

1. Emergency relief may be requested according to N.J.A.C. 1:6A-12.1.

i. Emergency relief may be granted if the administrative law judge determines from the proofs that:

(1) The applicant has a reasonable probability of ultimately prevailing on the merits;

(2) The student's education program will be terminated or interrupted to the extent that irreparable harm will occur; and

(3) The relief requested is narrowly defined to prevent the specific harm from occurring and will not cause unreasonable expense and substantial inconvenience.

2. Emergency relief may be requested if school personnel maintain that it is dangerous for the student with a disability to be in the current placement;

i. The administrative law judge may order a change in the placement of a student with a disability to an interim alternative educational setting for not more than 45 days in accordance with 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)(2) as amended and supplemented. (See chapter Appendix.)

3. Emergency relief may be requested by the parent or adult student if he or she disagrees with a manifestation determination related to disciplinary action or with a decision related to placement in an interim alternative educational setting by school officials for behavior involving drugs or weapons according to 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)(6)(A) as amended and supplemented. (See chapter Appendix.)

(i) If the public agency responsible for implementing the IEP fails to implement a hearing decision of the Office of Administrative Law, a request for enforcement may be made by the parent or adult student. The request shall be made in writing to the State Director of the Office of Special Education Programs, Department of Education. On receipt of this request, implementation of the decision shall be assured.

(j) Pending the outcome of a due process hearing or any administrative or judicial proceeding, no change shall be made to the student's classification, program or placement unless both parties agree, or emergency relief as part of a request for a due process hearing is granted by the Office of Administrative Law according to (h) above or as provided in 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)(7) as amended and supplemented. (See chapter Appendix.)

(k) Any party may appeal the decision of an administrative law judge according to N.J.A.C. 1:6A-18.3.

Amended by R.1998 d.527, effective November 2, 1998.
See: 30 N.J.R. 2852(a), 30 N.J.R. 3941(a).

Rewrote (d)3ii.

Case Notes

New Jersey limitations did not bar parents from seeking retroactive reimbursement. *Bernardsville Bd. of Educ. v. J.H.*, D.N.J.1993, 817 F.Supp. 14.

Parents did not waive right to reimbursement by unilaterally placing student in private school and failing to initiate review proceedings. *Bernardsville Bd. of Educ. v. J.H.*, D.N.J.1993, 817 F.Supp. 14.

Parents exhausted administrative remedies. *Woods on Behalf of T.W. v. New Jersey Dept. of Educ.*, D.N.J.1992, 796 F.Supp. 767.

Stipulation of settlement reached in suit under IDEA seeking residential placement did not bar action for funding of residential placement and for compensatory education. *Woods on Behalf of T.W. v. New Jersey Dept. of Educ.*, D.N.J.1992, 796 F.Supp. 767.

Parents of emotionally disturbed student were "prevailing parties" entitled to recover attorney fees; services performed at administrative level. *Field v. Haddonfield Bd. of Educ.*, D.N.J.1991, 769 F.Supp. 1313.

Administrative law judge lacked jurisdiction to conduct "due process" hearing to determine financial responsibility of State Department of Human Services for special education costs of blind, retarded child. *L.P. v. Edison Bd. of Educ.*, 265 N.J.Super. 266, 626 A.2d 473 (L.1993).

Superior Court, Law Division did not have jurisdiction to conduct "due process" hearing to determine financial responsibility for special education costs of blind, retarded child. *L.P. v. Edison Bd. of Educ.*, 265 N.J.Super. 266, 626 A.2d 473 (L.1993).

School district has burden of proving that proposed individualized education program is appropriate. *Lascari v. Board of Educ. of Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School Dist.*, 116 N.J. 30, 560 A.2d 1180 (1989).

Parents awarded private education reimbursement following improper placement by child study team entitled to interest on expenses from date of disbursement; counsel fee award not permitted (citing former N.J.A.C. 6:28-1.9). *Fallon v. Bd. of Ed., Scotch Plains-Fanwood School District, Union Cty.*, 185 N.J.Super. 142, 447 A.2d 607 (Law Div.1982).

Emergency relief for special education student denied. *C.Y. v. Deerfield Township Board of Education*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 59.

No change may be made in placement of handicapped pre-schooler without concurrence of both parties. *C.W. v. Bernards Township Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 359.

District failed to show emergency which would justify summary declassification of pupil currently classified as perceptually impaired. *Southern Gloucester Regional School District v. C.W.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 357.

State-operated school offering special education was not proper party in due process hearing regarding implementation of individualized education program (IEP). *A.B. v. Jersey City Board of Education and Office of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 295.

Untimely request precluded reimbursement due process hearing for unilateral enrollment of child in private school. *J.F. v. West Windsor-Plainsboro Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 119.

Special education student subject to regular school disciplinary process if different standard not applicable. *M.G. v. Brick Township Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 82.

School district may evaluate potentially educationally disabled student over parent's objection. *Morris School District v. V.S.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 37.

Father's unexcused failure to appear following notice required dismissal of request for due process hearing on disciplined student's individualized education program. *G.M. v. Vineland Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 233.

Inappropriate, aggressive and hostile behavior necessitated an order permitting school district to test and evaluate child despite lack of consent from parents. *Jersey City Board v. T.W.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 211.

Child study team evaluation requested by one parent was not required for progressing student in joint custody after divorce when opposed by other parent. *R.F. v. Saddle Brook Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 187.

Student with serious behavioral and educational problems required evaluation without parental consent. *Jersey City Board v. C.F.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 113.

Absence of evidence that student would regress; speech and language therapy summer session. *K.K. v. Washington Township Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 171.

12-year old student was given an emergency relief due process hearing and ordered to undergo a Child Study Team Evaluation. *Quinton Township Board of Education v. S.W.*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 130.

Petitioner's claim barred; settlement agreement. *J.L. v. Elizabeth Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 119.

Application by parents for emergent relief to return their emotionally disturbed daughter to high school transitional program pending hearing was denied. *S.H. v. Lenape*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 87.

Mother's changing her residence precluded entitlement to due process hearing challenging refusal to place son as tuition student. *N.A. v. Willingboro Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 19.

6A:14-2.8 Discipline/suspension/expulsions

(a) For disciplinary reasons, school officials may order the removal of a student with a disability from his or her current educational placement to an interim alternative educational setting, another setting, or a suspension without the provision of educational services for up to 10 consecutive or cumulative school days in a school year. Such suspensions are subject to the same district board of education procedures as nondisabled students. However, at the time of removal, the principal shall forward written notification and a description of the reasons for such action to the case manager.

(b) Disciplinary action initiated by a district board of education which involves removal to an interim alternative educational setting, suspension for more than 10 school days in a school year or expulsion of a student with a disability shall be in accordance with 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k), as amended and supplemented. (See chapter Appendix.)

Case Notes

Juvenile was not denied effective assistance of counsel in delinquency adjudication for serious offenses where evidence of guilt was overwhelming. *State in Interest of S.T.*, 233 N.J.Super. 598, 559 A.2d 861 (A.D.1989).

No compensatory education entitlement for special education student undermining procedural requirements. *R.S. v. Southern Gloucester County Regional Board of Education*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 22.

High school student's violent behavior warranted continued suspension pending re-evaluation. *Greater Egg Harbor Board of Education v. P.N., M.N. and J.N.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 12.

Teacher's petition to bring expulsion proceedings against student who assaulted her was dismissed where assault arose from student's handicap. *Barna v. Irvington Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDU) 598.

Request to return suspended kindergartener to classroom pending completion of evaluation was denied due to student's continued aggressive behavior. *M.J. v. Norwood Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 193.

School board was entitled to emergency relief to continue student's suspension pending further hearing on the matter. *Brick Township Board of Education v. R.I.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 107.

Student suspended for posing threat to others could not return without reevaluation. *Englewood Board v. C.M.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 112.

Handicapped student's suspension upheld. *Deptford Township Board of Education v. E.S.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 21.

Fight leading to disciplinary suspension not related to student's educational disability. *Deptford v. E.S.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 21.

Expulsion; initial evaluation by child study team. *Edison Board of Education v. R.H.*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 35.

Disciplinary record required child study team evaluation over refusal of parents to give consent. *Ewing Township v. J.R.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 94.

6A:14-2.9 Student records

(a) All student records shall be maintained according to N.J.A.C. 6:3-6.

(b) The parent, adult student or their designated representative shall be permitted to inspect and review the contents of the student's records maintained by the district board of education under N.J.A.C. 6:3-6 without unnecessary delay and before any meeting regarding the IEP.

(c) Any consent required for students with disabilities under N.J.A.C. 6:3-6 shall be obtained according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.3 "consent" and 2.3(a) and (b).

Case Notes

Due process hearing held to contest child study team's proposal to remove child from residential school into home and local school programs; determination of appropriate placement. *Geis v. Bd. of Ed., Parsippany-Troy Hills, Morris Cty.*, 589 F.Supp. 269 (D.N.J.1984), affirmed 774 F.2d 575 (3rd Cir.1985).

Federal due process requirements (citing former N.J.A.C. 6:28-1.9). *Levine v. State Dept. of Institutions and Agencies*, 84 N.J. 234, 418 A.2d 229 (1980).

No parental right to pupil records under Right to Know Law absent governing regulations from State Board of Education (citing former N.J.A.C. 6:28-2.4). *Robinson v. Goodwin*, 1975 S.L.D. 6.

Local board policy to permit parental access to classification records only by way of oral, interpretive conferences proper exercise of board's discretion (citing former N.J.A.C. 6:28-1.3 and 2.4). *D.N. Sr. v. Bd. of Ed., Closter Boro., Bergen Cty.*, 1974 S.L.D. 1332.

6A:14-2.10 Reimbursement for unilateral placement by parents

(a) Except as provided in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-6.1(a), the district board of education shall not be required to pay for

the cost of education, including special education and related services, of a student with a disability if the district made available a free, appropriate public education and the parents elected to enroll the student in a nonpublic school or an approved private school for the disabled.

2. Preschoolers with disabilities shall have their IEPs implemented no later than age three. To assure that preschoolers with disabilities have their initial IEPs implemented no later than age three, a written request for initial evaluation shall be forwarded to the district at least 120 days prior to the preschooler attaining age three.

3. When a preschool age child is referred for an initial evaluation, a speech-language specialist shall participate as a member of the child study team in the meeting to determine whether to evaluate and the nature and scope of the evaluation.

4. For students ages five to 21, when the suspected disability includes a language disorder, the child study team, the parent, a speech-language specialist and the regular education teacher who has knowledge of the student's educational performance or the district's programs shall participate in the meeting to decide whether to evaluate and the nature and scope of the evaluation.

5. For students ages five to 21, when the suspected disability is a disorder of voice, articulation and/or fluency only, the decision to evaluate and the determination of the nature and scope of the evaluation shall be according to (e) above, except that the meeting shall include the speech-language specialist, the parent and the regular education teacher who has knowledge of the student's educational performance or the district's programs.

(f) When it is determined that an evaluation for eligibility for services under this chapter is warranted, the student shall be considered identified as potentially disabled and the disciplinary requirements at N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.8 shall apply.

(g) Audiometric screening according to N.J.A.C. 6:29-5 shall be conducted for every student referred to the child study team for a special education evaluation.

(h) Vision screening shall be conducted by the school nurse for every student referred to the child study team for a special education evaluation.

Amended by R.1998 d.527, effective November 2, 1998.

See: 30 N.J.R. 2852(a), 30 N.J.R. 3941(a).

In (e), rewrote the introductory paragraph.

6A:14-3.4 Evaluation

(a) The child study team, the parent and the regular education teacher who has knowledge of the student's educational performance or the district's programs shall:

1. Review existing evaluation data on the student including evaluations and information provided by the parents, current classroom-based assessments and observations, and the observations of teachers and related services providers, and consider the need for any health appraisal or specialized medical evaluation;

2. On the basis of the review in (a)1 above identify what additional data, if any are needed to determine:

i. Whether the student has a disability under this chapter;

ii. The present levels of performance and educational needs of the student;

iii. Whether the student needs special education and related services; and

iv. Whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed to enable the student with a disability to meet annual goals set out in the IEP and to participate, as appropriate, in the general education curriculum; and

3. Determine which child study team members and/or specialists shall conduct the evaluation.

(b) Prior to conducting an initial evaluation, the district shall request and obtain consent to evaluate according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.3(e).

(c) After parental consent for initial evaluation of a preschool age or school age student has been received, the evaluation, determination of eligibility for services under this chapter, and, if eligible, development and implementation of the IEP for the student shall be completed within 90 calendar days.

1. If initial evaluation of a preschool age child is warranted, the district board of education shall take steps to ensure that consent to evaluate is obtained without delay.

(d) An initial evaluation shall consist of a multi-disciplinary assessment in all areas of suspected disability. Such evaluation shall include assessment by at least two members of the child study team and other specialists in the area of disability as required or as determined necessary. Each evaluation of the student shall:

1. Include, where appropriate, or required, the use of a standardized test(s) which shall be:

i. Individually administered;

ii. Valid and reliable;

iii. Normed on a representative population; and

iv. Scored as either standard score with standard deviation or norm referenced scores with a cutoff score; and

2. Include functional assessment of academic performance and, where appropriate, behavior. Each of the following components shall be completed by at least one evaluator:

i. A minimum of one structured observation by one evaluator in other than a testing session;

(1) In the case of a student who is suspected of having a specific learning disability, one evaluator shall observe the student's academic performance in the regular classroom;

- ii. An interview with the student's parent;
- iii. An interview with the teacher(s) referring the potentially disabled student;
- iv. A review of the student's developmental/educational history including records and interviews;
- v. A review of interventions documented by the classroom teacher(s) and others who work with the student; and
- vi. One or more informal measure(s) which may include, but not be limited to, surveys and inventories; analysis of work; trial teaching; self report; criterion referenced tests; curriculum based assessment; and informal rating scales.

(e) When the suspected disability is a disorder of articulation, voice or fluency according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.6(e), the speech-language specialist shall:

1. Meet with the parent and the regular education teacher who is knowledgeable about the student's educational performance or the district's programs to review existing data on the student including evaluations and information provided by the parents, current classroom-based assessments and observations, and the observations of teachers and related services providers;
2. Obtain consent to conduct the evaluation according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.3(e)5;
3. Conduct an assessment according to (d)1 and 2 above. The assessment shall include written information from the classroom teacher of the educational impact created by the speech problem. Such assessment shall fulfill the requirement for multi-disciplinary evaluation as required in (d) above; and
4. Prepare a written report of the results according to (f) below.

(f) A written report of the results of each assessment shall be prepared. At the discretion of the district, the written report may be prepared collaboratively by the evaluators or each evaluator may prepare an individually written report of the results of his or her assessments. Each written report shall be dated and signed by the individual(s) who conducted the assessment and shall include:

1. An appraisal of the student's current functioning and an analysis of instructional implication(s) appropriate to the professional discipline of the evaluator;
2. A statement regarding relevant behavior of the student, either reported or observed and the relationship of that behavior to the student's academic functioning; and
3. When a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability, the documentation of the determination of eligibility shall include a statement of:

- i. Whether the student has a specific learning disability;
- ii. The basis for making the determination;
- iii. The relevant behavior noted during the observation;
- iv. The relationship of that behavior to the student's academic performance;
- v. Educationally relevant medical findings, if any;
- vi. Whether there is a severe discrepancy between achievement and ability that is not correctable without special education and related services; and
- vii. The determination concerning the effects of environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.

(g) The reports and assessments of child study team members or specialists from other public school districts, Department of Education approved clinics or agencies, educational services commissions or jointure commissions or professionals in private practice may be submitted to the IEP team for consideration. The IEP team may accept or reject the entire report(s) or any part of the report(s). Acceptance of the report shall be noted in writing and shall become part of the report(s) of the district. If a report or part of a report is rejected, a written rationale shall be provided to the parent or adult student by the IEP team.

(h) By June 30 of a student's last year in a program for preschoolers with disabilities, a reevaluation shall be conducted and, if the student continues to be a student with a disability, the student shall be classified according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.5(c) or 3.6(a).

(i) Upon receipt of a written referral to the child study team, the school nurse shall review and summarize available health and medical information regarding the student and shall transmit the summary to the child study team for the meeting according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(a)1 to consider the need for a health appraisal or specialized medical evaluation.

Amended by R.1998 d.527, effective November 2, 1998.

See: 30 N.J.R. 2852(a), 30 N.J.R. 3941(a).

Added (i).

Case Notes

Equal educational opportunity to institutionalized persons. *Levine v. State Dept. of Institutions and Agencies*, 84 N.J. 234, 418 A.2d 229 (1980).

Denial of special education evaluation denied. *K.S. v. Parsippany-Troy Hills Board of Education*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 60.

Minor child's violence in school warranted evaluation. *Roselle Board of Education v. M.W.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 38.

High school student's poor performance and possession of knife in school warranted evaluation. *Sterling Board of Education v. M.C.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 37.

Student's poor progress warranted evaluation despite parents' opposition. *East Brunswick Board of Education v. A.M.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 14.

Student's poor performance warranted evaluation of student's eligibility for special education. *Weehawken Board of Education v. E.C.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 2.

Nonconsensual special education evaluation was appropriate where first grade student had difficulty finishing tasks and had engaged in inappropriate behavior since entering kindergarten. *Wayne Township v. T.F. and M.F.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 336.

Student's failing grades, truancies, and disciplinary suspensions supported special education evaluation. *C.B. v. Jackson Township Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 333.

Noncustodial parent lacked authority to consent to special education evaluation. *K.W. v. Sparta Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 286.

Initial comprehensive special education evaluation of high school student suffering from anorexia nervosa was appropriate where student would otherwise be too old to register for high school courses. *J.C. v. Elmwood Park Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 208.

Child study team evaluation of student failing all classes and exhibiting behavioral problems was ordered despite lack of parental consent. *Freehold Regional Board of Education v. M.DeL.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 191.

Evaluation of student as perceptually impaired with Attention Deficit Disorder was appropriate. *Millville Board of Education v. J.J.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 182.

Poor academic performance and consistent misbehavior warranted comprehensive evaluation of child over parent's consent to determine value of special education classification. *Voorhees Township Board In Interest of S.H.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 228.

Intervention in form of an evaluation by child study team was necessary for child with possible educational disability notwithstanding parent's lack of consent. *Parsippany-Troy Hills Board v. B.H.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 225.

Child's possible educational disability warranted comprehensive evaluation by child study team despite parent's failure to appear. *Union Township Board v. T.K.J.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 224.

Inappropriate, aggressive and hostile behavior necessitated an order permitting school district to test and evaluate child despite lack of consent from parents. *Jersey City Board v. T.W.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 211.

Lack of parental consent did not preclude evaluation of failing student for special education services. *South Brunswick Board v. J.R.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 161.

Parent could not further delay in arranging neurological examination for impaired child. *Upper Freehold Regional v. T.S.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 123.

Student with serious educational and behavioral problems with sexual overtones required emergent relief to complete child study team evaluations. *Dumont Board v. G.C.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 119.

Student with serious behavioral and educational problems required evaluation without parental consent. *Jersey City Board v. C.F.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 113.

Evaluation was required of student over parents' refusal upon arrest for possession of weapon. *State Operated School v. H.J.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 84.

Child's emotional and cognitive difficulties required evaluation over parents' refusal. *Ewing Township v. G.R.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 75.

Parents' costs for untimely assessment of neurologically impaired child were reimbursable. *A.S. v. Teaneck Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 45.

Mother's cooperation in evaluation of child for placement in special education class was required. *School District v. M.B.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 8.

Referral to child study team for evaluation as to placement in special education class was necessary for student with learning disability. *Board of Education v. T.W.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 6.

Student with drug problem not permitted to matriculate; Child Study Team given opportunity to conduct evaluation. *P.F. v. North Hunterdon Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 213.

School Board's implementation of Independent Education Program for child classified as mildly retarded was proper. *Caldwell-West Caldwell Board of Education v. M. B.*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 93.

Placement of neurologically impaired 6th-grader back in all special education 5th-grade classes was unnecessary. *A.B. v. Westfield Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 85.

Classification of child as multiply handicapped and placement of child in a special education program. *Orange Board of Education v. M.W.*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 18.

Child's poor school record and mother's failure to cooperate required evaluation without parental consent. *Caldwell-West Caldwell v. M.B.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 230.

Disruptive and threatening behavior justified referral of student with suspect disability for evaluation. *State-Operated School District v. D.A.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 151.

Student's continued poor progress required evaluation for handicap. *Marlboro v. A.P.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 149.

Disciplinary record required child study team evaluation over refusal of parents to give consent. *Ewing Township v. J.R.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 94.

Immediate evaluation of ten-year-old student ordered; student displayed educational deficiencies, poor behaviors and increased distractibility; complete absence of parental cooperation. *East Brunswick Board of Education v. K.P.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 77.

Child study team evaluation ordered for illiterate former street urchin. *Middletown Township Board of Education v. H.L.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 19.

Evaluation by child study team warranted for 10-year-old student exhibiting aggressive behavior. *Somerville Board of Education v. L.M.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 255.

Eighth-grade student referred to child study team for evaluation and possible classification. *East Brunswick Board of Education v. K.L.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 248.

Board authorized to evaluate student for purposes of determining special education needs; no parental cooperation. *North Brunswick Board of Education v. S.S.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 155.

Necessity of determining whether inappropriate classroom behavior was result of handicapped condition warranted completion of Child Study Team evaluation; parental opposition. *Lodi Board of Education v. N.W.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 108.

Record warranted order requiring evaluations of brother-and-sister twins. *North Bergen Board of Education v. N.M. and A.M.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 107.

Child Study Team evaluation was appropriate; absence of parental cooperation. *Elizabeth Board of Education v. S.S.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 103.

Student's inappropriate classroom behavior warranted Child Study Team evaluation to determine whether such behavior was result of handicapped condition. *Lodi Board of Education v. N.W.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 101.

Necessity for child study team evaluation demonstrated; absence of parental cooperation. Board of Education of Township of Bedminster v. J.T., 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 7.

Classification issues explained. R.D.H. v. Bd. of Ed., Flemington-Raritan Regional School District, Hunterdon Cty., 1975 S.L.D. 103, 1975 S.L.D. 111, 1976 S.L.D. 1161.

Classification and psychiatric evaluation. D.I. v. Neumann, 1974 S.L.D. 1006.

6A:14-3.5 Determination of eligibility for special education and related services

(a) When an initial evaluation is completed for a student age three through 21, a meeting according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(i)1 shall be convened to determine whether the student is eligible for special education and related services. A copy of the evaluation report(s) and documentation of eligibility shall be given to the parent or adult student. If eligible, the student shall be assigned the classification "eligible for special education and related services." Eligibility shall be determined collaboratively by the participants described in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(i)1.

(b) In making a determination of eligibility for special education and related services, a student shall not be determined eligible if the determinant factor is due to a lack of instruction in reading or math or due to limited English proficiency.

(c) A student shall be determined eligible and classified "eligible for special education and related services" under this chapter when it is determined that the student has one or more of the disabilities defined in (c)1 through 13 below; the disability adversely affects the student's educational performance and the student is in need of special education and related services. Classification shall be based on all assessments conducted including assessment by child study team members and assessment by other specialists as specified below.

1. "Audiotorily impaired" corresponds to "auditorily handicapped" and further corresponds to the Federal eligibility categories of deafness or hearing impairment. "Audiotorily impaired" means an inability to hear within normal limits due to physical impairment or dysfunction of auditory mechanisms characterized by (c)1i or ii below. An audiological evaluation by a specialist qualified in the field of audiology and a speech and language evaluation by a certified speech-language specialist are required.

i. "Deafness"—The auditory impairment is so severe that the student is impaired in processing linguistic information through hearing, with or without amplification and the student's educational performance is adversely affected.

ii. "Hearing impairment"—An impairment in hearing, whether permanent or fluctuating which adversely affects the student's educational performance.

2. "Autistic" means a pervasive developmental disability which significantly impacts verbal and nonverbal communication and social interaction that adversely affects a student's educational performance. Onset is generally evident before age three. Other characteristics often associated with autism are engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements, resistance to environmental change or change in daily routine, unusual responses to sensory experiences and lack of responsiveness to others. The term does not apply if the student's adverse educational performance is due to emotional disturbance as defined in (c)5 below. An assessment by a certified speech-language specialist and an assessment by a physician trained in neurodevelopmental assessment are required.

3. "Cognitively impaired" corresponds to "mentally retarded" and means a disability that is characterized by significantly below average general cognitive functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior; manifested during the developmental period that adversely affects a student's educational performance and is characterized by one of the following:

i. "Mild cognitive impairment" corresponds to "educable" and means a level of cognitive development and adaptive behavior in home, school and community settings that are mildly below age expectations with respect to all of the following:

- (1) The quality and rate of learning;
- (2) The use of symbols for the interpretation of information and the solution of problems; and
- (3) Performance on an individually administered test of intelligence that falls within a range of two to three standard deviations below the mean.

ii. "Moderate cognitive impairment" corresponds to "trainable" and means a level of cognitive development and adaptive behavior that is moderately below age expectations with respect to the following:

- (1) The ability to use symbols in the solution of problems of low complexity;
- (2) The ability to function socially without direct and close supervision in home, school and community settings; and
- (3) Performance on an individually administered test of intelligence that falls three standard deviations or more below the mean.

iii. "Severe cognitive impairment" corresponds to "eligible for day training" and means a level of functioning severely below age expectations whereby in a consistent basis the student is incapable of giving evidence of understanding and responding in a positive manner to simple directions expressed in the child's primary mode of communication and cannot in some manner express basic wants and needs.

4. "Communication impaired" corresponds to "communication handicapped" and means a language disorder in the areas of morphology, syntax, semantics and/or pragmatics/discourse which adversely affects a student's educational performance and is not due primarily to an auditory impairment. The problem shall be demonstrated through functional assessment of language in other than a testing situation and performance below 1.5 standard deviations, or the 10th percentile on at least two standardized oral language tests, where such tests are appropriate. When the area of suspected disability is language, an evaluation by a certified speech-language specialist is required. The speech-language specialist shall be considered a child study team member.

i. When it is determined that the student meets the eligibility criteria according to the definition in (c)4 above, but requires instruction by a speech-language specialist only, the student shall be classified as eligible for speech-language services.

ii. When the area of suspected disability is a disorder of articulation, voice or fluency, the student shall be evaluated according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(e) and if eligible, classified as eligible for speech-language services according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.6(a).

5. "Emotionally disturbed" means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects a student's educational performance due to:

i. An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors;

ii. An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers;

iii. Inappropriate types of behaviors or feelings under normal circumstances;

iv. A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or

v. A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.

6. "Multiply disabled" corresponds to "multiply handicapped" and means the presence of two or more disabling conditions. Eligibility for speech-language services as defined in this section shall not be one of the disabling conditions for classification based on the definition of "multiply disabled." "Multiply disabled" is characterized as follows:

i. "Multiple disabilities" means concomitant impairments, the combination of which causes such severe educational problems that programs designed for the separate disabling conditions will not meet the student's educational needs.

ii. "Deaf/blindness" means concomitant hearing and visual impairments, the combination of which causes

such severe communication and other developmental and educational problems that they cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for students with deafness or students with blindness.

7. "Orthopedically impaired" corresponds to "orthopedically handicapped" and means a disability characterized by a severe orthopedic impairment that adversely affects a student's educational performance. The term includes malformation, malfunction or loss of bones, muscle or tissue. A medical assessment documenting the orthopedic condition is required.

8. "Other health impaired" corresponds to "chronically ill" and means a disability that may be characterized by having limited strength, vitality or alertness, due to chronic or acute health problems, such as a heart condition, tuberculosis, rheumatic fever, nephritis, asthma, sickle cell anemia, hemophilia, epilepsy, lead poisoning, leukemia, diabetes or any other medical condition, such as Tourette Syndrome, that adversely affects a student's educational performance. A medical assessment documenting the health problem is required.

9. "Preschool disabled" corresponds to preschool handicapped and means an identified disabling condition and/or a measurable developmental impairment which occurs in children between the ages of three and five years and requires special education and related services.

10. "Social maladjustment" means a consistent inability to conform to the standards for behavior established by the school. Such behavior is seriously disruptive to the education of the student or other students and is not due to emotional disturbance as defined in (c)5 above.

11. "Specific learning disability" corresponds to "perceptually impaired" and means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in an imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations.

i. It is characterized by a severe discrepancy between the student's current achievement and intellectual ability in one or more of the following areas:

- (1) Basic reading skills;
- (2) Reading comprehension;
- (3) Oral expression;
- (4) Listening comprehension;
- (5) Mathematical computation;
- (6) Mathematical reasoning; and
- (7) Written expression.

ii. The term does not apply to students who have learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, general cognitive deficits,

emotional disturbance or environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.

iii. The district shall adopt procedures that utilize a statistical formula and criteria for determining severe discrepancy. Evaluation shall include assessment of current academic achievement and intellectual ability.

12. "Traumatic brain injury" corresponds to "neurologically impaired" and means an acquired injury to the brain caused by an external physical force or insult to the brain, resulting in total or partial functional disability or psychosocial impairment, or both. The term applies to open or closed head injuries resulting in impairments in one or more areas, such as cognition; language; memory; attention; reasoning; abstract thinking; judgment; problem-solving; sensory, perceptual and motor abilities; psychosocial behavior; physical functions; information processing; and speech.

13. "Visually impaired" corresponds to "visually handicapped" and means an impairment in vision that, even with correction, adversely affects a student's educational performance. The term includes both partial sight and blindness. An assessment by a specialist qualified to determine visual disability is required. Students with visual impairments shall be reported to the Commission for the Blind and Visually Impaired.

Amended by R.1998 d.527, effective November 2, 1998.

See: 30 N.J.R. 2852(a), 30 N.J.R. 3941(a).

In (c)8, inserted "that may be" following "disability" in the first sentence.

Case Notes

Recommended placement in new public school program did not violate the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. *Fuhrmann on Behalf of Fuhrmann v. East Hanover Bd. of Educ.*, C.A.3 (N.J.)1993, 993 F.2d 1031, rehearing denied.

Recommended placement in preschool handicapped program satisfied requirement for an "appropriate" education. *Fuhrmann on Behalf of Fuhrmann v. East Hanover Bd. of Educ.*, C.A.3 (N.J.)1993, 993 F.2d 1031, rehearing denied.

Reimbursement to parents of private school expenses denied. *Wexler v. Westfield Bd. of Ed.*, 784 F.2d 176 (3rd Cir.1986), certiorari denied 107 S.Ct. 99, 479 U.S. 825, 93 L.Ed.2d 49 (1986).

Juvenile's confession was not rendered inadmissible; police interrogation was not interpreted for Spanish-speaking guardian. *State in Interest of J.F.*, 286 N.J.Super. 89, 668 A.2d 426 (A.D.1995).

Former N.J.A.C. 6:28-3.5(e)8 defining "pre-school handicapped" set aside as impermissibly narrowing statutory language and frustrating statutory policy. In re: *Repeal of N.J.A.C. 6:28, 204 N.J.Super.* 158, 497 A.2d 1272 (App.Div.1985).

School board required to continue student's placement consistent with IEP. *C.R. v. Atlantic City Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 384.

Six-year old who assaulted teacher and other students properly classified as emotionally disturbed. *Jersey City Board of Education v. T.H.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDE) 358.

Special education high school student would not be reclassified from neurologically impaired to autistic. *R.S. v. Ridgewood Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 299.

Failure of mentally retarded student to progress supported non-sensual classification as full-time special education student and placement in moderate cognitive program. *Elizabeth Board of Education v. L.H.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 297.

Classification of student as perceptually impaired was ordered over parental objection where three child study teams agreed on student's status as disabled. *Marlboro Township Board of Education v. R.F.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 184.

Emotionally disturbed student was entitled to special education classification and home study. *R.S. v. East Brunswick Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 177.

Reimbursement of evaluation and counseling costs for nonclassified student were denied since nonclassified students are not covered under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. *M.C. v. Franklin Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 175.

Student previously classified as neurologically impaired would be reclassified as educable mentally retarded after her consistently low test scores were found not to be solely due to her hyperactivity and distractibility during test taking. *A.E. v. Jersey City Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 89.

Student not eligible for special education services when no disability found to justify such services. *F.C. v. Palmyra Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 39.

Multi-handicapped student was placed in private academy where placement in public high school would likely result in failure. *C.D. v. West Windsor-Plainsboro Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 22.

Residential placement for handicapped child denied when current day placement provided fair and appropriate education and residential placement not made for education reasons. *B.L. v. Board of Education of the Borough of Berlin*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 12.

Poor academic performance and behavior necessitated child's classification, program and placement even though parent was inaccessible and unresponsive. *M.F. v. Piscataway Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 206.

Student whose behavior was due directly to heavy marijuana use was not eligible for special education services. *J.M. v. Freehold Township*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 133.

Discrepancy between academic performance and cognitive abilities did not warrant special education classification. *N.C. v. Englewood Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 99.

Emotionally disturbed student; special education. *South Orange-Maplewood Board of Education v. A.I.*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 168.

Parents of rebellious student; no determination was made that student was educationally disabled. *B.B. v. Hillsborough Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 71.

Placement in full-time residential educational facility was not warranted absent an adequate measurement of mentally disabled student's potential. *J.C. v. Department of Human Services*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 267.

Costs of private schooling for handicapped child whose communication difficulty was mild were not reimbursable. *A.M. v. Board of Education*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 133.

Record supported classification of child as neurologically-impaired; placement in one ½ day kindergarten class and one ½ day neurologically-impaired class. *D.M. v. Union City Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 143.

Student's asthma did not adversely affect him so as to prevent him from receiving adequate instruction in regular school program; not chronically ill. *Hopewell Valley Board of Education v. S.L.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 91.

Chronically ill student not special education student entitled to related service of transportation. *R.F. v. Hackensack Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 59.

Recovering anorexic was no longer "emotionally disturbed" or "chronically ill". *J.C. v. Elmwood Park Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 25.

Ten-year-old student perceptually impaired; implementation of individualized educational program ordered. In *Matter of S.R.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 4.

Vision and hearing difficulties did not render student classifiable as handicapped. *A.K. v. Clinton Town Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 1.

Former regulations silent on reimbursement to parents. *Holmdel Bd. of Ed. v. G.M.*, 6 N.J.A.R. 96 (1983).

Proper classification under former N.J.A.C. 6:28-1.2(g) of multiply handicapped pupil. *A.N. v. Clark Bd. of Ed.*, 5 N.J.A.R. 152 (1983).

New York resident's child, domiciled in New Jersey, not entitled to New Jersey free education. *V.R. v. Bd. of Ed., Hamburg Boro., Sussex Cty.*, 2 N.J.A.R. 283 (1980).

Expulsion for disorderly and disruptive behavior. *J.P. v. Bd. of Ed., Matawan-Aberdeen Regional School District*, 1979 S.L.D. 382, 1979 S.L.D. 389.

Treatment of mainstreaming concept under former N.J.A.C. 6:28-2.1. *O'Lexy v. Bd. of Ed., Deptford Twp., Gloucester Cty.*, 1972 S.L.D. 641.

6A:14-3.6 Determination of eligibility for speech-language services

(a) "Eligible for speech-language services" means a speech and/or language disorder as follows:

1. A speech disorder in articulation, phonology, fluency, voice, or any combination, unrelated to dialect, cultural differences or the influence of a foreign language, which adversely affects a student's educational performance; and/or

2. A language disorder which meets the criteria of N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.5(c)4 and the student requires speech-language services only.

(b) The evaluation for a speech disorder shall be conducted according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(e). Documentation of the educational impact of the speech problem shall be provided by the student's teacher. The speech disorder must meet the criteria in (b)1, 2, and/or 3 below and require instruction by a speech-language specialist:

1. Articulation/phonology: On a standardized articulation or phonology assessment, the student exhibits one or more sound production error patterns beyond the age at which 90 percent of the population has achieved mastery according to current developmental norms and misarticulates sounds consistently in a speech sample.

2. Fluency: The student demonstrates at least a mild rating, or its equivalent, on a formal fluency rating scale and in a speech sample, the student exhibits disfluency in five percent or more of the words spoken.

3. Voice: On a formal rating scale, the student performs below the normed level for voice quality, pitch,

resonance, loudness or duration and the condition is evident on two separate occasions, three to four weeks apart, at different times.

(c) When the initial speech-language evaluation is completed, classification shall be determined collaboratively by the participants at a meeting according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(i)1. The speech-language specialist who conducted the evaluation shall be considered a child study team member at the meeting to determine whether a student is eligible for speech-language services. A copy of the evaluation report(s) and documentation of eligibility shall be given to the parent or adult student.

(d) The IEP shall be developed in a meeting according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(i)2. The speech-language specialist shall be considered the child study team member, the individual who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results and the service provider at the IEP meeting. The speech-language specialist shall not serve also as the agency representative at the IEP meeting.

(e) When a student has been determined eligible for speech-language services and other disabilities are suspected or other services are being considered, the student shall be referred to the child study team.

Case Notes

School board required to provide extended-year services to seven year old with speech disorder. *J.M. v. Alloway Township Board of Education*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 39.

6A:14-3.7 Individualized education program

(a) A meeting to develop the IEP shall be held within 30 calendar days of a determination that a student is eligible for special education and related services or eligible for speech-language services. An IEP shall be in effect before special education and related services are provided to a student with a disability and such IEP shall be implemented as soon as possible following the IEP meeting.

1. At the beginning of each school year, the district board of education shall have in effect an IEP for every student who is receiving special education and related services from the district.

(b) The IEP shall be developed by the IEP team according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(i)2 for students classified eligible for special education and related services or according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.6(d) for students classified eligible for speech-language services.

(c) When developing the IEP, the IEP team shall:

1. Consider the strengths of the student and the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of *their* child;

2. Consider the results of the initial evaluation or most recent evaluation of the student;

3. In the case of a student whose behavior impedes his or her learning or that of others, consider, when appropriate, strategies, including positive behavioral interventions and supports to address that behavior;

4. In the case of a student with limited English proficiency, consider the language needs of the student as related to the IEP;

5. In the case of a student who is blind or visually impaired, provide for instruction in Braille and the use of Braille unless the IEP team determines, after an evaluation of the student's reading and writing skills, and current and projected needs for instruction in Braille that such instruction is not appropriate;

6. Consider the communication needs of the student;

7. In the case of a student who is deaf or hard of hearing consider the student's language and communication needs, opportunities for direct communication with peers and professional personnel in the student's language and communication mode, academic level, and full range of opportunities for direct instruction in the student's language and communication mode;

8. Consider whether the student requires assistive technology devices and services; and

9. Beginning at age 14, consider the need for technical consultation from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Department of Labor.

(d) With the exception of an IEP for a student classified as eligible for speech-language services, the IEP shall include, but not be limited to:

1. A statement of the student's present levels of educational performance, including, but not limited to:

i. How the student's disability affects the student's involvement and progress in the general curriculum; or

ii. For preschool students, as appropriate, how the disability affects the student's participation in appropriate activities;

2. A statement of measurable annual goals that shall be related to the core curriculum content standards through the general education curriculum unless otherwise required according to the student's educational needs. Such measurable annual goals shall include benchmarks or short-term objectives related to:

i. Meeting the student's needs that result from the student's disability to enable the student to be involved in and progress in the general education curriculum; and

ii. Meeting each of the student's other educational needs that result from the student's disability;

3. A statement of the special education and related services and supplementary aids and services that shall be provided for the student, or on behalf of the student, and a statement of the program modifications or supports for school personnel that shall be provided for the student:

i. To advance appropriately toward attaining the annual goals;

ii. To be involved and progress in the general education curriculum according to (d)1 above and to participate in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities; and

iii. To be educated and participate with other students with disabilities and nondisabled students;

4. An explanation of the extent, if any, to which the student shall not participate with nondisabled students in the general education class and in extracurricular and nonacademic activities;

5. A statement of any individual modifications in the administration of Statewide or districtwide assessments of student achievement needed for the student to participate in such assessment.

i. If the IEP team determines that the student shall not participate in a particular Statewide or districtwide assessment of student achievement (or part of such an assessment), a statement of why that assessment is not appropriate for the student and a statement of how that student shall be assessed;

6. A statement which specifies the projected date for the beginning of the services and modifications described in (d)3 above, and the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those services and modifications. For in-class resource programs, the IEP shall specify the frequency and amount of instructional time the in-class resource teacher is present in the class;

7. A statement of the State and local graduation requirements that the student shall be expected to meet. If a student with a disability is exempted from local and State high school graduation requirements, the statement shall include:

i. A rationale for the exemption based on the student's educational needs which shall be consistent with N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.12; and

ii. A description of the alternate proficiencies to be achieved by the student to qualify for a State endorsed diploma.

8. A statement of student's transition from an elementary program to the secondary program which shall be determined by factors including number of years in school; social, academic and vocational development; and chronological age;

9. Beginning at age 14, and updated annually, a statement of the transition service needs of the student under the applicable parts of the student's IEP that focuses on the student's courses of study including, when appropriate, technical consultation from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services, Department of Labor;

10. For students with disabilities age 16 and over, or younger if deemed appropriate, a statement of needed transition services including when appropriate, a statement of the interagency responsibilities, or any needed linkages. Transition services are defined in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.3.

i. The transition services as defined in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.3 shall be based on the individual student's needs, taking into account the student's preferences and interests and shall include:

- (1) Instruction;
- (2) Related services;
- (3) Community experiences;
- (4) The development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives; and
- (5) If appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation;

11. If the participants in the IEP meeting determine that transition services shall not be needed in one or more of the specified areas in (d)10i(1) through (5) above, a statement to that effect and the basis upon which the determination was made;

12. The person(s) responsible to serve as a liaison to post-secondary resources and make referrals to the resources as appropriate. If the student with educational disabilities does not attend the IEP meeting where transition services are discussed, the district board of education or public agency shall take other steps to ensure that the student's preferences and interests are considered;

13. Beginning at least one year before the student reaches age 18, a statement that the student has been informed of the rights under this chapter that will transfer to the student on reaching the age of majority;

14. A statement of how the student's progress toward the annual goals described in (d)2 above will be measured; and

15. A statement of how the student's parents will be regularly informed of their student's progress toward the annual goals and the extent to which that progress is sufficient to enable the student to achieve the goals by the end of the year. The parents of a student with a disability shall be informed of the progress of their child at least as often as parents of a nondisabled student are informed of their child's progress.

(e) The IEP for the student classified as eligible for speech-language services shall include (d)1 through 6, 14 and 15 above. When appropriate, (d)9, 10 and 13 above shall be included. The statement of the current educational status in (d)1 above shall be a description of the student's status in speech-language performance. Students who are classified as eligible for speech-language services shall not be exempted from districtwide or Statewide assessment.

(f) If an agency other than the district board of education fails to provide the transition services included in the student's individualized education program, the district board of education shall reconvene a meeting of the IEP participants. Alternative strategies to meet the student's transition objectives shall be identified.

(g) If an agency invited to send a representative to the IEP meeting does not do so, the district board of education shall take other steps to obtain the participation of the other agency in the planning of any transition services.

(h) Annually, or more often if necessary, the IEP team shall meet to review and revise the IEP and determine placement as specified in this subchapter.

1. The annual review of the IEP for a preschool student with educational disabilities shall be completed by June 30 of the student's last year in the preschool program.

2. The annual review of the IEP for an elementary school student with educational disabilities shall be completed by June 30 of the student's last year in the elementary school program. The annual review shall include input from the staff of the secondary school.

(i) The IEP team shall review:

1. Any lack of expected progress toward the annual goals and in the general curriculum, where appropriate;

2. The results of any reevaluation conducted according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.8;

3. Information about the student including information provided by the parents, current classroom-based assessments and observations, and the observations of teachers and related services providers;

4. The student's anticipated needs; or

5. Other relevant matters.

(j) Signatures of those persons who participated in the development of the IEP shall be maintained and a copy of the IEP shall be provided to the parents.

(k) When the parent declines participation in an IEP meeting or is in disagreement with the recommendations, the remaining participants shall develop a written IEP in accordance with this section. However, initial implementation of special education cannot occur until consent is

obtained or a due process hearing decision is issued. For other than initial implementation of special education, consent is not required. The parents shall be provided written notice according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(e) and (f).

Amended by R.1998 d.527, effective November 2, 1998.

See: 30 N.J.R. 2852(a), 30 N.J.R. 3941(a).

In (d)3, rewrote the introductory paragraph.

Case Notes

Failure to mainstream to maximum extent may not necessarily mean that school has discriminated on basis of handicap in violation of the Rehabilitation Act. *Oberti by Oberti v. Board of Educ. of Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, C.A.3 (N.J.)1993, 995 F.2d 1204.

Failure to meet burden of proving by preponderance of the evidence that child could not be educated in regular classroom. *Oberti by Oberti v. Board of Educ. of Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, C.A.3 (N.J.)1993, 995 F.2d 1204.

There is presumption in favor of placing child, in neighborhood school. *Oberti by Oberti v. Board of Educ. of Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, C.A.3 (N.J.)1993, 995 F.2d 1204.

Recommended placement in new public school program did not violate the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). *Fuhrmann on Behalf of Fuhrmann v. East Hanover Bd. of Educ.*, C.A.3 (N.J.)1993, 993 F.2d 1031, rehearing denied.

Recommended placement in preschool handicapped program satisfied requirement for an "appropriate" education. *Fuhrmann on Behalf of Fuhrmann v. East Hanover Bd. of Educ.*, C.A.3 (N.J.)1993, 993 F.2d 1031, rehearing denied.

"Progress key" method of setting out educational objectives and student's progress toward those objectives, as employed in Individual Education Program (IEP) prepared by school district for severely disabled student, did not satisfy procedural requirements of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and New Jersey law with respect to provision of statement of annual goals with specific measurable objectives, and of evaluation criteria related to those goals and objectives, despite fact that "progress key" method had been approved by state Department of Education. *D.B. v. Ocean Tp. Bd. of Educ.*, 985 F.Supp. 457 (D.N.J. 1997).

Student granted compensatory education after inappropriate special education placement. *T.B. v. Camden Vocational Technical High School and Lower Camden County Regional High School District Number 1*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 104.

School board required transportation only from child's home. *I.D. and M.D. v. Board of Education of the Township of Hazlet*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 33.

Parents do have right to question whether program in settlement agreement meets requirements of statute if there has been change in circumstances. *D.R. by M.R. v. East Brunswick Bd. of Educ.*, D.N.J. 1993, 838 F.Supp. 184, on remand 94 N.J.A.R.2d(EDS) 145.

Settlement agreement was unambiguous. *D.R. by M.R. v. East Brunswick Bd. of Educ.*, D.N.J.1993, 838 F.Supp. 184, on remand 94 N.J.A.R.2d(EDS) 145.

School district improperly failed to consider less restrictive placements. *Oberti by Oberti v. Board of Educ. of Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, D.N.J.1992, 801 F.Supp. 1392, order affirmed and remanded 995 F.2d 1204.

Violation of Individuals With Disabilities Education Act; failure to provide adequate supplementary aids and services to kindergarten student. *Oberti by Oberti v. Board of Educ. of Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, D.N.J.1992, 801 F.Supp. 1392, order affirmed and remanded 995 F.2d 1204.

Behavior problems during kindergarten year were not basis for placement of child in segregated special education class. *Oberti by Oberti v. Board of Educ. of Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, D.N.J.1992, 789 F.Supp. 1322.

Placement in segregated, self-contained special education class was flawed Individualized Education Program. *Oberti by Oberti v. Board of Educ. of Borough of Clementon School Dist.*, D.N.J.1992, 789 F.Supp. 1322.

Regulation governing education of handicapped students impermissibly narrowed scope of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) with respect to provision of assistive technology and services; regulation failed to expressly or impliedly incorporate federal requirements and did not adequately define crucial terms. *Matter of Adoption of Amendments to N.J.A.C. 6:28-2.10, 3.6, and 4.3*, 305 N.J.Super. 389, 702 A.2d 838 (A.D. 1997).

Focus of appropriateness is on program offered and not on program that could have been provided. *Lascari v. Board of Educ. of Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School Dist.*, 116 N.J. 30, 560 A.2d 1180 (1989).

Standard of appropriateness is whether program allows child "to best achieve success in learning." *Lascari v. Board of Educ. of Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School Dist.*, 116 N.J. 30, 560 A.2d 1180 (1989).

Program was deficient where its goals could not be objectively evaluated. *Lascari v. Board of Educ. of Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School Dist.*, 116 N.J. 30, 560 A.2d 1180 (1989).

Parents awarded private education reimbursement following improper placement by child study team entitled to interest on expenses from date of disbursement. *Fallon v. Bd. of Ed.*, Scotch Plains-Fanwood School District, Union Cty., 185 N.J.Super. 142, 447 A.2d 607 (Law Div.1982).

Regulations of the State Board of Education adopted. *New Jersey Assn. for Retarded Citizens, Inc. v. State Dept. of Human Services*, 89 N.J. 234, 445 A.2d 704 (1982).

Modification of special education program for student with articulation disability did not violate her federal rights. *Norwood Board of Education v. C.C.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 108.

Individualized education program sufficient if in compliance with statutory order. *C.L. v. State-Operated School District of Jersey City*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 83.

Request for extended day supplemental instruction and extended school year denied when classified student's individualized education program (IEP) found sufficient without such services. *S.R. v. Manasquan Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 32.

Child with increasing difficulties in reading and spelling required perceptually impaired classification to provide him with necessary support in a special education program. *Spring Lake Board v. P.M.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 267.

Neighborhood school with separated first grade classes was most appropriate placement for perceptually impaired student whose attention was easily distracted. *I.M. v. Atlantic City Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 250.

Father's unexcused failure to appear following notice required dismissal of request for due process hearing on disciplined student's individualized education program. *G.M. v. Vineland Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 233.

Perceptually impaired child was entitled to an extended school year in form of five hours per week of summer tutorial assistance with reasonable and necessary travel expenses. *C.G. v. Old Bridge Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 221.

Agreement with parent and individualized educational program both established responsibility of school board for orthopedically handicapped child's occupational and physically therapy during summer months. *West Milford v. C.F.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 204.

Behavioral difficulties of disabled student precluded mainstreaming in regular school setting. *J.T. v. Collingswood Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 129.

Student with attention deficit disorder was more appropriately placed in private school. *R.S., A Minor v. West Orange Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 59.

Disabilities of emotionally disturbed and gifted student were not sufficient to warrant removal from regular setting. *Matawan-Aberdeen v. R.C., A Minor*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 29.

Current placement in public school system, rather than residential placement, was more appropriate for multiply handicapped child. *J.M. v. Board of Education*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 10.

Classified student entitled to transfer from special education class to comparable mainstream class. *P.D. v. Hasbrouck Heights Board of Education*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 5.

Teachers could amend individualized educational plan to assist neurologically impaired child during epileptic seizures. *S.G. v. West Orange*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 1.

Deaf student entitled to attend summer school. *R.C. v. Jersey City State-Operated School District*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 166.

Request for an extended school year program was denied for multiply handicapped 14-year old. *J.B. v. Middletown Township Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 129.

Denial of emergency transfer of emotionally disturbed child to prior school was proper. *A.W. v. Jefferson Township Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 51.

Request to modify special education student's individual education plan was properly denied. *E.J. v. Mansfield Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 3.

Classification of 15-year-old child born with Down's syndrome as TMR and to recommend placement in TMR/EMR program at high school was appropriate. *J.B. v. West Orange Board of Education*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 294.

Educational needs of 4-year-old autistic child were met by placement in preschool handicapped program. *K.M. v. Franklin Lakes*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 213.

Personalized educational program and support services were sufficient to allow handicapped student to make significant educational progress. *J.J.K. v. Union County Board*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 161.

Significant regression required extension of school year for multiply handicapped student. *J.C. v. Wharton*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 152.

Student's explosive and violent behavior required placement in structured educational environment. *Ocean City v. J.W.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 147.

Severely disabled child required school district to comply with Individualized Education Policy in order to deliver a free and appropriate education. *E.M., a Child v. West Orange*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 111.

County region school district failed to establish that self-contained Trainable Mentally Retarded program at in-district school was appropriate educational program for Downs Syndrome student. *A.R. v. Union County Regional High School District*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 48.

Record established that Individualized Education Program for 10-year-old neurologically impaired student should be implemented. *Jersey City School District v. N.G.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 28.

Program designed and implemented by child study team was adequate; expenditures for outside tutoring not reimbursable. *S.A. v. Jackson Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 256.

Appropriate placement for 12-year-old multiply handicapped student was Township public school system; appropriate individualized educational program could be developed. *T.H. v. Wall Township Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 227.

Evidence supported in-district placement of neurologically impaired student; parents' preference for out-of-district placement only one factor in decision. *S.A. v. Board of Education of Township of North Brunswick*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 220.

Record established that current day placement was least restrictive and appropriate education for emotionally disturbed 11-year-old boy. *R.R. v. Mt. Olive Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 205.

Record established that multiply handicapped student's educational needs could not be met by perceptually impaired class offered by board of education. *Alloway Township Board of Education v. M.P.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 202.

Parents not entitled to reimbursement for placement at nonpublic school; flaws in Individualized Education Program not result in significant harm; no showing that academic program of school met requirements of Program. *N.P. v. Kinnelon Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 190.

Placement of attention deficit disorder student in regional school district program was most appropriate and least restrictive placement. *T.P. v. Delaware Valley Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 175.

Placement at nonpublic school not authorized; no valid individualized education program. *M.Y. v. Fair Lawn Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 163.

Perceptually impaired student not provided with appropriate education; private school tuition reimbursement. *J.H. v. Bernardsville Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 147.

Student classified as socially maladjusted was entitled to emergent relief authorizing him to participate in high school graduation ceremonies. *B.M. v. Kingsway Regional Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 130.

Appropriate placement of 6-year-old, neurologically impaired student was in self-contained neurologically impaired special education class at in-district school. *A.F. v. Roselle Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 118.

Mainstreaming sixth grade student for remainder of school year not shown to be appropriate. *D.E. v. Woodcliff Lake Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 116.

Out-of-state residential school appropriate placement for 16-year-old boy who was auditorily and emotionally impaired. *J.P. v. Metuchen Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 110.

Individualized Education Plan recommending that perceptually impaired student be educated at public middle school was appropriate. *Passaic Board of Education v. E.G.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 86.

Morning preschool handicapped class placement sufficient. *M.G. v. East Brunswick Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 84.

Placement of hearing-impaired child; local elementary school appropriate. *A.M. v. Madison Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 51.

Former regulations silent on reimbursement, although sanctioned by Commissioner. *Holmdel Bd. of Ed. v. G.M.*, 6 N.J.A.R. 96 (1983).

Residential program for multiply handicapped pupil determined to be least restrictive appropriate placement under former N.J.A.C. 6:28-2.2. *A.N. v. Clark Bd. of Ed.*, 5 N.J.A.R. 152 (1983).

Under former N.J.A.C. 6:28-4.3 and 4.8, a school board is responsible for residential costs when an appropriate nonresidential placement is not available. *A.N. v. Clark Bd. of Ed.*, 5 N.J.A.R. 152 (1983).

Disparate treatment of neurologically versus perceptually impaired pupils (citing former regulations.). *M.D. v. Bd. of Ed., Rahway, Union Cty.*, 1976 S.L.D. 323, 1976 S.L.D. 333, 1977 S.L.D. 1296.

6A:14-3.8 Reevaluation

(a) Within three years of the previous classification, a multi-disciplinary reevaluation shall be completed to deter-

mine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability. Reevaluation shall be conducted sooner if conditions warrant or if the student's parent or teacher requests the reevaluation. When a reevaluation is conducted sooner at the request of a parent or teacher, or because conditions warrant, the reevaluation shall be completed without undue delay.

(b) The IEP team shall determine the nature and scope of the reevaluation according to the following:

1. The IEP team shall review existing evaluation data according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(a)2 and administer such tests and procedures needed to determine:

i. Whether the student continues to have a disability according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.5(c) or 3.6(a);

ii. The present levels of performance and educational needs of the student;

iii. Whether the student needs special education and related services; and

iv. Whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed to enable the student with a disability to meet annual goals set out in the IEP and to participate, as appropriate, in the general education curriculum.

2. If the IEP team determines that no additional data are needed to determine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability, the district board of education:

i. Shall provide notice according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(e) and (f) to the student's parents of that determination and the right of the parents to request an assessment to determine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability; and

ii. Shall not be required to conduct such an assessment unless requested by the student's parents;

3. If a reevaluation is warranted, the IEP team shall determine which child study team members and/or specialists shall conduct the reevaluation.

(c) Prior to conducting any reevaluation of a student with a disability, the district board of education shall obtain consent from the parent or adult student according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(a)3.

(d) Individual assessments shall be conducted according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(d)1 and 2 or 3.4(e), as appropriate.

(e) A reevaluation shall be conducted when a change in eligibility is being considered.

(f) When a reevaluation is completed:

1. A meeting of the student's IEP team according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(i)2 or 3.6(c) shall be conducted to determine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability. A copy of the evaluation report(s) and documentation of the eligibility shall be given to the parent or adult student.

2. If the student remains eligible, an IEP team meeting according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(i)2 or 3.6(d) shall be conducted to review and revise the student's IEP.

Case Notes

There was no significant change in student's placement; board of education was not obligated to secure new placement and develop new individualized education plan upon student's expulsion. *Field v. Haddonfield Bd. of Educ.*, D.N.J.1991, 769 F.Supp. 1313.

Student ordered to undergo psychiatric evaluation. *Vernon Township v. G.F.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 56.

Testing results indicating special education student no longer perceptually impaired justifies declassification. *C.W. v. Southern Gloucester County Regional*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 34.

Parents do have right to question whether program in settlement agreement meets requirements of statute if there has been change in circumstances. *D.R. by M.R. v. East Brunswick Bd. of Educ.*, D.N.J. 1993, 838 F.Supp. 184, on remand 94 N.J.A.R.2d(EDS) 145.

Settlement agreement was unambiguous. *D.R. by M.R. v. East Brunswick Bd. of Educ.*, D.N.J.1993, 838 F.Supp. 184, on remand 94 N.J.A.R.2d(EDS) 145.

School board's current out-of-district dayschool placement, rather than residential placement requested by parents, was most appropriate placement for neurologically impaired student with aggressive and disruptive behavior. *K.J. v. Runnemede Board of Education*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 257.

School board's current out-of-district dayschool placement, rather than residential placement requested by parents, was most appropriate placement for neurologically impaired student with aggressive and disruptive behavior. *B.C. v. Flemington-Raritan Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 255.

Student suspended for posing threat to others could not return without reevaluation. *Englewood Board v. C.M.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 112.

Nosebleeds did not pose serious enough problem to warrant emergent relief in form of home instruction. *Mount Laurel Board v. C.S.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 110.

Student with aggressive behavior was withdrawn from school pending re-evaluation in order to protect fellow students. *Brick Township v. P.M.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 83.

Scores and assessments established need to change student's classification to multiply handicapped. *L.R. v. North Plainfield*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 72.

Current placement in public school system, rather than residential placement, was more appropriate for multiply handicapped child. *J.M. v. Board of Education*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 10.

Reevaluation of disabled child was proper. *P.B. v. Wayne Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 69.

Reclassification of multiply handicapped child as eligible for day training was improper. *A.V. v. Branchburg Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 62.

Returning child to mainstream school was appropriate. *D.F. v. Carteret Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 19.