

EMPLOYMENT APPEALS BOARD DECISION
2026-EAB-0277

Affirmed
Ineligible for Training Unemployment Insurance

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On January 14, 2026, the Oregon Employment Department (the Department) served notice of an administrative decision concluding that claimant was not eligible for Training Unemployment Insurance (TUI) benefits (also known as the Dislocated Worker Program) effective January 4, 2026 (decision # L0015436197). Claimant filed a timely request for hearing. On March 3, 2026, ALJ Frank conducted a hearing, and on March 11, 2026 issued Order No. 26-UI-323306, affirming decision # L0015436197. On March 19, 2026, claimant filed an application for review with the Employment Appeals Board (EAB).

WRITTEN ARGUMENT: Claimant filed written arguments on April 6 and 13, 2026. Both of claimant's arguments contained information that was not in the hearing record, and which claimant requested that EAB consider when reaching this decision.¹ Some of this information, such as further information regarding the coursework that claimant was enrolled in, appears to have been available to claimant prior to the hearing, and claimant therefore has not shown that factors or circumstances beyond her reasonable control prevented her from offering the information during the hearing. ORS 657.275(2) and OAR 471-041-0090.

Likewise, claimant included new information relating to the accreditation status of the program she was enrolled in. Claimant explained:

Beginning on February 17, 2026, prior to the March 3, 2026 hearing, Claimant initiated a written inquiry with the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), which administers Oregon's Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL). Claimant specifically asked whether the regionally accredited universities behind the edX-delivered Strategic Partnerships

¹ Under OAR 471-041-0090(1)(b) (May 13, 2019), "Any party may request that EAB consider additional evidence, and EAB may allow such a request when the party offering the additional evidence establishes that: (A) The additional evidence is relevant and material to EAB's determination, and (B) Factors or circumstances beyond the party's reasonable control prevented the party from offering the additional evidence into the hearing record."

courses, rather than edX itself as the delivery platform, could qualify as eligible training providers under Oregon’s ETPL...

HECC responded on April 3, 2026, confirming three things. First, that institutions of higher education providing programs leading to recognized postsecondary credentials qualify directly under category 1 of Oregon’s ETPL policy, and that Harvard, University of Maryland, RIT, and UC Davis fall directly under that category. Second, that a mechanism exists for out-of-state accredited universities to be listed on Oregon’s ETPL. Third, that the only exception process under Oregon’s ETPL policy is for the high-demand requirement, which is not relevant here because the universities qualify directly under category 1 without any exception.

Claimant’s April 6, 2026 Written Argument at 4. Because claimant sought this information two weeks prior to the hearing, but did not receive it until a month *after* the hearing, claimant was prevented from offering this information at hearing due to factors or circumstances beyond her reasonable control. In light of this, as well as the fact that the information is relevant and material to EAB’s decision in this matter, EAB has considered this additional information when reaching this decision.

Claimant’s arguments also included new information that was not available to her at hearing because it pertained to post-hearing developments. For instance, claimant included information relating to determinations the Department made, after the hearing, to reverse decisions they had previously made on claimant’s eligibility for both the TUI and Self-Employment Assistance (SEA) programs in a prior year. *See, e.g.*, Claimant’s April 13, 2026 Written Argument at 13–15. Claimant was clearly prevented from offering this information into the record at hearing due to factors or circumstances beyond her reasonable control, as it was not available prior to the hearing. However, while this information may be relevant and material to EAB’s decision in this matter, it is of limited probative value. Therefore, while EAB has considered this information while reaching this decision, it does not change the outcome in this matter.

Claimant asserted, in brief, that she offered this information about the Department’s post-hearing actions because the Department’s “prior formal approval and full payment of benefits on the Spring 2025 TUI program — the identical program structure at issue in this appeal — is affirmative evidence that the program satisfied the applicable standards under OAR 471-030-0080.” Claimant’s April 13, 2026 Written Argument at 4. Even assuming that the facts in two separate circumstances are identical, it is possible for the Department to nevertheless reach two separate conclusions regarding the eligibility of the individuals in those circumstances. Thus, the fact that the Department allowed claimant TUI benefits in 2025 but then reversed that decision in 2026, apparently after learning of a purportedly faulty basis for allowing them while attending the hearing in this matter, merely shows that the Department sought to correct a mistake it concluded it had made in 2025, such that the TUI program could be administered more consistently.

Finally, claimant’s written arguments also contained multiple assertions which suggested that she “relied” on the Department’s previous approval of her TUI benefits in 2025. *See, e.g.*, Claimant’s April 6, 2026 Written Argument at 5. It is not clear what claimant intended to assert here. To the extent that she was suggesting that the doctrine of equitable estoppel applies here, however, that argument fails.

The doctrine of equitable estoppel “requires proof of a false representation, (1) of which the other party

was ignorant, (2) made with the knowledge of the facts, (3) made with the intention that it would induce action by the other party, and (4) that induced the other party to act upon it.” *Keppinger v. Hanson Crushing, Inc.*, 161 Or App 424, 428, 983 P2d 1084 (1999) (citation omitted). In addition, to prove estoppel against a state agency, a party “must have relied on the agency’s representations and the party’s reliance must have been reasonable.” *State ex rel SOSCF v. Dennis*, 173 Or App 604, 611, 25 P3d 341, rev. den., 332 Or 448 (2001) (citing *Dept. of Transportation v. Hewett Professional Group*, 321 Or 118, 126, 895 P2d 755 (1995)). “The ‘[mis]representation must be justifiably relied upon by [the party] in taking action or in refraining from it to [their] damage.’ *Meader v. Francis Ford, Inc.*, 286 Or. 451, 456, 595 P.2d 480 (1979) (emphasis added).”

Neither the hearing record, nor the new information in claimant’s written arguments, shows that claimant’s circumstances meet the above criteria. Even aside from any question regarding whether the Department made knowingly false representations to claimant with the intent of inducing her to act—and the facts here do not support such a conclusion—claimant has not shown that she suffered any *damages* as a result of said action. Claimant’s argument here appears to suggest that she was induced to file an application for TUI benefits in 2026 because she had previously been allowed TUI benefits in 2025 under similar circumstances. Even if that is true, merely filing an application for TUI benefits that she might not have filed if she did not believe she would likely to be eligible does not show that claimant suffered any injury (financial or otherwise), lost any opportunity that she otherwise would have pursued, or incurred any sort of damages as a result of filing the application. Thus, the doctrine of equitable estoppel does not apply to claimant’s circumstances, and the Department is not estopped from determining claimant ineligible for TUI benefits in 2026 based on its earlier decision to allow them in 2025.

FINDINGS OF FACT: (1) On June 24, 2025, claimant filed an initial application for unemployment insurance benefits. The Department determined claimant’s weekly benefit amount to be \$836.

(2) On January 5, 2026, claimant filed an application for the Dislocated Worker Program, commonly referred to as the TUI program. Claimant’s basis for application to the TUI program was her enrollment in a non-degree-bearing workforce development program. The program was intended to provide claimant with multiple certifications necessary for her to find re-employment in fields similar to those in which she had been previously working. The classes for this program were administered by various universities, such as Harvard University and the University of Maryland, and delivered through a single online platform called edX. Claimant was enrolled for the approximate equivalent of 26 credit hours, and spent approximately 25 hours per week on her coursework.

(3) The Department required claimant to submit two parts of the TUI application: one that she was to complete herself, and another that was to be completed by the educational institution. Typically, the Department expected TUI applicants to provide the institution’s portion of the application to the institution to have them complete it, at which point the applicant would then submit both portions of the application to the Department. In the alternative, the Department accepted letters from the institutions containing all of information requested on the application. When claimant submitted her application, however, she only included the portion that she completed herself. Claimant explained to the Department’s adjudicator handling her case that she did not submit the institution’s portion of the application because they did not complete it due to “the model of the program.” Audio Record at 23:30.

(4) After the Department received claimant's application, they determined that the program claimant was enrolled in was not licensed or accredited by the state where the training was provided.

(5) Claimant claimed benefits for several weeks between January and April 2026. The Department did not pay claimant benefits for any of these weeks.²

CONCLUSIONS AND REASONS: Claimant was not eligible for TUI benefits.

ORS 657.335 provides:

As used in ORS 657.335 to 657.360:

(1) "Career and technical training" means training or retraining and basic education, including literacy skills, designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment in recognized or new occupations or to prepare individuals to become self-employed. "Career and technical training" does not include programs of instruction for an individual, including transfer credit programs of instruction given at community colleges, that are primarily intended to lead toward a baccalaureate or higher degree or training that has for its purpose the preparation of individuals for employment in occupations that require a baccalaureate or higher degree from institutions of higher education unless approved by the Director of the Employment Department.

(2) "Eligible dislocated workers" means individuals who are not disqualified from benefits under ORS 657.176 and who:

(a) Have been terminated or laid off or who have received a notice of termination or layoff, are eligible for or have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation and are unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation;

(b) Have been terminated or have received a notice of termination of employment, as a result of any permanent closure of or any substantial layoff at a plant, facility or enterprise;

(c) Are long term unemployed and have limited opportunities for employment or reemployment in the same or a similar occupation in the area in which such individuals reside, including older individuals who may have substantial barriers to employment by reason of age;

(d) Were self-employed, including farmers and ranchers, and are unemployed as a result of general economic conditions in the community in which they reside or because of natural disasters;

² EAB has taken notice of these facts, which contained in Employment Department records. OAR 471-041-0090(1). Any party that objects to EAB taking notice of this information must send their objection to EAB in writing, stating why they object, within ten days of EAB mailing this decision. OAR 471-041-0090(2). Unless EAB receives and agrees with the objection, the noticed facts will remain in the record.

- (e) Returned to service in the Oregon National Guard or the military reserve forces of the United States following active duty service;
- (f) Have separated from a declining industry; or
- (g) Have been involuntarily and indefinitely separated from employment as a result of a permanent reduction of operations at their place of employment.

ORS 657.340 provides:

- (1) Dislocated workers approved for career and technical training may not be denied unemployment insurance benefits solely because they are attending career and technical training, nor shall such individual be denied benefits by reason of leaving work to enter such training if the work left was part-time or temporary or paid less than 80 percent of the individual's average weekly wage during the base year.
- (2) Notwithstanding provisions of this chapter relating to availability for work, actively seeking work or refusal to accept suitable work, dislocated workers approved for career and technical training and otherwise eligible for benefits are not ineligible for such benefits or waiting week credit because of attendance in career and technical training.
- (3)
 - (a) Eligible dislocated workers who file valid unemployment compensation claims, upon exhaustion of regular benefits, are eligible for supplemental benefits from 1 to 26 times the individual's most recent weekly benefit amount based upon the amount needed to continue or complete approved career and technical training.
 - (b) Supplemental benefits shall be paid under the same terms and conditions as regular benefits under this chapter, except that the Director of the Employment Department may extend the benefit year of an individual attending an approved career and technical training program a sufficient number of weeks to allow the individual to complete the training program.
 - (c) Supplemental benefits may be paid only when the eligible dislocated worker is not eligible to receive extended benefits as provided in ORS 657.321 to 657.329 or additional benefits as provided in ORS 657.331 to 657.334.
- (4) The receipt of supplemental benefits is conditioned upon the individual's demonstrating satisfactory progress and attendance in career and technical training.

ORS 657.345 provides:

- (1) Individuals who are identified as dislocated workers under the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, and implementing regulations, and who attend training programs identified under the Act shall be considered to be in approved career and technical training. The training shall be for occupations or skills for which there are or are expected to be reasonable

employment opportunities in the area or in another area to which the individual is willing to relocate or which relate to the development of a self-employment enterprise for which there is reasonable opportunity for success.

(2) In approving career and technical training for eligible dislocated workers who do not attend training programs identified in subsection (1) of this section, the Director of the Employment Department shall require:

(a) That the career and technical training relates to an occupation or skill for which there are, or are expected to be, reasonable employment opportunities in this state or relates to the development of a self-employment enterprise for which there is a reasonable opportunity for success.

(b) That the individual has the qualifications and aptitudes to successfully complete such career and technical training.

OAR 471-030-0080 (January 11, 2018) provides:

(1) Career and technical training, as defined in ORS 657.335, shall not be approved by the Director unless the public or private institution, school, or agency offering such program is certified or licensed by the Oregon State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Oregon Workforce Investment Board, or another Oregon State agency authorized to grant such certification or license or an equivalent state agency in the state where the training is to be provided.

(2) Career and technical training shall not be approved by the Director if the Director finds that the planned curriculum of classes and course activity is less than the equivalent of full-time student status as defined by the training provider. The Director may waive this requirement if:

(a) Classes needed to complete the training are not available to the individual; or

(b) The number of classes needed to complete the training is less than the equivalent of a full-time schedule.

(3) To receive benefits for any week during career and technical training, a dislocated worker who is otherwise eligible for unemployment insurance benefits must:

(a) Submit a written application for approval of career and technical training on forms prescribed or approved for such purpose by the Director, with the Employment Department Benefits Section — UI Training Programs Unit within 90 days of:

(A) Certification as a dislocated worker; or

(B) Termination from the dislocating employment; or

(C) The filing of a claim for unemployment insurance benefits; and

(b) Submit to the Employment Department a timely claim for such week in accordance with OAR 471-030-0045(4) which establishes the individual:

(A) Was physically present in the individual's labor market as defined in OAR 471-030-0036(6); and

(B) Attended and participated in all scheduled classes for each week of approved career and technical training; or

(C) If the individual failed to attend or participate in all scheduled classes during the week, was able and available for work; and

(c) At the end of each term provide to the Employment Department grades or completion of program documentation from the training facility which certifies that the claimant was satisfactorily pursuing the approved career and technical training; and

(4) Decisions of the Director to approve or disapprove an application for course approval or to discontinue such approval for one or more weeks during career and technical training or to approve or deny supplemental benefits under the provisions of ORS 657.335 through 657.360 shall be in writing, shall set forth the reasons therefore, and shall be served upon the claimant by mailing to the claimant's last known address of record with the Employment Department.

(5) As used in ORS 657.335(1):

(a) "Eligible dislocated workers" includes:

(A) For purposes of ORS 657.345(1), any worker attending training financed wholly or in part, or directly delivered by, a recipient or subrecipient administering Title 1B of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-220).

(B) For purposes of ORS 657.345(2), any worker identified as dislocated by the Employment Department under ORS 657.335(1).

(b) "Unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation" includes the following:

(A) The individual has been identified as meeting the Worker Profiling Program participation threshold developed by the Employment Department, or

(B) The individual has been permanently separated from an employer in an occupation identified as declining by the Employment Department in that geographic area in which the claimant resides, or

(C) The individual has been evaluated and referred to training by a vocational rehabilitation provider, including but not limited to Vocational Rehabilitation Division, Workers Compensation Division, or a private insurance carrier.

(c) “Long-term unemployed” means unemployed from the dislocated occupation for at least 15 of the last 26 weeks or for at least 8 consecutive weeks immediately prior to application (including survival jobs during such period).

(6) In applying the provisions of ORS 657.340, the Director may approve a program of instruction, including transfer credit programs of instruction given at community colleges, leading toward a baccalaureate or higher degree or training that has for its purpose the preparation of persons for employment in occupations which require a baccalaureate or higher degree from institutions of higher education if:

(a) The individual does not have significant transferable skills for other occupations in the statewide labor market;

(b) Unless previously approved in accordance with the provisions of Title IB of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-220), the individual is within 48 quarter credit hours (or the semester equivalent) from completing the baccalaureate or higher degree; and

(c) Completing the baccalaureate or higher degree offers the best chance of long term employment.

(7) As used in ORS 657.340(2), “attendance in career and technical training” means the period of time beginning with the starting date of the training and ends with satisfactory completion of the training program. The period of time defined in this section includes customary academic recesses for holidays and between academic terms but does not include the customary academic summer recess. For purposes of applying 657.340(2), an individual may be determined not to be in “attendance in career and technical training” as defined in this section if the individual fails to demonstrate satisfactory progress and attendance as defined in section (3) of this rule.

(8) As used in ORS 657.340(3), “terms and conditions” includes “benefit year” as defined in 657.010(3). In applying the provisions of 657.340(3), the benefit year of an eligible dislocated worker may be extended, whether or not the benefit year has expired, if the eligible dislocated worker has not filed a subsequent initial claim establishing a new benefit year.

(9) The determination that an individual meets the definition of dislocated worker may be made by the Employment Department for purposes of paying benefits under ORS 657.335 to 657.360.

The Department denied claimant’s TUI application on the basis that the training program in which she was enrolled was “not accredited or licensed by the state where the training is provided.” Exhibit 1 at 6. In addition to this, the Department’s witness explained at hearing that there were two other bases for denying claimant’s application: first, that she indicated on her application that she would only be taking between two and six credits, which is not equivalent to full-time enrollment; and second, that claimant never submitted the institution’s portion of the application. Audio Record at 7:12 to 8:20. The record was later clarified to show that claimant actually indicated that she was taking 26 credits (or the

equivalent thereof). Audio Record at 12:56. Thus, that particular issue does not appear to impact claimant's eligibility for the TUI program.

As to the matter of the Department's approval of the program in which claimant was enrolled, the record shows that denial of TUI benefits was warranted based on claimant having never submitted the institution's portion of the application. Therefore, whether the program was considered a training program identified under the federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, per ORS 657.345(1), such that it would be considered approved under that provision of the statute, need not be addressed.

At hearing, the Department's witness testified that the program in which claimant was enrolled was not licensed or accredited by the state where the training was being provided, suggesting that the Department had not approved the program. Audio Record at 7:12. By contrast, claimant asserted at hearing that all of the institutions that were providing the courses she had been taking were accredited. Audio Record at 17:02. Additionally, claimant included with her April 6, 2026 written argument a series of emails with HECC which suggest that the institutions delivering the program via edX might have been accredited for purposes of being approved for the TUI program. Claimant's April 6, 2026 Written Argument at 9–18. Without further inquiry on this point, a determination as to whether or not the Department approved the program cannot be made. However, claimant nevertheless remains ineligible for TUI benefits due to her incomplete application.

Regarding claimant's application, OAR 471-030-0080(3) required claimant, in relevant part, to “[s]ubmit a written application for approval of career and technical training on forms prescribed or approved for such purpose by the [Department.]” The record shows that the Department required claimant, in furtherance of this provision of the rule, to submit both the portion of the application that she completed herself; and either the portion of the application that was to be completed by the school or institution, or the equivalent of that response under separate cover. It can be reasonably inferred from this that the Department interpreted that provision of the rule to require the submission of both parts of the application (or, in the case of the institution's portion, the substantive equivalent) for claimant to be eligible for TUI benefits. As this constitutes an interpretation of the Department's own rule, and as the interpretation is consistent with the text of the rule, the Department is entitled to deference to this interpretation.³

Claimant did not return the institution's completed portion of the application or its substantial equivalent. She explained to the adjudicator who handled the matter that she did not do so because of “the model of the program.” This appears to suggest that claimant was unable to submit the institution's completed portion of the application due to how the program was delivered—i.e., by way of a multi-institution online platform. Even if claimant was unable to complete it despite a good faith effort to do so, however, the rule does not provide any exceptions to that requirement, and the Department likewise did not indicate at hearing that they interpret the rule to allow for any such exceptions. Thus, claimant failed to comply with the requirements of OAR 471-030-0080(3).

³ EAB will follow the Department's interpretation of an administrative rule about unemployment insurance unless their interpretation is inconsistent with the rule's text, context, or any other source of law. *See accord Ring v. Employment Dep't.*, 205 Or App 532, 134 P3d 1096 (2006), *citing Don't Waste Oregon Com. v. Energy Facility Siting*, 320 Or 132, 142, 881 P2d 119 (1994); *Johnson v. Employment Dept.*, 189 Or App 243, 74 P3d 1159 (*Johnson II*), *adh'd to as modified on recons.*, 191 Or App 222, 81 P3d 730 (2003) (*Johnson III*).

In sum, because claimant did not submit her application in conformity with the requirements of OAR 471-030-0080(3), claimant was not eligible for TUI benefits.

DECISION: Order No. 26-UI-323306 is affirmed.

D. Hettle and A. Steger-Bentz;
S. Serres, not participating.

DATE of Service: May 5, 2026

NOTE: You may appeal this decision by filing a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals **within 30 days of the date of service stated above**. See ORS 657.282. For forms and information, visit <https://www.courts.oregon.gov/courts/appellate/forms/Pages/appeal.aspx> and choose the appropriate form under “File a Petition for Judicial Review.” You may also contact the Court of Appeals by telephone at (503) 986-5555, by fax at (503) 986-5560, or by mail at 1163 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97301.

Please help us improve our service by completing an online customer service survey. To complete the survey, please go to <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5552642/EAB-Customer-Service-Survey>. If you are unable to complete the survey online and wish to have a paper copy of the survey, please contact our office.



Understanding Your Employment Appeals Board Decision

English

Attention – This decision affects your unemployment benefits. If you do not understand this decision, contact the Employment Appeals Board immediately. If you do not agree with this decision, you may file a Petition for Judicial Review with the Oregon Court of Appeals following the instructions written at the end of the decision.

Simplified Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Traditional Chinese

注意 – 本判決會影響您的失業救濟金。如果您不明白本判決，請立即聯繫就業上訴委員會。如果您不同意此判決，您可以按照該判決結尾所寫的說明，向俄勒岡州上訴法院提出司法複審申請。

Tagalog

Paalala – Nakakaapekto ang desisyong ito sa iyong mga benepisyo sa pagkawala ng trabaho. Kung hindi mo naiintindihan ang desisyong ito, makipag-ugnayan kaagad sa Lupon ng mga Apela sa Trabaho (Employment Appeals Board). Kung hindi ka sumasang-ayon sa desisyong ito, maaari kang maghain ng isang Petisyon sa Pagsusuri ng Hukuman (Petition for Judicial Review) sa Hukuman sa Paghahabol (Court of Appeals) ng Oregon na sinusunod ang mga tagubilin na nakasulat sa dulo ng desisyon.

Vietnamese

Chú ý - Quyết định này ảnh hưởng đến trợ cấp thất nghiệp của quý vị. Nếu quý vị không hiểu quyết định này, hãy liên lạc với Ban Kháng Cáo Việc Làm ngay lập tức. Nếu quý vị không đồng ý với quyết định này, quý vị có thể nộp Đơn Xin Tái Xét Tư Pháp với Tòa Kháng Cáo Oregon theo các hướng dẫn được viết ra ở cuối quyết định này.

Spanish

Atención – Esta decisión afecta sus beneficios de desempleo. Si no entiende esta decisión, comuníquese inmediatamente con la Junta de Apelaciones de Empleo. Si no está de acuerdo con esta decisión, puede presentar una Aplicación de Revisión Judicial ante el Tribunal de Apelaciones de Oregon siguiendo las instrucciones escritas al final de la decisión.

Russian

Внимание – Данное решение влияет на ваше пособие по безработице. Если решение Вам непонятно – немедленно обратитесь в Апелляционный Комитет по Трудоустройству. Если Вы не согласны с принятым решением, вы можете подать Ходатайство о Пересмотре Судебного Решения в Апелляционный Суд штата Орегон, следуя инструкциям, описанным в конце решения.

Khmer

ចំណុចសំខាន់ – សេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះមានផលប៉ះពាល់ដល់អត្ថប្រយោជន៍គ្មានការងារធ្វើរបស់លោកអ្នក។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់អំពីសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ សូមទាក់ទងគណៈកម្មការឧទ្ធរណ៍ការងារភ្លាមៗ។ ប្រសិនបើលោកអ្នកមិនយល់ស្របចំពោះសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះទេ លោកអ្នកអាចដាក់ពាក្យប្តឹងសុំឲ្យមានការពិនិត្យរឿងក្តីឡើងវិញជាមួយតុលាការឧទ្ធរណ៍រដ្ឋ Oregon ដោយអនុវត្តតាមសេចក្តីណែនាំដែលសរសេរនៅខាងចុងបញ្ចប់នៃសេចក្តីសម្រេចនេះ។

Laotian

ເອົາໃຈໃສ່ – ຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້ມີຜົນກະທົບຕໍ່ກັບເງິນຊ່ວຍເຫຼືອການຫວ່າງງານຂອງທ່ານ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຂົ້າໃຈຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້, ກະລຸນາຕິດຕໍ່ຫາຄະນະກຳມະການອຸທອນການຈ້າງງານໃນທັນທີ. ຖ້າທ່ານບໍ່ເຫັນດີນຳຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້, ທ່ານສາມາດຍື່ນຄຳຮ້ອງຂໍການທົບທວນຄຳຕັດສິນນຳສານອຸທອນລັດ Oregon ໄດ້ໂດຍປະຕິບັດຕາມຄຳແນະນຳທີ່ບອກໄວ້ຢູ່ຕອນທ້າຍຂອງຄຳຕັດສິນນີ້.

Arabic

هذا القرار قد يؤثر على منحة البطالة الخاصة بك، إذا لم تفهم هذا القرار، إتصل بمجلس منازعات العمل فوراً، و إذا كنت لا توافق على هذا القرار، يمكنك رفع شكوى للمراجعة القانونية بمحكمة الإستئناف بأوريغون و ذلك بإتباع الإرشادات المدرجة أسفل القرار.

Farsi

توجه - این حکم بر مزایای بیکاری شما تاثیر می گذارد. اگر با این تصمیم موافق نیستید، بلافاصله با هیأت فرجام خواهی استخدام تماس بگیرید. اگر از این حکم رضایت ندارید، می‌توانید با استفاده از دستور العمل موجود در پایان آن، از دادگاه تجدید نظر اورگان درخواست تجدید نظر کنید.

Employment Appeals Board - 875 Union Street NE | Salem, OR 97311
 Phone: (503) 378-2077 | 1-800-734-6949 | Fax: (503) 378-2129 | TDD: 711
 Email: appealsboard@employ.oregon.gov
 Website: www.Oregon.gov/employ/pages/employment-appeals-board.aspx

The Oregon Employment Department is an equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. Language assistance is available to persons with limited English proficiency at no cost.

El Departamento de Empleo de Oregon es un programa que respeta la igualdad de oportunidades. Disponemos de servicios o ayudas auxiliares, formatos alternos y asistencia de idiomas para personas con discapacidades o conocimiento limitado del inglés, a pedido y sin costo.