

of the parties, enforcement may not be sought with respect to that part of the decision.

(u) Pending the outcome of a due process hearing, including an expedited 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 (m) above or as provided in 20 U.S.C. §1415(k)4 as amended and supplemented. (See chapter Appendix A.)

1. If the decision of the administrative law judge agrees with the student's parents that a change of placement is appropriate, that placement shall be treated as an agreement between the district board of education and the parents for the remainder of any court proceedings.

(v) Any party may appeal the decision of an administrative law judge in a due process hearing.

1. Any appeal of a final decision of an administrative law judge in a due process hearing shall be filed within 90 days of the date of issuance the final decision. Interim decisions of an administrative law judge in a due process hearing, including determinations on requests for emergency relief or determinations with respect to procedural issues, including discovery or scheduling, shall not be subject to the 90-day limitations period for filing appeals, and are instead subject to applicable requirements pertaining to filing interlocutory appeals to courts of appropriate jurisdiction.

(w) Requests for a due process hearing with respect to issues concerning Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. §794a, shall be processed in accordance with this section, except as follows:

1. There shall be no resolution period or opportunity for a resolution meeting pursuant to (h) above with respect to requests for a due process hearing and issues concerning Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, regardless of whether the request for a due process hearing is filed by a parent or a district board of education. However, the parties may agree to participate in a mediation conference and, if so, mediation shall be scheduled in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.6; and

2. The provisions of (d), (e) and (f) above are not applicable with respect to requests for a due process hearing filed concerning issues involving Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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.

Amended by R.2000 d.137, effective April 3, 2000.
See: 31 N.J.R. 4173(a), 32 N.J.R. 1177(a).

In (a), changed N.J.A.C. reference.

Amended by R.2000 d.230, effective June 5, 2000.
See: 32 N.J.R. 755(a), 32 N.J.R. 2052(a).

Rewrote the section.

Amended by R.2002 d.79, effective March 18, 2002.

See: 33 N.J.R. 3715(a), 34 N.J.R. 1265(a).

In (b), inserted "or a" preceding "reevaluation", and deleted "implement an initial IEP" preceding "or to release".

Amended by R.2003 d.387, effective October 6, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 1991(a), 35 N.J.R. 4714(c).

In (a), substituted "Appendixes A and D" for "Appendix" in the third sentence, and amended N.J.A.C. reference at the end.

Amended by R.2006 d.315, effective September 5, 2006.

See: 38 N.J.R. 2253(a), 38 N.J.R. 3530(b).

Rewrote the section.

Case Notes

Administrative exhaustion is required before a district court can provide review under 20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2) of a school district's determination that a student's misbehavior and misconduct is not a manifestation of his disability: (1) a manifestation determination is most appropriately reviewed in the first instance by experienced educators; (2) 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)(6)(A) and N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.7 provide a mechanism for obtaining administrative review of a manifestation determination; and (3) the development of the record, through the administrative review process, is necessary for a court to determine whether or not an alleged manifestation determination error has been made, whether the student's federal rights have been violated as a result of that error, and whether the student is entitled to damages. *Gutin v. Wash. Twp. Bd. of Educ.*, 467 F.Supp.2d 414, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92451 (D.N.J. 2006).

District court could not review, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2), a school district's determination that a student's use of drugs was not a manifestation of his Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) because the student's parents had not exhausted their administrative remedies by filing an administrative appeal challenging that determination: (1) a manifestation determination was most appropriately reviewed in the first instance by experienced educators; (2) 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)(6)(A) and N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.7 provided a mechanism for administratively appealing manifestation determinations; and (3) requiring exhaustion of administrative remedies with regard to claims based on alleged manifestation determination errors was appropriate because, to award damages for such an alleged error, a court would necessarily have to decide whether the behavior at issue was a manifestation of the student's disability, and the use of the administrative process would help develop the record and establish whether or not a violation of federal law had occurred. *Gutin v. Wash. Twp. Bd. of Educ.*, 467 F.Supp.2d 414, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 92451 (D.N.J. 2006).

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.

Forty-five day deadline provided in state special education regulations for expedited hearings in disciplinary matters upon the request of a parent was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable, despite fact that deadline for non-expedited hearings was also 45 days; deadline for expedited hearings allowed for no exceptions or extensions, providing for final decision within the accelerated time frame. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

Parents of disabled students failed to sustain their burden of demonstrating that state special education regulations were arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable, or were violative of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), federal regulations, or state special education laws. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

State special education regulations requiring parent seeking emergency relief as part of expedited hearing in connection with student disciplinary matter to demonstrate entitlement to emergency relief did not violate provision of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requiring state educational agency (SEA) and local educational agency (LEA) to arrange for expedited hearing upon a parent's request, where emergency relief process and expedited hearing process were separate and were not redundant, and where request for emergency relief did not slow expedited hearing process. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

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.

Law Review and Journal Commentaries

Stay-Put Provision and Its Implications to Practitioners. *George M. Holland*, 222 N.J. Lawyer 35 (2003).

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 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 and the student's parent(s).

1. Notwithstanding (a) above, preschool students with disabilities shall not be suspended, long-term or short-term, and shall not be expelled.

2. The district board of education is not required by 20 U.S.C. §§1400 et seq. or this chapter to provide services during periods of removal to a student with a disability who has been removed from his or her current placement for 10 school days or less in that school year, provided that if services are provided to general education students for removals of 10 or fewer days duration, students with disabilities shall be provided services in the same manner as students without disabilities during such time periods for removals of 10 or fewer days.

(b) School district personnel may, on a case-by-case basis, consider any unique circumstances when determining whether or not to impose a disciplinary sanction or order a

change of placement for a student with a disability who violates a school code of conduct.

(c) Removals of a student with a disability from the student's current educational placement for disciplinary reasons constitutes a change of placement if:

1. The removal is for more than 10 consecutive school days; or

2. The student is subjected to a series of short-term removals that constitute a pattern because they cumulate to more than 10 school days in a school year and because of

factors such as the length of each removal, the total amount of time the student is removed and the proximity of the removals to one another.

- i. School officials in consultation with the student's case manager shall determine whether a series of short-term removals constitutes a pattern that creates a change of placement.

- (d) 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

6A:14-8.3 Provision of programs

(a) A residential State facility may recommend placement of a student with a disability in a local school district. Documentation of attempts to place the student in the least restrictive environment according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4 shall be stated in the student's IEP. Tuition shall be paid by the State facility to the local board of education where the student is placed.

(b) All personnel providing special education programs, related services, or multi-disciplinary team services shall hold the appropriate educational certificate and, if required, a license for the position in which they function.

(c) Day school programs operated by the Department of Human Services shall be provided in the following manner:

1. The Department of Human Services shall provide educational programs and related services for students with disabilities in State-operated or contracted facilities;
2. The district board of education shall be responsible for providing the services according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.3 through 3.8. The day school program is responsible for implementing the IEP developed by the district board of education; and
3. The district board of education shall be responsible to monitor the student's placement at least annually to ensure the implementation of the IEP.

(d) An educational program for students with disabilities in a State residential facility shall be commensurate with those in a day school program.

(e) For students placed in State facilities, representative(s) of the program and the district board of education shall participate in any meeting(s) according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(k).

(f) When a student in a State facility is in need of home instruction according to N.J.A.C. 6A:16-10.1, the State facility shall implement the home instruction program.

Amended by R.2006 d.315, effective September 5, 2006.
See: 38 N.J.R. 2253(a), 38 N.J.R. 3530(b).

In (a), substituted "4" for "4.2"; rewrote (b); in (e), substituted "(k)" for "(i)"; in (f), substituted "6A:16-10.1" for "6A:14-4.9".

Case Notes

N.J.A.C. 6:28-8.3(d) upheld as statutorily consistent. In re: Repeal of N.J.A.C. 6:28, 204 N.J.Super. 158, 497 A.2d 1272 (App.Div.1985).

SUBCHAPTER 9. MONITORING, CORRECTIVE ACTION AND COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

6A:14-9.1 Monitoring and corrective action

(a) The Department of Education shall monitor all programs and services required by this chapter for compliance

with New Jersey statutes, the New Jersey Administrative Code, the approved special education plan and Federal requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

1. The monitoring process shall include, but is not limited to, review of:

- i. Provision of a free, appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment;
- ii. Provision of transition services; and
- iii. Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent such representation is the result of inappropriate identification.

(b) The monitoring procedures may include, but are not limited to:

1. A self-assessment conducted by the program being monitored;
2. Review of data, reports and student records;
3. On-site visits;
4. Comparison of a sample of individualized education programs with the programs and services provided;
5. Development of an improvement plan by the program being monitored to address areas of noncompliance identified during the self-assessment; and
6. Audit of Federal and State funds.

(c) After the monitoring process is completed, a report shall be written and sent to the public or private agency.

(d) If the public or private agency receives a final report that indicates noncompliance in addition to any areas of need identified through self-assessment, revisions to the improvement plan shall be developed by the agency and submitted to the Department of Education for approval.

(e) The improvement plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Objectives and strategies for correcting each non-compliance item cited, including resources needed; and
2. The dates by which noncompliance will be corrected.

(f) The Department of Education shall review the improvement plan and notify the agency if it is acceptable.

(g) When an improvement plan is not submitted, found unacceptable or not implemented, the Department of Education shall notify the agency of the actions that it intends to take.

(h) An appeal of the denial of approval of an improvement plan, imposition of sanctions or determination of noncom-

pliance may be made to the Commissioner of Education according to N.J.A.C. 6A:3.

(i) The Department of Education shall maintain monitoring records for a period of at least five years.

Amended by R.2000 d.137, effective April 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 4173(a), 32 N.J.R. 1177(a).

In (h), changed N.J.A.C. reference.

Amended by R.2000 d.230, effective June 5, 2000.

See: 32 N.J.R. 755(a), 32 N.J.R. 2052(a).

In (a), added a reference to Federal requirements under IDEA.

Amended by R.2006 d.315, effective September 5, 2006.

See: 38 N.J.R. 2253(a), 38 N.J.R. 3530(b).

Rewrote the section.

Case Notes

Complaint investigation process established in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-9.2, when read in conjunction with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) provisions it implements, clearly contemplates that the Office of Special Education Programs Director's decision on any complaint is the final decision of the agency; this conclusion is strengthened by the absence in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-9.2 of a comparable provision to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-9.1(h), where the right of appeal to the Commissioner is expressly specified. *Lenape Reg'l H.S. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. N.J. State Dep't of Educ.*, OAL Dkt. Nos. EDU 2781-06 (EDU 8853-01 ON REMAND), EDU 2779-06 (EDU 735-03 ON REMAND), EDU 496-06, EDU 2780-06 (EDU 8012-05 ON REMAND) and EDU 2595-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 920, Commissioner's Decision (October 16, 2006), *aff'd*, SB Nos. 41-06, 42-06 and 43-06, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1086 (N.J. State Bd. of Educ. April 4, 2007), *aff'd*, 2008 N.J. Super. LEXIS 87 (App.Div. April 22, 2008).

6A:14-9.2 Complaint investigation

(a) The State Director of the Office of Special Education Programs or designee(s) shall be responsible for reviewing, investigating and taking action on any signed written complaint regarding the provision of special education and related services covered under this chapter.

(b) An organization or individual may request a complaint investigation by simultaneously submitting a written signed request to the State Director of the Office of Special Education Programs and to the educational agency against which the complaint is directed. The complaint shall include:

1. A statement that a public or private education agency has violated the requirements of State and/or Federal statute and/or regulation for the provision of special education and related services;
2. The facts on which the statement is based; and
3. The time period when the alleged violation occurred.
 - i. The complainant shall allege a violation that occurred not more than one year prior to the date that the complaint is received.

(c) The Office of Special Education Programs shall, if deemed necessary, complete an investigation within 60 calendar days after receipt of the written signed complaint and issue a report setting forth a final decision with respect to the complaint, unless the time period is extended according to (c)6 below.

1. If a party believes that a final decision includes an error that is material to the determination in the decision, the party may inform the Office of Special Education Programs and the other party in writing, within 15 days of the date of the report. The letter shall identify the asserted error and include any documentation to support the claim. The Office of Special Education Programs will determine the appropriate steps to consider the claim of error after receipt of the letter.

2. The investigation may include, but not be limited to:

- i. Review of policies and procedures;
- ii. Review of student record(s);
- iii. Observation of programs;
- iv. Interview(s);
- v. An on-site investigation if determined necessary; and
- vi. If the parent consents, an opportunity for the education agency to engage the parent in mediation or an alternative means of dispute resolution.

3. The complainant shall be given the opportunity to provide additional information, either orally or in writing about the allegations in the complaint.

4. The education agency against which the complaint is directed shall be provided an opportunity to respond to the complaint and, at the discretion of the Director of the Office of Special Education Programs or a designee, may be afforded an opportunity to resolve the issues in the complaint prior to issuance of an investigation report.

5. The State Director of the Office of Special Education Programs may extend the timeline for completion of the investigation only if exceptional circumstances exist with respect to a particular complaint or if the parent and education agency agree to mediate the dispute or engage in another means of dispute resolution.

(d) If a written complaint is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the Office of Special Education Programs shall set aside the entire complaint until the conclusion of the hearing.

1. If an issue is raised in a complaint that has been previously decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties, the hearing decision is binding and the Office of Special Education Programs shall inform the complainant to that effect.

(e) A report of findings, conclusions and, when warranted, the required corrective actions shall be sent to all parties within 60 calendar days after receipt of the written signed complaint unless the 60-day time period is extended in accordance with (c)6 above.

(f) If the education agency is found to be in noncompliance, a corrective action plan in accordance with the directive in the report shall be developed and submitted to the Office of Special Education Programs.

(g) The corrective action plan shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Objectives, strategies and activities for correcting each noncompliance item cited, including resources needed to obtain the objectives; and

2. The dates by which the noncompliance will be corrected.

(h) The State Director of the Office of Special Education Programs shall review the corrective action plan and notify the education agency if it is acceptable.

(i) The Office of Special Education Programs shall review and verify the implementation of the corrective action plan.

(j) When a corrective action plan is not submitted, is unacceptable or is not implemented, the Office of Special Education Programs shall notify the agency of the actions it intends to take.

(k) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting the right of parents or adult students to seek a due process hearing with regard to issues raised in a request for complaint investigation. If a due process hearing is sought while a complaint investigation is pending, the complaint investigation with respect to all issues in the request for a due process hearing shall be halted pending completion of the due process hearing. Upon completion of the due process hearing, the complaint shall be processed in accordance with (d) above.

Amended by R.2000 d.230, effective June 5, 2000.

See: 32 N.J.R. 755(a), 32 N.J.R. 2052(a).

Amended (b); in (c), added a new 2 and recodified former 2 as 3; added a new (d) and recodified former (d) as (e); and recodified former (e) through (i) as (f) through (j).

Amended by R.2003 d.387, effective October 6, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 1991(a), 35 N.J.R. 4714(c).

Rewrote the section.

Amended by R.2006 d.315, effective September 5, 2006.

See: 38 N.J.R. 2253(a), 38 N.J.R. 3530(b).

Rewrote (b) through (f).

Case Notes

State special education regulations addressing complaint time limitations and procedures applicable to complaint and due process hearing request concerning the same issue mirrored language of equivalent federal regulations and satisfied federal requirements. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

State special education regulations concerning implementation of final decisions of state educational agency (SEA) with respect to complaint investigations sufficiently complied with federal requirement that corrective action plan be developed and all aspects of final decision be implemented, and were broad enough to encompass all needed implementation tools, despite failure to specify therein particular implementation procedures. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

State special education regulations governing complaint procedures, requiring development of corrective action plan, requiring that objectives and strategies for correcting each non-compliance item be set forth in such plan, and permitting the state Department of Education to take any action deemed necessary should corrective action plan be inadequate, were sufficient to conform to federal regulatory requirements that deficiencies be remediated and appropriate services provided to students with disabilities. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

State special education regulations requiring "a report of findings [and] conclusions" in connection with minimum state complaint procedures required determination as to whether public agency had violated any requirement of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as mandated by federal regulations, despite failure to specify particular determinations required to be made in connection with complaint procedures; state regulation's list of activities to be undertaken in investigating complaints was not exclusive, and investigation of and report on complaints of IDEA violations was clearly within its contemplated scope. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

Under state special education regulations governing notice of corrective actions intended to be taken by the state Department of Education in response to parent complaints, county office of education was required to notify a noncompliant educational agency should local education agency (LEA) fail to do so. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

Adopting Initial Decision's conclusion that the Commissioner of Education has no jurisdiction to consider an appeal from the final decision of the Office of Special Education Programs issued in response to a complaint investigation conducted under N.J.A.C. 6A:14-9.2 (adopting and modifying 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 441). *Lenape Reg'l H.S. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. N.J. State Dep't of Educ.*, OAL Dkt. Nos. EDU 2781-06 (EDU 8853-01 ON REMAND), EDU 2779-06 (EDU 735-03 ON REMAND), EDU 496-06, EDU 2780-06 (EDU 8012-05 ON REMAND) and EDU 2595-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 920, Commissioner's Decision (October 16, 2006), *aff'd*, SB Nos. 41-06, 42-06 and 43-06, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1086 (N.J. State Bd. of Educ. April 4, 2007), *aff'd*, 2008 N.J. Super. LEXIS 87 (App.Div. April 22, 2008).

Complaint investigation process established in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-9.2, when read in conjunction with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) provisions it implements, clearly contemplates that the Office of Special Education Programs Director's decision on any complaint is the final decision of the agency; this conclusion is strengthened by the absence in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-9.2 of a comparable provision to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-9.1(h), where the right of appeal to the Commissioner is expressly specified. *Lenape Reg'l H.S. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. N.J. State Dep't of Educ.*, OAL Dkt. Nos. EDU 2781-06 (EDU 8853-01 ON REMAND), EDU 2779-06 (EDU 735-03 ON REMAND), EDU 496-06, EDU 2780-06 (EDU 8012-05 ON REMAND) and EDU 2595-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 920, Commissioner's Decision (October 16, 2006), *aff'd*, SB Nos. 41-06, 42-06 and 43-06, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1086 (N.J. State Bd. of Educ. April 4, 2007), *aff'd*, 2008 N.J. Super. LEXIS 87 (App.Div. April 22, 2008).

SUBCHAPTER 10. EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

6A:14-10.1 Early intervention programs serving children between birth and age three

Early intervention programs shall be administered by the Department of Health and Senior Services as the lead agency in collaboration with the Departments of Human Services and Education in accordance with P.L. 1992, c.155.

6A:14-10.2 General requirements when district boards of education contract with early intervention programs under contract with the Department of Health and Senior Services for students age three

(a) When an IEP is developed by a district board of education for a child age three who has been enrolled in an early intervention program and it is determined that the district shall provide a free, appropriate public education for that student by continuing the program in the early intervention program for the balance of that school year, the following requirements shall apply:

1. The district board of education shall be responsible to ensure that the requirements of N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.1(d) shall be met;
2. A contractual agreement shall be provided between the district board of education and the early intervention program;
3. Personnel shall be appropriately certified and, if required, licensed; and
4. Applications for exceptions according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.9 shall be made whenever necessary.

(b) When the district board of education determines that the child who has been enrolled in the early intervention program requires an extended year program, the district may contract with the early intervention program for the provision of that program.

Amended by R.2003 d.387, effective October 6, 2003.
See: 35 N.J.R. 1991(a), 35 N.J.R. 4714(c).

In (a)4, amended NJAC reference.
Amended by R.2006 d.315, effective September 5, 2006.
See: 38 N.J.R. 2253(a), 38 N.J.R. 3530(b).
In (a)4, substituted "4.9" for "4.10".

APPENDIX A

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 2004

20 U.S.C. §§1415, 1412, 1414

20 U.S.C. §1415

(k) Placement in alternative educational setting

(1) Authority of school personnel

(A) Case-by-case determination

School personnel may consider any unique circumstances on a case-by-case basis when determining whether to order a change in placement for a child with a disability who violates a code of student conduct.

(B) Authority

School personnel under this subsection may remove a child with a disability who violates a code of student conduct from their current placement to an appropriate interim alternative educational setting, another setting, or suspension, for not more than 10 school days (to the extent such alternatives are applied to children without disabilities).

(C) Additional authority

If school personnel seek to order a change in placement that would exceed 10 school days and the behavior that gave rise to the violation of the school code is determined not to be a manifestation of the child's disability pursuant to subparagraph (E), the relevant disciplinary procedures applicable to children without disabilities may be applied to the child in the same manner and for the same duration in which the procedures would be applied to children without disabilities, except as provided in section 1412(a)(1) of this title although it may be provided in an interim alternative educational setting.

(D) Services

A child with a disability who is removed from the child's current placement under subparagraph (G) (irrespective of whether the behavior is determined to be a manifestation of the child's disability) or subparagraph (C) shall—

(i) continue to receive educational services, as provided in section 1412(a)(1) of this title, so as to enable the child to continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward meeting the goals set out in the child's IEP; and

(ii) receive, as appropriate, a functional behavioral assessment, behavioral intervention services and modifications, that are designed to address the behavior violation so that it does not recur.

(E) Manifestation determination

(i) In general

Except as provided in subparagraph (B), within 10 school days of any decision to change the placement of a child with a disability because of a violation of a code of student conduct, the local educational agency, the parent, and relevant members of the IEP Team (as determined by the parent and the local educational agency) shall review all relevant information in the student's file, including the child's IEP, any teacher observations, and any relevant information provided by the parents to determine—

(I) if the conduct in question was caused by, or had a direct and substantial relationship to, the child's disability; or

(II) if the conduct in question was the direct result of the local educational agency's failure to implement the IEP.

(ii) Manifestation

If the local educational agency, the parent, and relevant members of the IEP Team determine that either subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) is applicable for the child, the conduct shall be determined to be a manifestation of the child's disability.

(F) Determination that behavior was a manifestation

If the local educational agency, the parent, and relevant members of the IEP Team make the determination that the conduct was a manifestation of the child's disability, the IEP Team shall—

(i) conduct a functional behavioral assessment, and implement a behavioral intervention plan for such child, provided that the local educational agency had

not conducted such assessment prior to such determination before the behavior that resulted in a change in placement described in subparagraph (C) or (G);

(ii) in the situation where a behavioral intervention plan has been developed, review the behavioral intervention plan if the child already has such a behavioral intervention plan, and modify it, as necessary, to address the behavior; and

(iii) except as provided in subparagraph (G), return the child to the placement from which the child was removed, unless the parent and the local educational agency agree to a change of placement as part of the modification of the behavioral intervention plan.

(G) Special circumstances

School personnel may remove a student to an interim alternative educational setting for not more than 45 school days without regard to whether the behavior is