeal.
- (j) A non-attorney representative may not file pleadings or other documents on behalf of a party, present statements and arguments on behalf of a party, examine and cross-examine witnesses, offer and introduce evidence, object to the introduction of evidence and testimony, or engage in other activities in a representative capacity unless the hearing officer has reviewed a written authorization filed under this section and determined that the non-attorney representative is qualified to represent the party in the hearing.
- (k) In accordance with the Texas Education Code, §38.022, a school district may require an attorney or a non-attorney representative who enters a school campus to display his or her driver's license or another form of government-issued identification. A school district may also verify whether the representative is a registered sex offender and may apply a policy adopted by its board of trustees regarding the action to be taken when a visitor to a school campus is identified as a sex offender.

§89.1195. Special Education Complaint Resolution.

- (a) In accordance with 34 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §300.151, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) has established a complaint resolution process that provides for the investigation and issuance of findings

regarding alleged violations of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or a state special education statute or administrative rule.

- (b) A complaint may be filed with TEA by any individual or organization and must:
- (1) be in writing;
 - (2) include the signature and contact information for the complainant;
 - (3) contain a statement that a public education agency has violated Part B of the IDEA; 34 CFR, §300.1 et seq.; or a state special education statute or administrative rule;
 - (4) include the facts upon which the complaint is based;
 - (5) if alleging violations with respect to a specific student, include:
 - (A) the name and address of the residence of the student;
 - (B) the name of the school the student is attending;
 - (C) in the case of a homeless child or youth (within the meaning of §725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Act (42 United States Code, §11434a(2)), available contact information for the student and the name of the school the student is attending;
 - (D) a description of the nature of the problem of the student, including facts relating to the problem; and
 - (E) a proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available to the party at the time the complaint is filed;
 - (6) allege a violation that occurred not more than one calendar year prior to the date the complaint is received; and
 - (7) be forwarded to the public education agency that is the subject of the complaint at the same time that the complaint is filed with TEA.
- (c) A complaint must be filed with TEA by electronic mail, mail, hand-delivery, or facsimile. TEA has developed a form that may be used by persons or organizations filing a complaint. The form is available on request from TEA and is also available on the TEA website. The complaint timeline will commence on the business day that TEA receives the complaint. If a complaint is received on a day other than a business day, the complaint timeline will commence on the first business day after the day on which TEA receives the complaint. The one-calendar-year statute of limitations for a complaint will be determined based on the day that the complaint timeline commences.
- (d) If a complaint does not meet the requirements outlined in subsection (b) of this section, TEA must notify the complainant of the deficiencies in the complaint.
- (e) Upon receipt of a complaint that meets the requirements of this section, TEA must initiate an investigation to determine whether the public education agency is in compliance with applicable law and regulations in accordance with the following procedures.
- (1) TEA must send written notification to the parties acknowledging receipt of a complaint.
 - (A) The notification must include:
 - (i) the alleged violations that will be investigated;
 - (ii) alternative procedures available to address allegations in the complaint that are outside of the scope of Part B of the IDEA; 34 CFR, §300.1, et seq.; or a state special education statute or administrative rule;
 - (iii) a statement that the public education agency may, at its discretion, investigate the alleged violations and propose a resolution of the complaint;

- (iv) a statement that the parties have the opportunity to resolve the complaint through mediation in accordance with the procedures in §89.1193 of this title (relating to Special Education Mediation);
 - (v) a timeline for the public education agency to submit:
 - (I) documentation demonstrating that the complaint has been resolved; or
 - (II) a written response to the complaint and all documentation and information requested by TEA;
 - (vi) a statement that the complainant may submit additional information about the allegations in the complaint, either orally or in writing within a timeline specified by TEA, and may provide a copy of any additional information to the public education agency to assist the parties in resolving the dispute at the local level; and
 - (vii) a statement that TEA may grant extensions of the timeline for a party to submit information under clause (v) or (vi) of this subparagraph at the request of either party.
- (B) In accordance with 34 CFR, §300.504, upon receipt of the first special education complaint filed by a parent during a school year, TEA will provide an electronic copy of the Notice of Procedural Safeguards to the parent, and the public education agency against which the complaint is filed must provide the parent with a hard copy of the Notice of Procedural Safeguards unless that parent has elected, in accordance with 34 CFR, §300.505, to receive the required notice by electronic mail, if the public education agency makes that option available.
- (C) The public education agency must provide TEA with a written response to the complaint and all documentation and information requested by TEA. The public education agency must forward its response to the parent who filed the complaint at the same time that the response is provided to TEA. The public education agency may also provide the parent with a copy of the documentation and information requested by TEA. If the complaint was filed by an individual other than the student's parent, the public education agency must forward a copy of the response to that individual only if written parental consent has been provided to the public education agency.
- (2) If the complaint is also the subject of a due process hearing or if it contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that due process hearing, TEA must:
- (A) set aside any part of the complaint that is being addressed in the due process hearing until the conclusion of the hearing; and
 - (B) resolve any issue in the complaint that is not a part of the due process hearing.
- (3) If an issue raised in the complaint has previously been decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties, TEA must inform the complainant that the due process hearing decision is binding.
- (4) TEA has 60 calendar days after a valid written complaint is received to carry out the investigation and to resolve the complaint. TEA may extend the time limit beyond 60 calendar days if exceptional circumstances, as determined by TEA, exist with respect to a particular complaint. The parties will be notified in writing by TEA of the exceptional circumstances, if applicable, and the extended time limit. The time limit may also be extended if the parties agree to extend it in order to engage in mediation pursuant to §89.1193 of this title or other alternative means of dispute resolution. In accordance with the Texas Education Code, §29.010(e), TEA must expedite a complaint alleging that a public education agency has refused to enroll a student eligible for special education and related services or that otherwise indicates a need for expedited resolution, as determined by TEA.
- (5) During the course of the investigation and in resolving the complaint, TEA must:

- (A) conduct an investigation of the complaint that must include a complete review of all relevant documentation and that may include interviews with appropriate individuals and an independent on-site investigation, if necessary;
 - (B) consider all facts and issues presented and the applicable requirements specified in law, regulations, or standards;
 - (C) make a determination of compliance or noncompliance on each issue in the complaint based upon the facts and applicable law, regulations, or standards and issue a written report of findings of fact and conclusions, including reasons for the decision, and any corrective actions that are required, including the time period within which each action must be taken;
 - (D) review any evidence that the public education agency has corrected noncompliance on its own initiative;
 - (E) ensure that TEA's final decision is effectively implemented, if needed, through technical assistance activities, negotiations, and corrective actions to achieve compliance; and
 - (F) in the case of a complaint filed by an individual other than the student's parent, provide a copy of the written report only if written parental consent has been provided to TEA.
- (6) In resolving a complaint in which a failure to provide appropriate services is found, TEA must address:
- (A) the failure to provide appropriate services, including corrective action appropriate to address the needs of the student, including compensatory services, monetary reimbursement, or other corrective action appropriate to the needs of the student; and
 - (B) appropriate future provision of services for all students with disabilities.
- (7) In accordance with 34 CFR, §300.600(e), the public education agency must complete all required corrective actions as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year after TEA's identification of the noncompliance. A public education agency's failure to correct the identified noncompliance within the one-year timeline will result in an additional finding of noncompliance under 34 CFR, §300.600(e), and may result in sanctions against the public education agency in accordance with §89.1076 of this title (relating to Interventions and Sanctions).
- (f) In accordance with 34 CFR, §300.151, TEA's complaint resolution procedures must be widely disseminated to parents and other interested individuals, including parent training and information centers, protection and advocacy agencies, independent living centers, and other appropriate entities.
- (g) In exercising its general supervisory authority under 34 CFR, §300.149 and §300.600, TEA may resolve any other credibly alleged violation of IDEA or a state special education statute or administrative rule that it receives even if a sufficient complaint is not filed with TEA in accordance with 34 CFR, §§300.151-300.153, and this section. In doing so, TEA may take one or more of the following actions:
- (1) requesting a response and supporting documentation from a public education agency against which a credible violation of IDEA or a state special education statute or administrative rule has been alleged;
 - (2) conducting a desk or on-site investigation of a public education agency;
 - (3) making a determination regarding the allegation(s); and
 - (4) requiring a public education agency to implement corrective actions to address any identified noncompliance.
- (h) For the purposes of subsection (g) of this section, anonymous complaints, complaints that are received outside the one-calendar-year statute of limitations for a special education complaint, and complaints that do not include sufficient information or detail for TEA to determine that an alleged violation of special education requirements may have occurred will not be considered to be credible complaints under this section but may possibly be addressed through the procedures describe by §97.1071 of this title (relating to Special Program Performance; Monitoring, Review, and Supports).

§89.1197. State-Administered Individualized Education Program Facilitation.

- (a) In accordance with Texas Education Code, §29.020, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) will establish a program that provides independent individualized education program (IEP) facilitators.
- (b) For purposes of this section, where TEA is referenced in subsections (c)-(p) of this section and where not otherwise prohibited by law, TEA may delegate duties and responsibilities to an education service center (ESC) when it is determined to be the most efficient way to implement the program.
- (c) For the purpose of this section, IEP facilitation has the same general meaning as described in §89.1196(a) of this title (relating to Individualized Education Program Facilitation), except that state IEP facilitation may be utilized by a school district and a parent of a student with a disability to avoid a potential dispute relating to the provision of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) or when the admission, review, and dismissal (ARD) committee meeting has ended in disagreement about decisions relating to the provision of FAPE to a student with a disability and the facilitator is an independent facilitator provided by TEA.
- (d) A request for IEP facilitation under this section must be filed by completing a form developed by TEA that is available upon request from TEA and on the TEA website. The form must be filed with TEA by one of the parties by electronic mail, mail, hand-delivery, or facsimile.
- (e) IEP facilitation under this section must be voluntary on the part of the parties and provided at no cost to the parties.
- (f) In order for TEA to provide an independent facilitator, the request must be submitted jointly by a school district and a parent of a student with a disability, and the following conditions must be met.
 - (1) The required form must be completed and signed by both parties.
 - (2) The parties believe that a state-appointed IEP facilitator may assist in avoiding a potential dispute relating to the provision of FAPE or an ARD committee meeting has ended in disagreement regarding the provision of FAPE and the committee has agreed to recess and reconvene the meeting in accordance with §89.1055(o) of this title (relating to Individualized Education Program).
 - (3) The request for IEP facilitation must be received by TEA at least 10 school days prior to the ARD committee meeting for which a facilitator is being requested or within 10 school days of the ARD committee meeting that ended in disagreement. A state-appointed facilitator must be available on the date set for the meeting.
 - (4) The same parties must not have participated in IEP facilitation concerning the same student under this section within the same school year of the filing of the current request for IEP facilitation.
- (g) Within five business days of receipt of a request for an IEP facilitation under this section, TEA will determine whether the conditions in subsections (d)-(f) of this section have been met and will notify the parties of its determination and the assignment of the independent facilitator, if applicable.
- (h) Notwithstanding subsections (c)-(f) of this section, if a special education due process hearing or complaint decision requires a public education agency to provide an independent facilitator to assist with an ARD committee meeting, the public education agency may request that TEA assign an independent facilitator. Within five business days of receipt of a written request for IEP facilitation under this subsection, TEA will notify the parties of its decision to assign or not assign an independent facilitator. If TEA declines the request to assign an independent facilitator, the public education agency must provide an independent facilitator at its own expense.
- (i) TEA's decision not to provide an independent facilitator is final and not subject to review or appeal.
- (j) The independent facilitator assignment may be made based on a combination of factors, including, but not limited to, geographic location and availability. Once assigned, the independent facilitator must promptly contact the parties to clarify the issues, gather necessary information, and explain the IEP facilitation process.

- (k) TEA will use a competitive solicitation method to seek independent facilitation services, and the contracts with independent facilitators will be developed and managed in accordance with TEA's contracting practices and procedures.
- (l) At a minimum, an individual who serves as an independent facilitator under this section:
 - (1) must have demonstrated knowledge of federal and state requirements relating to the provision of special education and related services to students with disabilities;
 - (2) must have demonstrated knowledge of and experience with the ARD committee meeting process;
 - (3) must have completed 18 hours or more of training in IEP facilitation, consensus building, and/or conflict resolution as specified in TEA's competitive solicitation;
 - (4) must complete continuing education as determined by TEA;
 - (5) may not be an employee of TEA or the public education agency that the student attends; and
 - (6) may not have a personal or professional interest that conflicts with his or her impartiality.
- (m) An individual is not an employee of TEA solely because the individual is paid by TEA to serve as an independent facilitator.
- (n) An independent facilitator must not be a member of the student's ARD committee, must not have any decision-making authority, and must remain impartial to the topics under discussion. The independent facilitator must assist with the overall organization and conduct of the ARD committee meeting by:
 - (1) assisting the committee in establishing an agenda and setting the time allotted for the meeting;
 - (2) assisting the committee in establishing a set of guidelines for the meeting;
 - (3) guiding the discussion and keeping the focus on developing a mutually agreed upon IEP for the student;
 - (4) ensuring that each committee member has an opportunity to participate;
 - (5) helping to resolve disagreements that arise; and
 - (6) helping to keep the ARD committee on task so that the meeting purposes can be accomplished within the time allotted for the meeting.
- (o) An independent facilitator must protect the confidentiality of personally identifiable information about the student and comply with the requirements in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act regulations, 34 CFR, Part 99, relating to the disclosure and redisclosure of personally identifiable information from a student's education record.
- (p) TEA will develop surveys to evaluate the IEP facilitation program and the independent facilitators and will request that parties who participate in the program complete the surveys.