

CHAPTER 14

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Authority

N.J.S.A. 18A:4-15, 18A:7A-1 et seq., 18A:7B et seq., 18A:7C-1 et seq., 18A:40-4, 18A:46-1 et seq., 18A:46A-1 et seq., 18A:48-8, 39:1-1, U.S.P.L. 93-112, Sec. 504, 94-142, 101-476 and 99-457.

Source and Effective Date

R.1998 d.334, effective July 6, 1998.
See: 30 N.J.R. 1219(b), 30 N.J.R. 2435(a).

Executive Order No. 66(1978) Expiration Date

Chapter 14, Special Education, expires on July 6, 2003.

CHAPTER TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBCHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

- 6A:14-1.1 General requirements
- 6A:14-1.2 District eligibility for assistance under IDEA Part B
- 6A:14-1.3 Definitions

SUBCHAPTER 2. PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

- 6A:14-2.1 General requirements
- 6A:14-2.2 Surrogate parents and foster parents
- 6A:14-2.3 Parental consent, notice, participation and meetings
- 6A:14-2.4 Native language
- 6A:14-2.5 Protection in evaluation procedures
- 6A:14-2.6 Mediation
- 6A:14-2.7 Due process hearings
- 6A:14-2.8 Discipline/suspension/expulsions
- 6A:14-2.9 Student records
- 6A:14-2.10 Reimbursement for unilateral placement by parents

SUBCHAPTER 3. SERVICES

- 6A:14-3.1 General requirements
- 6A:14-3.2 Case manager
- 6A:14-3.3 Location, referral and identification
- 6A:14-3.4 Evaluation
- 6A:14-3.5 Determination of eligibility for special education and related services
- 6A:14-3.6 Determination of eligibility for speech-language services
- 6A:14-3.7 Individualized education program
- 6A:14-3.8 Reevaluation
- 6A:14-3.9 (Reserved)

SUBCHAPTER 4. PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION

- 6A:14-4.1 General requirements
- 6A:14-4.2 Placement in the least restrictive environment
- 6A:14-4.3 Program options
- 6A:14-4.4 Program criteria: speech-language services
- 6A:14-4.5 Program criteria: supplementary instruction
- 6A:14-4.6 Program criteria: resource programs
- 6A:14-4.7 Program criteria: special class programs, secondary, and vocational rehabilitation
- 6A:14-4.8 Program criteria: home instruction
- 6A:14-4.9 Home instruction due to temporary illness or injury for students with or without disabilities
- 6A:14-4.10 Exceptions
- 6A:14-4.11 Statewide assessment
- 6A:14-4.12 Graduation

SUBCHAPTER 5. PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL AND RELATED SERVICES

- 6A:14-5.1 General requirements
- 6A:14-5.2 Approval procedures for clinics or agencies

SUBCHAPTER 6. REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICES IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

- 6A:14-6.1 Equitable participation under IDEA Part B
- 6A:14-6.2 Provision of programs and services provided under N.J.S.A. 18A:46A-1 et seq. and 18A:46-19.1 et seq.
- 6A:14-6.3 Fiscal management provided under N.J.S.A. 18A:46A-1 et seq. and 18A:46-19.1 et seq.
- 6A:14-6.4 End of the year report provided under N.J.S.A. 18A:46A-1 et seq. and 18A:46-19.1 et seq.
- 6A:14-6.5 Placement in accredited nonpublic schools which are not specifically approved for the education of disabled students

SUBCHAPTER 7. RECEIVING SCHOOLS

- 6A:14-7.1 General requirements
- 6A:14-7.2 Approval procedures to establish a new receiving school
- 6A:14-7.3 Amendment procedures for receiving schools
- 6A:14-7.4 Annual procedures for private schools for the disabled
- 6A:14-7.5 Responsibilities of district boards of education
- 6A:14-7.6 Provision of programs
- 6A:14-7.7 Termination or withdrawal from a receiving school
- 6A:14-7.8 Fiscal management
- 6A:14-7.9 Records
- 6A:14-7.10 Monitoring and corrective action

SUBCHAPTER 8. PROGRAMS OPERATED BY THE DEPARTMENTS OF CORRECTIONS AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND THE JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION

- 6A:14-8.1 General requirements
- 6A:14-8.2 Procedural safeguards
- 6A:14-8.3 Provision of programs

SUBCHAPTER 9. MONITORING, CORRECTIVE ACTION AND COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

- 6A:14-9.1 Monitoring and corrective action
- 6A:14-9.2 Complaint investigation

SUBCHAPTER 10. EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

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

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

SUBCHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

6A:14-1.1 General requirements

(a) The rules in this chapter supersede all rules in effect prior to July 6, 1998 pertaining to students with disabilities.

(b) The purpose of this chapter is to:

1. Ensure that all students with disabilities as defined in this chapter, including students with disabilities who have been suspended or expelled from school, have available to them a free, appropriate public education as that standard is set under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. §§ 1400 et seq.); and, in furtherance thereof, to:

i. Ensure that the obligation to make a free, appropriate public education available to each eligible student begins no later than the student's third birthday and that an individualized education program is in effect for the student by that date;

ii. Ensure that a free, appropriate public education is available to any student with a disability who needs special education and related services, even though the student is advancing from grade to grade;

iii. Ensure that the services and placement needed by each student with a disability to receive a free, appropriate public education are based on the student's unique needs and not on the student's disability;

2. Ensure that students with disabilities are educated in the least restrictive environment;

3. Ensure the provision of special education and related services;

4. Ensure that the rights of students with disabilities and their parents are protected;

5. Assist public and private agencies providing educational services to students with disabilities; and

6. Ensure the evaluation of the effectiveness of the education of students with disabilities.

(c) The rules in this chapter shall apply to all public and private agencies providing publicly funded educational programs and services to students with disabilities.

1. Programs and services shall be provided to students age three through 21.

2. Programs and services may be provided by a district board of education at their option to students below the age of three and above the age of 21.

3. Each district board of education shall provide information regarding services available through other State, county and local agencies to parents of children with disabilities below the age of three.

(d) Each district board of education is responsible for providing a system of free, appropriate special education and related services to students with disabilities age three through 21 which shall:

1. Be provided at public expense, under public supervision and with no charge to the parent;

2. Be administered, supervised and provided by appropriately certified professional staff members;

3. Be located in facilities that are accessible to the disabled; and

4. Meet all requirements of this chapter.

(e) With the exception of students placed in nonpublic schools according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-6.5, all students with disabilities shall be placed in facilities or programs which have been approved by the Department of Education according to N.J.S.A. 18A:46-14 and 15.

(f) Each district board of education shall ensure that the hearing aids worn by children who are deaf and/or hard of hearing are functioning properly.

(g) All special education programs and services provided under this chapter shall be subject to review and approval by the Department of Education.

(h) All public and private agencies that provide educational programs and services to students with disabilities shall maintain documentation demonstrating compliance with this chapter.

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

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

In (b), added i through iii.

Case Notes

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).

Appropriateness of individualized education program focuses 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).

Individualized program was not appropriate where goals could 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).

Standard in evaluating individualized education program 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).

Discussion of former regulatory scheme for education of handicapped children. *Henderson v. Morristown Memorial Hospital*, 198 N.J.Super. 418, 487 A.2d 742 (App.Div.1985), certification denied 101 N.J. 250, 501 A.2d 922 (1985).

Student's sudden change in school behavior might not support expulsion if special classification indicated. *K.E. v. Monroe Township Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 77.

Individualized education program (IEP) implemented where evidence showed program appropriate and reasonable and student improved under prior IEPs. *A.S. v. Franklin Township Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 25.

(c) If the mediation according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.6 or due process hearing according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.7 involves initial admission to the public school, the child shall be placed in an interim public school program agreed to by the parent and the district board of education pending the outcome of the mediation or due process hearing.

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

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

In (b), deleted reference to adult student.

Case Notes

Successful challenge to local board's decision to remove multiply handicapped 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).

Three-year old special education student did not require extended services. *J.L. v. Board of Education of Englewood*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 2.

Handicapped student received entirely inappropriate and inadequate education and was entitled to placement in out-of-state residential program. *L.P. v. Hamilton Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 360.

Emergency relief request regarding classified student's suspension was rendered moot by student's withdrawal from school. *Brick Township Board of Education v. M.F.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 127.

Student with multiple disabilities required extra year of special education due to chronic absenteeism. *G.K. v. Roselle Borough*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 86.

Impaired student's research paper was acceptable for grading as long as marking periods in subject were passed. *T.D. v. Rutherford Board*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 47.

Parents not entitled to emergent relief; no evidence offered to show that student was socially maladjusted. *N.P. v. Freehold Regional High School*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 218.

Handicapped child with increasing level of seizure activity; extended-year residential care. *J.S. v. West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 152.

Emergency placement for neurologically impaired child was not available absent evidence of irreparable harm. *M.B. v. Manville*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 233.

Student, classified as perceptually impaired, who filed an application for emergency relief return to his previously established course of study was returned to mainstream placement with resource room assistance pending outcome of the dispute over his proper classification and placement. *Milt v. East Windsor Regional School District*, 9 N.J.A.R. 159 (1986).

State Department of Human Services not a necessary party to special education placement determination; joinder of party denied due to lack of authority; consolidation denied as unqualified. *A.N. v. Clark Bd. of Ed.*, 6 N.J.A.R. 360 (1983).

Standing of foster parents (citing former regulations). *Orr v. Bd. of Ed., Caldwell-West Caldwell, Essex Cty.*, 1976 S.L.D. 264.

6A:14-2.2 Surrogate parents and foster parents

(a) Each district board of education or responsible State agency shall ensure that the rights of a student are protected through the provision of an individual to act as surrogate for the parent and assume all parental rights under this chapter when either:

1. The parent as defined according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.3 cannot be identified;

2. The parent cannot be located after reasonable efforts; or

3. An agency of the State of New Jersey has guardianship of the student.

(b) Each district board of education or responsible State agency shall establish a method for selecting and training surrogate parents.

(c) The person serving as a surrogate parent shall have:

1. No interest that conflicts with those of the student he or she represents; and

2. Knowledge and skills that ensure adequate representation of the student.

(d) The person(s) serving as a surrogate parent may not be an employee of the Department of Education, the district board of education or public agency providing services to the student. A surrogate parent may be paid solely to act in that capacity.

(e) When a student (who is or may be a student with a disability) is in the care of a foster parent, the district board of education where the foster parent resides shall contact the student's case manager at the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS) in the Department of Human Services to:

1. Determine whether the parent retains the right to make educational decisions; and

2. Determine the whereabouts of the parent.

(f) If the parent retains the right to make educational decisions and the parent's whereabouts are known to the district board of education, the school shall obtain all required consent from and provide written notices to the parent.

(g) If the district board of education cannot ascertain the whereabouts of the parent, the district board of education shall consult with the student's case manager at DYFS to assist in identifying an individual, including the foster parent, who may serve as a surrogate. The district board of education shall appoint a surrogate parent and obtain all required consent from and provide written notices to the surrogate parent.

(h) If the rights of the parent have been terminated, the district board of education shall consult with the student's case manager at DYFS to determine whether the foster parent meets the criteria established at N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.3 in the definition of "parent" and can act on behalf of the student. If so, the district board of education shall obtain all required consent from and provide written notices to the foster parent.

1. If it is determined that the foster parent cannot serve as the parent on behalf of the student, the district board of education in consultation with DYFS shall appoint a surrogate parent and obtain all required consent from and provide written notices to the surrogate parent.

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.

Case Notes

Successful challenge to local board's decision to remove multiply handicapped child from residential school into home and local school programs. *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).

Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) imposed no federal requirement of statewide uniformity of methods for the selection and training of surrogate parents, and state special education regulations which provided for establishment of selection and training systems by each district board of education or responsible state agency were not arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

State special education regulations defining eligibility for appointment as a surrogate parent which did not prohibit appointment of an employee of a nonpublic agency involved in the education or care of the child as that child's surrogate parent improperly failed to conform to federal conflict-of-interest standard. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

Regulation valid. In re: Repeal of N.J.A.C. 6:28, 204 N.J.Super. 158, 497 A.2d 1272 (App.Div.1985).

6A:14-2.3 Parental consent, notice, participation and meetings

(a) Consent shall be obtained:

1. Prior to conducting any assessment as part of an initial evaluation;

2. Prior to implementation of the initial IEP resulting from (a)1 above;

3. Prior to conducting any assessment as part of a reevaluation, except that such consent is not required if the district board of education can demonstrate that it had taken reasonable measures, consistent with (i)7 below, to obtain such consent and the parent failed to respond; and

4. Prior to the release of student records according to N.J.A.C. 6:3-6.

(b) If a parent refuses to provide consent and the district and the parent have not agreed to other action, the district shall request a due process hearing according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.7(b) to obtain consent.

(c) Upon receipt of consent, the district board of education shall implement without delay the action for which consent was granted.

(d) Written notice which meets the requirements of this section shall be provided to the parent when a district board of education:

1. Proposes to initiate or change the identification, classification, evaluation, educational placement of the student or the provision of a free, appropriate public education to the student; or

2. Declines to initiate or change the identification, classification, evaluation, educational placement of the student or the provision of a free, appropriate public education to the student.

(e) Written notice shall be in language understandable to the general public, and shall be provided in the native language of the parent, unless it is clearly not feasible to do so according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.4. Written notice shall include:

1. A description of the action proposed or denied by the district board of education;

2. An explanation of why it is taking such action;

3. A description of any options the district board of education considered and the reasons why those options were rejected;

4. A description of the procedures, tests, records or reports and factors used by the district board of education in determining whether to propose or deny an action;

5. A description of any other factors that are relevant to the proposal or refusal by the district board of education;

6. A statement that the parents of a student with a disability have protection under the procedural safeguards of this chapter, the means by which a copy of a description of the procedural safeguards can be obtained and sources for parents to contact to obtain assistance in understanding the provisions of this chapter; and

7. In addition, a copy of the procedural safeguards statement published by the New Jersey Department of Education which contains a full explanation of the procedural safeguards available to parents shall be provided:

i. Upon referral for an initial evaluation;

ii. Upon each notification of an IEP meeting;

iii. Upon reevaluation; and

iv. When a request for a due process hearing is submitted to the Department of Education.

(f) Written notice according to (e) above shall be provided to the parent as follows:

1. The district board of education shall provide written notice no later than 15 calendar days after making a determination;

2. The district of board of education shall provide written notice at least 15 calendar days prior to the implementation of a proposed action so that the parent may consider the proposal. The proposed action may be implemented sooner, if the parent agrees in writing;

3. The district board of education shall implement the proposed action after the opportunity for consideration in (f)2 above has expired unless:

i. The parent disagrees with the proposed action and the district takes action in an attempt to resolve the disagreement; or

ii. The parent requests mediation or a due process hearing according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.6 or 2.7. A request for mediation or a due process hearing prior to the expiration of the 15th calendar day in (f)2 above shall delay the implementation of the proposed action according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.6(d)9 or 2.7(j).

4. The district of residence may provide written notice less than 15 calendar days prior to the implementation of a disciplinary action according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.8(b) when the IEP team determines that disciplinary action requires immediate implementation. Such written notice shall be provided according to the following:

i. The notice shall specify when the disciplinary action will be implemented and shall meet all other requirements according to (e) above. Documentation of the notice shall be maintained and shall include the reason(s) that notice for less than 15 calendar days was warranted.

ii. During the pendency of mediation or due process related to the disciplinary action the student shall be returned to the last agreed upon placement, unless the parent and district agree otherwise, the district requests emergency relief or if the student has been placed in an interim alternative educational setting according to 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)(1)(A)(ii) or § 1415(k)(2), the student shall remain in the interim alternative educational setting according to 20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)(7).

5. Upon receipt of any written parental request to initiate or change the referral, identification, classification, evaluation, educational placement or the provision of a free, appropriate public education, a response that meets the requirements of written notice in (e) above shall be provided to the parent within 20 calendar days, excluding school holidays but not summer vacation.

i. When a meeting is required to make the determination and respond to the parental request, the meeting shall be conducted and a determination made within 20 calendar days, excluding school holidays but not summer vacation. Written notice of the determination shall be provided within 15 calendar days of the meeting.

(g) When a determination is made to conduct or not to conduct an initial evaluation, in addition to the notice

required in (e) above, the parent shall be provided with copies of the special education rules (N.J.A.C. 6A:14), and due process hearing rules (N.J.A.C. 1:6A).

(h) A district board of education shall take steps to ensure that the parent is given the opportunity to participate in meetings regarding the identification, evaluation, classification, educational placement of, or the provision of a free, appropriate public education to the student.

(i) Meetings to determine eligibility and develop an IEP may be combined as long as the requirements for notice of a meeting according to (e)7ii above and (i)3 through 5 below are met.

1. Any eligibility meeting for students classified according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.5(c) shall include the following participants:

i. The parent;

ii. A teacher who is knowledgeable about the student's educational performance or, if there is no teacher who is knowledgeable about the student's educational performance, a teacher who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;

iii. The student, where appropriate;

iv. At least one child study team member who participated in the evaluation;

v. The case manager;

vi. Other appropriate individuals at the discretion of the parent or school district; and

vii. For an initial eligibility meeting, certified school personnel referring the student as potentially disabled, or the school principal or designee if they choose to participate.

2. Meetings of the IEP team shall include the following participants:

i. The parent;

ii. At least one regular education teacher of the student, if the student is or may be participating in the regular education classroom;

(1) If the student has no regular education teacher, the regular education teacher shall be knowledgeable about the district's programs;

(2) The regular education teacher as a member of the IEP team must to the extent appropriate, participate in the development, review, and revision of the student's IEP;

(3) The regular education teacher shall assist in the determination of appropriate positive behavioral interventions and strategies; and

(4) The regular education teacher shall assist in the determination of supplementary aids and ser-

vices, program modifications or supports for school personnel that will be provided for the student;

iii. At least one special education teacher of the student or, where appropriate, at least one special education provider of the student;

(1) If there is no special education teacher or special education provider of the student, the special education teacher or provider shall be knowledgeable about the district's programs;

iv. At least one child study team member who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results;

v. The case manager;

vi. A representative of the responsible district who:

(1) Is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities;

(2) Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum;

(3) Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the district board of education; and

(4) Shall be the child study team member or other appropriate school personnel including the special education administrator or principal;

vii. At the discretion of the parent or school district, other individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student, including related services personnel as appropriate;

(1) The determination of the special knowledge or expertise shall be made by the party (parent or school district) who invited the individual;

viii. The student where appropriate; and

ix. If a purpose of the meeting is to consider transition services, the student with disabilities and a representative of any other agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services shall be invited to attend the IEP meeting.

3. Parents shall be given written notice of a meeting early enough to ensure that they will have an opportunity to attend.

4. Meetings shall be scheduled at a mutually agreed upon time and place.

5. Notice of meetings shall indicate the purpose, time, location and participants.

i. The notice of an IEP meeting shall inform the parents of the provisions in (i)2vii and (i)2vii(1) above relating to the participation of other individuals on the IEP team who have knowledge or special expertise.

ii. When a purpose of an IEP meeting for a student with a disability beginning at age 14, or younger, if appropriate, is a discussion of transition services needs, the notice of the IEP meeting shall indicate that:

(1) A purpose of the meeting will be the development of a statement of the transition services needs of the student; and

(2) The school district will invite the student;

iii. When a purpose of an IEP meeting for a student with a disability beginning at age 16, or younger, if appropriate, is a discussion of needed transition services, the notice of the IEP meeting shall:

(1) Indicate that a purpose of the meeting is the consideration of needed transition services for the student;

(2) Indicate that the school will invite the student; and

(3) Identify any other agency that will be invited to send a representative.

6. If the parent cannot attend the meeting(s), the chief school administrator or designee shall attempt to ensure parental participation. Parental participation may include the use of electronic conference equipment.

7. A meeting may be conducted without the parent in attendance if the district board of education can document that it is unable to secure the participation of the parent. The school shall maintain a record of its attempts to arrange the meeting, including, but not limited to:

i. Detailed records of telephone calls made or attempted and the results of those calls;

ii. Copies of correspondence sent to the parents and any responses received; and

iii. Detailed records of visits made to the parent's home or place of employment and the results of those visits.

8. Participants at the IEP meeting shall be allowed to use an audio-tape recorder during the meeting.

(j) The following activities shall not be considered a meeting that requires parental participation:

1. Informal or unscheduled conversations involving school district personnel and conversations on issues such as teaching methodology, lesson plans, or coordination of service provision if those issues are not addressed in the student's IEP; and

2. Preparatory activities that school district personnel engage in to develop a proposal or response to a parent proposal that will be discussed at a later meeting.

(k) Except when a parent has obtained legal guardianship, all rights under this chapter shall transfer to the student upon attainment of the 18th birthday. The district board of education shall provide the adult student and the parent with written notice that the rights under this chapter have transferred to the adult student. The adult student shall be given a copy of the special education rules (N.J.A.C. 6A:14), the due process hearing rules (N.J.A.C. 1:6A) and the procedural safeguards statement published by the Department of Education.

1. An adult student shall be given notice and shall participate in meetings according to (a) through (i) above. The district board of education or the adult student may invite the parent to participate in meetings regarding the identification, evaluation, classification, or educational placement of, or the provision of a free, appropriate public education to, the adult student.

2. Consent to conduct an initial evaluation or reevaluation, for initial implementation of a special education program and related services, or for release of records of an adult student shall be obtained from the adult student.

3. The district board of education shall provide any notice required under this chapter to the adult student and the parent.

4. When there is a disagreement regarding the identification, evaluation, classification, or educational placement of, or the provision of a free, appropriate public education to, an adult student, the adult student may request mediation or a due process hearing.

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

In (f)5, added “, excluding school holidays, but not summer vacation” at the end.

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.

Case Notes

Recommended placement of handicapped child in its 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.

Recommended placement of handicapped child 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.

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 regulation mandating provision of copy of procedural safeguards statement, including complaint procedures, to parents of special education students did not satisfy the federal regulatory requirements for dissemination of complaint procedures; federal regulations also required dissemination of statement at parent training and information centers, protection and advocacy centers, independent living centers, and other appropriate agencies. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

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).

Special education program approved for classified student despite lack of parental approval after mother failed to attend either of two scheduled conferences. *Seaside Park Board of Education v. C.G.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 257.

Handicapped child's pre-school educational program was appropriate since it conferred meaningful educational benefit for child. *A.E. v. Springfield Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 128.

Mother of third-grader who exhibited serious behavioral and educational problems was properly ordered to produce child for evaluations by child study team. *Linden Board of Education v. T.T.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS)105.

Parents' refusal to cooperate compels administrative order to place special education student in out-of-district facility recommended under individualized education plan. *Lawrence Township Board of Education v. C.D.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 98.

Objection to emotionally disturbed classification and out-of-district placement of student with discipline problems dismissed after both classification and placement found to be justified. *L.M. v. Vinland Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 93.

Student classified as neurologically impaired was properly ordered placed in self-contained class despite lack of parental consent to such placement. *Jersey City Board of Education v. J.H.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 92.

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.

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.

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.

Mother of disabled student required to participate in interview with school district. *Jersey City State-Operated School District v. M.B.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 8.

Board of Education entitled to administer initial evaluation for special education services of student, no parental consent. *Jersey City Board of Education v. T.W.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 6.

Classification of neurologically impaired student changed to emotionally disturbed. *D.I. v. Teaneck*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 237.

Lack of proper notice to parents of board's placement decision under former N.J.A.C. 6:28-1.9; review meeting under former N.J.A.C. 6:28-1.8. *A.N. v. Clark Bd. of Ed.*, 5 N.J.A.R. 152 (1983).

6A:14-2.4 Native language

(a) Written notice to the parent shall be provided and parent conferences required by this chapter shall be conducted in the language used for communication by the parent and student unless it is clearly not feasible to do so.

1. Foreign language interpreters or translators and sign language interpreters for the deaf shall be provided, when necessary, by the district board of education at no cost to the parent.

(b) If the native language is not a written language, the district board of education shall take steps to ensure that:

1. The notice is translated orally or by other means to the parent in his or her native language or other mode of communication;

2. That the parent understands the content of the notice; and

3. There is written documentation that the requirements of (b)1 and 2 above have been met.

Case Notes

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).

6A:14-2.5 Protection in evaluation procedures

(a) In conducting the evaluation, each district board of education shall:

1. Use a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional and developmental information, including information:

i. Provided by the parent that may assist in determining whether a child is a student with a disability and in determining the content of the student's IEP; and

ii. Related to enabling the student to be involved in and progress in the general education curriculum or, for preschool children with disabilities to participate in appropriate activities;

2. Not use any single procedure as the sole criterion for determining whether a student is a student with a disability or determining an appropriate educational program for the student; and

3. Use technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors.

(b) Each district board of education shall ensure:

1. That evaluation procedures including, but not limited to, tests and other evaluation materials according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4:

i. Are selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory; and

ii. Are provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication unless it is clearly not feasible to do so; and

iii. Materials and procedures used to assess a student with limited English proficiency are selected and administered to ensure that they measure the extent to which the student has a disability and needs special education, rather than measure the student's English language skills;

2. Any standardized tests that are administered:

i. Have been validated for the purpose(s) for which they are administered; and

ii. Are administered by certified personnel trained in conformance with the instructions provided by their producer;

3. The student is assessed in all areas of suspected disability;

4. Assessment tools and strategies that provide relevant information that directly assists persons in determining the educational needs of the student are provided;

5. Tests are selected, administered and interpreted so that when a student has sensory, manual or communication impairments, the results accurately reflect the ability which that procedure purports to measure, rather than the impairment unless that is the intended purpose of the testing;

6. The evaluation is conducted by a multi-disciplinary team of professionals consisting of at least two members of the child study team and where appropriate, other specialists. At least one evaluator shall be knowledgeable in the area of the suspected disability; and

7. In evaluating each student with a disability, the evaluation is sufficiently comprehensive to identify all of the child's special education and related services needs, whether or not commonly linked to the suspected eligibility category.

(c) A parent may request an independent evaluation if there is disagreement with the evaluation provided by a district board of education.

1. Such independent evaluation(s) shall be provided at no cost to the parent unless the district board of education initiates a due process hearing to show that its evaluation is appropriate and a final determination to that effect is made following the hearing.

3. Have an apportioned amount of time for case management responsibilities; and
4. Be responsible for transition planning.

6A:14-3.3 Location, referral and identification

(a) Each district board of education shall develop written procedures for students age three through 21, including students attending nonpublic schools, who reside within the local school district with respect to the location and referral of students who may be disabled due to physical, sensory, emotional, communication, cognitive or social difficulties.

1. The requirements of this section apply to highly mobile students with disabilities, such as migrant and homeless students, and to students who may be disabled even though they are advancing from grade to grade.

2. The activities undertaken to locate nonpublic school students with disabilities shall be comparable to activities undertaken to locate public school students with disabilities. In addition, each district board of education shall consult with appropriate representatives of nonpublic school students on how to carry out these activities.

3. The referral procedures shall provide for:

i. Interventions in the general education program according to N.J.A.C. 6:26;

ii. Evaluation to determine eligibility for special education and related services; and/or

iii. Other educational action, as appropriate.

(b) The procedures shall provide for referral by instructional, administrative and other professional staff of the local school district, parents and agencies concerned with the welfare of students.

(c) Interventions in the general education program to alleviate educational problems shall be provided to a student unless the student's educational problem(s) is such that direct referral to the child study team is required according to (d) below.

1. The staff of the general education program shall maintain written documentation of the implementation and effectiveness of the interventions.

2. When it is determined that interventions in the general education program have not adequately addressed the educational difficulties and it is believed that the student may be disabled, the student shall be referred for evaluation to determine eligibility for special education programs and services under this chapter.

3. A determination whether or not to conduct an evaluation shall be made in accordance with (e) below.

(d) Interventions in the regular education program are not a prerequisite to an evaluation for services under this chapter when:

1. It can be documented that the nature of the student's educational problem(s) is such that evaluation to determine eligibility for services under this chapter is warranted without delay; or

2. The parent makes a written request for an evaluation to determine eligibility for services under this chapter. Such a request shall be considered a referral and shall be forwarded without delay to the child study team for consideration.

(e) When a preschool age or school age student is referred for an initial evaluation to determine eligibility for

special education programs and services under this chapter, a meeting of the child study team, the parent and the regular education teacher of the student who is knowledgeable about the student's educational performance or if there is no teacher of the student, a teacher who is knowledgeable about the district's programs shall be convened within 20 calendar days (excluding school holidays, but not summer vacation) of receipt of the written request. This group shall determine whether an evaluation is warranted and, if warranted, shall determine the nature and scope of the evaluation, according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(a). The parent shall be provided written notice of the determination(s), which includes a request for consent to evaluate, if an evaluation will be conducted, according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(a).

1. To facilitate the transition from early intervention to preschool, a child study team member of the district board of education shall participate in the preschool transition planning conference arranged by the Department of Health and Senior Services.

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 of the student who has knowledge of the student's educational performance or if there is no teacher of the student, a teacher who is knowledgeable about 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 of the student who has knowledge of the student's educational performance or if there is no teacher of the student, a teacher who is knowledgeable about 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. If the student is removed for disciplinary action, limitations on the amount of time the student is removed and the requirement

to provide services shall be consistent with procedures in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.8.

(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.

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

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

In (d)2, deleted a reference to adult students; and rewrote (a), (e) and (f).

Case Notes

Requirements of regulations under Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) that each state have on file with Secretary of Education description of how "child find" policies and procedures will be monitored to ensure that the state educational agency (SEA) obtained information on number of children identified within each category of disability, information adequate to evaluate effectiveness of those policies and procedures, and description of method used by state to determine which children were receiving special education and related services were not met by state regulations merely mandating that each school district develop written procedures. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

State special education regulations requiring each district board of education to develop written procedures for locating potentially disabled students satisfied requirement of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) that each state have policies and procedures to ensure that practical method for locating disabled students be developed; neither IDEA nor its regulations established any particular "child find" method to be used, or require states to establish uniform methods. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

State special education regulations which failed to include portions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or its regulations setting forth filing requirements in connection with "child find" requirements were impermissibly inconsistent with federal standard, despite state's contention that filing requirements applied only to state and not to local school districts, where result of failure to incorporate federal standard in regulations was lack of public awareness of applicable standards and how standards were applied. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

6A:14-3.4 Evaluation

(a) The child study team, the parent and the regular education teacher of the student who has knowledge of the student's educational performance or if there is no teacher of the student, a teacher who is knowledgeable about 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 any assessment as part of 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;

(2) In the case of a student of preschool age, a child study team member in an environment appropriate for a child of that age;

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 student's regular education teacher who is knowledgeable about the student's educational performance or, if there is no regular education teacher, a regular education teacher who is knowledgeable about 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;

3. If an assessment is not conducted under standard conditions, the extent to which it varied from standard conditions; and

4. 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 by the IEP team.

(h) 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).

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.

Case Notes

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 which did not track regulations under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), requiring dissenting members of a child's individualized education program

(IEP) team to file separate written reports, frustrated federal policy of providing disabled children with free appropriate public education (FAPE) and protecting their rights and those of their parents, where parents who disagreed with an IEP team's evaluation had no other way of discovering existence of disagreement among team members. *Baer v. Klagholtz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

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

Psychiatric evaluation granted due to student's distorted behavior. *Hillside Board of Education v. B.L.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 128.

Assaultive student ordered to undergo evaluation even if parent refuses to give consent. *Bloomfield Board of Education v. R.G.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 121.

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, trancies, 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. 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. "Auditorily impaired" corresponds to "auditorily handicapped" and further corresponds to the Federal eligibility categories of deafness or hearing impairment. "Auditorily 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. A child who manifests the characteristics of autism after age three may be classified as autistic if the criteria in this paragraph are met. 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, assessment by a certified speech-language specialist and assessment to establish the educational impact are 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 characterized by having limited strength, vitality or alertness, including a heightened alertness with respect to the educational environment, due to chronic or acute health problems, such as attention deficit disorder or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, 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, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia.

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.

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), deleted a reference to adult students; in (c)2, added a fifth sentence; in (c)4, substituted references to assessment for references to evaluation; and rewrote (c)8 and the introductory paragraph of (c)11.

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).

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 regulation requiring that copies of evaluation tests and documentation of eligibility be given to parents at eligibility conference violated provision of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requiring that such tests and documentation be provided to parents upon their completion, especially in the absence of any state requirement that materials be made available in parents' native language; IDEA and federal regulations required that tests and documentation be provided to parents in advance of eligibility meeting to permit parents' meaningful participation. *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

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).

Sufficient data supporting classification justifies school board's request to classify student as emotionally disturbed. *Clifton Board of Education v. J.T.*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 121.

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 nonconsensual 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-M 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.

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) 29.

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. Bernardville 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) As part of any reevaluation, 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 on the student, including:

- i. Evaluations and information provided by the parents;
- ii. Current classroom based assessments and observations; and
- iii. Observations by teachers and related services providers; and

2. On the basis of that review, and input from the student's parents, the IEP team shall identify what additional data, if any are 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.

3. 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;

4. If additional data are needed, the IEP team shall determine which child study team members and/or specialists shall administer tests and other assessment procedures to make the required determinations in (b)2i through iv above.

(c) Prior to conducting any assessment as part of a reevaluation of a student with a disability, the district board of education shall obtain consent from the parent 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, except that a reevaluation shall not be required before the termination of a student's eligibility under this chapter due to graduation or exceeding age 21.

(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.

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.

(g) By June 30 of a student's last year of eligibility for 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).

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

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

Rewrote (b); amended (c) and (e); in (f)1, deleted "or adult student" following "parent" in the second sentence; added (g).

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. Hadonfield 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. Runnemed 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.

Returning child to mainstream school; child was no longer multiply handicapped. *D.F. v. Carteret Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 19.

Classification of neurologically impaired student changed to emotionally disturbed. *D.I. v. Teaneck*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 237.

6A:14-3.9 (Reserved)

Repealed by R.2001 d.17, effective January 2, 2001.

See: 32 N.J.R. 3695(a), 33 N.J.R. 31(a).

Section was "Related services".

SUBCHAPTER 4. PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION

6A:14-4.1 General requirements

(a) Each district board of education shall provide educational programs and related services for students with disabilities required by the individualized education programs of those students for whom the district board of education is responsible.

(b) A district board of education proposal to establish, change or eliminate special education programs or services shall be approved by the Department of Education through its county offices.

(c) The length of the school day and the academic year of programs for students with disabilities, including preschoolers with disabilities, shall be at least as long as that established for nondisabled students.

(d) Programs for preschoolers with disabilities shall be in operation five days per week, one day of which may be used for parent training and at least four days of which shall provide a minimum total of 10 hours of student instruction, with the following exception:

1. Preschool disabled classes shall operate at least as long as any district program for nondisabled preschoolers, but not less than 10 hours per week.

(e) If a classroom aide is employed, he or she shall work under the direction of a principal, special education teacher, general education teacher or other appropriately certified personnel in a special education program. The job description of a classroom aide shall be approved by the Department of Education through its county offices.

(f) Physical education services, specially designed if necessary, shall be made available to every student with a disability age five through 21, including those students in separate facilities.

(g) When a student with a disability transfers from one New Jersey school district to another or from an out-of-State school district to a New Jersey school district, the child study team of the district into which the student has transferred shall conduct an immediate review of the evaluation information and the IEP.

1. If the parents and the district agree, the IEP shall be implemented as written.

2. The student shall immediately be provided a program through an interim IEP that is consistent with the current IEP when:

- i. The district disagrees with the current evaluation and/or the current individualized education program;
- ii. The parent disagrees with the proposed revisions to the individualized education program; and/or
- iii. Supplemental evaluations are required.

3. When the records from the previous school district are incomplete or not available, the district shall immediately place the student into an interim educational program consistent with the available information. The district shall complete any evaluations and develop or revise the IEP without delay.

(h) When the IEP of a student with a disability does not describe any restrictions, the student shall be included in the regular school program provided by the district board of education.

1. When instruction in health, industrial arts, fine arts, music, home economics, and other regular education programs is provided to groups consisting solely of students with disabilities, the size of the groups and age range shall conform to the requirements for special class programs described in this subchapter. An exception to the age range and group size requirements may be requested by

writing to the Department of Education through the county office according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.10.

2. When students with disabilities participate in physical education, intramural and interscholastic sports, non-academic and extracurricular activities in groups consisting solely of students with disabilities, the age range and group size shall be based on the nature of the activity, needs of the students participating in the activity and the level of supervision required.

(i) Each district board of education, through appropriate personnel, shall establish and implement a plan to evaluate special education programs and services according to N.J.S.A. 18A:7A-10, 11, 14, and 14.1 and this chapter.

(j) Each district board of education shall ensure that all students with disabilities have available to them the variety of educational programs and services available to nondisabled students.

(k) The district board of education shall provide the parent with the opportunity to observe the proposed educational placement prior to implementation of the IEP.

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

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

In (c), inserted a reference to preschoolers with disabilities; in (d), inserted "with the following exception" in introductory paragraph and added 1; in (g)2, added "immediately"; in (k), deleted a reference to adult student.

Case Notes

Former standard of service for local school bds. incorporated into the Federal Education of the Handicapped Act. Bd. of Educ. of E. Windsor Regional School v. Diamond, 808 F.2d 987 (3rd Cir.1986).

Regulatory description of appropriate educational program being one in the least restrictive environment found to mean least even in which educational progress rather than regression can take place. Bd. of Educ. of E. Windsor Regional School District v. Diamond, 808 F.2d 987 (3rd Cir.1986).

Focus in determining appropriateness of program is on program offered. Lascari v. Board of Educ. of Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School Dist., 116 N.J. 30, 560 A.2d 1180 (1989).

Student entitled to same-sex aide for personal care during overnight camping trip. M.W. v. Shamong Township Board of Education, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 102.

Petition regarding responsibility for costs of special education student's academic program was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction; allocation of costs was provided for in contract, and Commissioner of Education cannot decide issues of contract law. Cherry Hill v. Borough of Haddonfield, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDU) 1032.

Handicapped child entitled to same number of school hours offered to non-handicapped children of same age. D.S. v. Cresskill Board of Education, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 379.

Failure to show that special education student had substantially regressed during the summer supported denial of extended school year services. S.T. v. Ewing Board of Education, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 283.

Adverse outcome of prior federal lawsuit brought by handicapped former student against school board for failure to comply with IEP barred current action by student against board. E.A. v. Willingboro Township Board of Education, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 113.

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.

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.

Educational placement out of district was appropriate for perceptually impaired student's educational needs despite parent's noncooperation. P.M. v. Brick Township Board, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 201.

Residential placement for multiply handicapped child with various diagnosed disorders ranging from loving to potentially injurious was only appropriate placement in least restrictive environment. Z.D. v. Fort Lee Board v. 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 193.

Services of education expert for special education child with maladaptive behavior were no longer necessary. Services of B.L. v. Englewood City Board, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 125.

Student with multiple disabilities required extra year of special education due to chronic absenteeism. G.K. v. Roselle Borough, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 86.

Placement out-of-district was not appropriate for handicapped child when opportunities in district were equal. L.A. v. Union County, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 78.

Provision of all special education services based upon 180-day school year. S.M. v. Township Board of Education, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 176.

Residential school placement; behavioral problems manifested only in the home environment. R.W. v. Howell Township Board of Education, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 39.

Multiply handicapped student; transportation by bus company other than one retained by school board. N.S. v. Trenton Board of Education, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 36.

Removal of an emotionally disabled child from a private school and placing him in public school was not detrimental. In the Matter of J.C., 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 15.

Placement of an emotionally handicapped and learning disabled child in a special education program was warranted. Ewing Township Board of Education v. J.R., 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 11.

Constant attention by a registered or licensed practical nurse required by a severely handicapped student was a medical need. C.F. v. Roxbury Township Board of Education, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 6.

School board would not be liable for expenses of student's attendance at private unapproved placement. C.D. v. Wanaque Board of Education, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 304.

Program provided by school board; appropriate for child's learning disability. J.M. v. Manville Bd. of Educ., 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 100.

Board of education had appropriately addressed visually impaired 19-year-old's educational, occupational therapy, mobility and other needs; no obligation to provide special education services following graduation. L.I. v. Montville Board of Education, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 1.

Changing placement of 10-year-old Downs Syndrome student to in-district special education class was not warranted. Lakewood Board of Education v. M.C., 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 744.

Petitioners' action to require local school board to pay residential costs and tuition retroactively denied. M.B., Through His Parents, R.B. and J.B. v. Bernards Twp. Bd. of Educ., 9 N.J.A.R. 179 (1985).

Regulations contain standards for provision of remedial and auxiliary services to non-public school students; future contract for such services forbidden due to contractor's financial standing and fiscal practices. New Jersey Education Assn. v. Essex Cty. Educational Services Commission, 5 N.J.A.R. 29 (1981).

Petitioners' action to require local school board to pay residential costs and tuition retroactively, for out-of-state placement in a private residential school for their 13 year old son, classified as neurologically impaired, denied; finding that local board had attempted to provide a free appropriate education, with personalized instruction and sufficient support services to allow the child to benefit educationally. *M.B., Through His Parents, R.B. and J.B. v. Bernards Twp. Bd. of Educ.*, 9 N.J.A.R. 179 (1985).

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).

Parents not entitled to reimbursement for private school tuition following unilateral withdrawal of pupil from special education program. *Robinson v. Goodwin*, 1975 S.L.D. 6.

6A:14-4.4 Program criteria: speech-language services

(a) Speech-language services provided to a student with a disability shall be in addition to the regular instructional program and shall meet the following criteria:

1. Speech-language services shall be given individually or in groups.
 - i. The size and composition of the group shall be determined by the IEP team in accordance with the speech-language needs of the student(s) with educational disabilities and shall not exceed five students.
2. Speech-language services shall be provided by a certified speech-language specialist as defined in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.3.

6A:14-4.5 Program criteria: supplementary instruction

(a) Supplementary instruction shall be provided to students with disabilities in addition to the primary instruction for the subject being taught. The program of supplementary instruction shall be specified in the student's IEP.

(b) A teacher providing supplementary instruction shall be appropriately certified either for the subject or level in which instruction is given or as a teacher of the handicapped according to the requirements of N.J.A.C. 6:11.

(c) Supplementary instruction shall be provided individually or in groups according to the numbers for support resource programs.

(d) Supplementary instruction and replacement resource program shall not be provided by the same teacher during the same instructional period.

Case Notes

Replacement instruction more appropriate than in-class support for dyslexic student. *S.D. v. Washington Township (Gloucester County) Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 377.

Reimbursement of parent for costs of private tutoring for neurologically impaired child denied. *N.B. West Orange Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 86.

Reimbursement of past contributions toward costs of residential placement of autistic child and set-aside of lien filed against property for additional unpaid amounts was not appropriate. *S.P. v. Division of Youth and Family Services*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (DYF) 5.

School district was not liable for tutoring expenses for special education student. *L.M. v. Cranbury Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 4.

Third-grade student would be classified as perceptually impaired, and Individualized Education Program retaining her in regular classes with two hours of resource room would be implemented. *North Brunswick Board of Education v. S.S.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 27.

6A:14-4.6 Program criteria: resource programs

(a) Resource programs shall offer individual and small group instruction to students with disabilities. Resource programs may be provided in a regular class or in a pull-out resource program according to N.J.A.C. 6:22-5.4 and 5.5. When a resource program is provided, it shall be specified in the student's IEP. Resource programs shall provide support instruction or replacement instruction as defined in (e) and (f) below.

(b) The resource program teacher shall hold certification as a teacher of the handicapped. If the resource program solely serves students with a visual impairment, the teacher shall be certified as a teacher of blind or partially sighted. If the resource program solely serves students with an auditory impairment, the teacher shall be certified as a teacher of deaf and/or hard of hearing.

(c) A resource program teacher shall be provided time for consultation with appropriate general education teaching staff.

(d) An in-class resource program may be provided up to the student's entire instructional day. At the elementary level, a pull-out resource program may be provided for up to one half of the instructional day. At the secondary level, a pull-out resource program may be provided for up to the entire instructional day.

(e) In a support resource program, the student shall meet the regular education curriculum requirements for the grade or subject being taught. Modifications to the instructional strategies or testing procedures may be provided and, if provided, shall be provided in accordance with the student's IEP. The primary instructional responsibility for the student in a support resource program shall be the regular classroom teacher with input from the resource program teacher as specified in the student's IEP. A support resource program provided in the student's regular class shall be at the same time and in the same activities as the rest of the class.

(f) In a replacement resource program, the regular education curriculum and the instructional strategies may be modified based on the student's IEP. The resource program teacher shall have primary instructional responsibility for the student in the replacement resource program and shall consult with the regular classroom teacher as appropriate. In an in-class replacement resource program, only a single content area shall be taught to the group. A student receiving an in-class replacement program shall be included in activities such as group discussion, special projects, field

trips and other regular class activities as deemed appropriate in the student's IEP.

(g) The age span in an approved separate resource program shall not exceed four years.

(h) Group sizes for resource programs shall not exceed the limits listed below. Group size may be increased with the addition of an instructional aide, except where noted, according to the following:

Support	Preschool/Elementary		Secondary	
	No Aide	Aide Required	No Aide	Aide Required
In-class ¹	6	—	9	—
Pull-out				
Single subject	6	7 to 9	9	10 to 12
Multiple subject	6	7 to 9	6	7 to 9
Replacement	Preschool/Elementary		Secondary	
	No Aide	Aide Required	No Aide	Aide Required
In-class ²	3	—	3	—
Pull-out				
Single subject	6	7 to 9	9	10 to 12
Multiple subject ³	4	—	4	—

¹Group size for in-class support instruction shall not be increased, except according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.10.

²Group size for in-class replacement instruction shall not be increased, except according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.10.

³Group size for multiple subject pull-out replacement instruction shall not be increased except according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.10.

(i) In-class support and in-class replacement instruction may be provided only at the preschool or elementary level to students with disabilities by the same teacher during the same instructional period. Group size for this combined in-class resource program shall not exceed three students with disabilities.

(j) Pull-out support and pull-out replacement resource programs shall not be provided at the same time by the same teacher.

(k) Secondary resource programs shall be in schools in which any combination of grades six through 12 are contained and where the organizational structure is departmentalized for general education students.

(l) The district board of education may establish a team teaching model as an in-class resource program at the preschool or elementary level according to the following:

1. A regular education teacher and a special education teacher shall be assigned to the class full-time;
2. The total number of students with disabilities enrolled in the class who are receiving in-class resource instruction shall be limited to eight; and

3. The district board of education shall submit a description of the program to the Department of Education through the county office of education according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.1(b).

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

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

In (i), inserted "only at the preschool or elementary school level" following "provided", and substituted "three students with disabilities" for "five students with disabilities for the preschool, elementary or secondary level" at the end; and added (k).

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

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

Amended (f); added new (j); and recodified former (j) and (k) as (k) and (l).

6A:14-4.7 Program criteria: special class programs, secondary, and vocational rehabilitation

(a) A special class program shall serve students who have similar educational needs in accordance with their individualized education programs. Special class programs shall offer instruction in the core curriculum content standards unless the IEP specifies an alternative curriculum due to the nature or severity of the student's disability. The regular education curriculum and the instructional strategies may be modified based on the student's IEP. Special class programs shall meet the following criteria:

1. Depending on the disabilities of the students assigned to the special class program, the special class teacher shall hold certification as teacher of the handicapped, teacher of blind or partially sighted, and/or teacher of the deaf or hard of hearing;

2. The age span in special class programs shall not exceed four years; and

3. A special class program shall not be approved as a kindergarten.

(b) The special class programs listed below are organized to provide environments where the nature of the student's impairment is the primary focus. The district board of education shall develop a description of each special class program it provides. Special class programs for students with auditory impairments shall be instructed by a certified teacher of the deaf/hard of hearing.

1. The nature and intensity of the student's educational needs shall determine whether the student is placed in a program that addresses moderate to severe cognitive disabilities or severe to profound cognitive disabilities.

2. Special class programs for students with learning and/or language disabilities may be organized around the learning disabilities or the language disabilities or a combination of learning and language disabilities.

3. Instructional group sizes for preschool, elementary and secondary special class programs shall not exceed the limits listed below. The instructional group size may be increased with the addition of a classroom aide according to the numbers listed in Column III as follows:

I Program	II Instructional Size: No Classroom Aide Required	III Instructional Size: Classroom Aide Required
Auditory impairments	8	9 to 12

<u>I</u> Program	<u>II</u> Instructional Size:	<u>III</u> Instructional Size:
Autism ¹	3	4 to 6 7 to 9 (Secondary only; (Two aides required) 10 to 12
Behavioral disabilities	9	10 to 12
Cognitive ²		
Mild	12	13 to 16
Moderate	10	11 to 13
Severe	3	4 to 6 7 to 9 (Two aides required)
Learning and/or language disabilities		
Mild to moderate	10	11 to 16
Severe	8	9 to 12
Multiple disabilities	8	9 to 12
Preschool disabilities ³	—	1 to 8 9 to 12 (Two aides required)
Visual impairments	8	9 to 12

¹A program for students with autism shall maintain a student to staff ratio of three to one. For a secondary program, two classroom aides are required when the class size exceeds six students.

²A program for students with severe to profound cognitive disabilities shall maintain a three to one student to staff ratio.

³A classroom aide is required for a preschool classroom. Two aides are required when the class size exceeds eight students.

(c) Secondary special class programs are defined as programs which are located in schools in which there is any combination of grades six through 12 and where the organizational structure is departmentalized for general education students.

(d) In addition to the requirements for instructional size for special class programs according to (b)³ above, instruction may be provided in the following secondary settings as appropriate:

1. A class organized around a single content area consisting solely of students with disabilities instructed by a regular education teacher where an adapted general education curriculum is used shall have a maximum instructional size of 12. The instructional size may be increased with the addition of a classroom aide up to 16 students.

2. The number of students with disabilities in a regular education class instructed by a subject area teacher shall be limited to four, if significant program modification is required. The IEP shall specify the program modifications including the supplementary aids and services to ensure access to the general education curriculum.

(e) Vocational education programs shall meet the following criteria:

1. For the student placed in a vocational program outside of the local district, responsibility shall be as follows:

i. In a full-time county vocational school, all responsibility for programs and services rests with the receiving district board of education;

ii. In a shared-time county vocational school and in an area vocational technical school, primary responsibility rests with the sending district board of education. Vocational personnel shall participate in the IEP decisions; and

2. In vocational shop and related academic programs, class sizes shall be as follows:

i. For a class consisting of students with disabilities, the maximum class size with an aide shall not exceed 15. Class size shall not exceed 10 without the addition of an aide unless prior written approval of the Department of Education through its county office is granted according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.10. Requests for approval of a class size which exceeds 10 without an aide shall include, but not be limited to, a description of the following student needs and instructional considerations:

- (1) The nature and degree of the student's educationally disabling condition;
- (2) The interests, aptitudes and abilities of the student;
- (3) The functional level of the student;
- (4) The employment potential of the student;
- (5) The type of occupational area;
- (6) Instructional strategies;
- (7) Safety factors; and
- (8) Physical facility requirements.

(f) Secondary level students may be placed in community rehabilitation programs for vocational rehabilitation services according to the following:

1. Community rehabilitation programs shall be approved according to N.J.A.C. 12:51-11 by the New Jersey Department of Labor, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services to provide vocational evaluation, work adjustment training, job coaching, skill training, supported employment and time-limited job coaching;

2. Placement shall be made according to the student's IEP. The IEP shall specify the core curriculum content standards to be met and shall address how the instruction will be provided; and

3. Within 10 calendar days of placement in community rehabilitation facilities, the district board of education shall provide written notification of the placement to the county office.

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

In (b)3, divided the learning and/or language disabilities program category into Mild to moderate and Severe.
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)3; in (d)2, added second sentence.

Case Notes

State special education regulations governing placement of secondary-level students in community rehabilitation programs for vocational rehabilitation services, permitting students to be placed in programs approved by the state Division of Vocational Services (DVRs), were insufficiently broad to encompass placement in programs approved by agencies serving the blind or those so severely developmentally disabled as to be unemployable, as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). *Baer v. Klagholz*, 771 A.2d 603 (2001).

6A:14-4.8 Program criteria: home instruction

(a) A student classified as disabled shall have his or her IEP implemented through one to one instruction at home or in another appropriate setting when it can be documented that all other less restrictive programs options have been considered and have been determined inappropriate.

1. Prior written approval to provide home instruction shall be obtained from the Department of Education through its county office.

2. Approval may be obtained for a maximum of 60 calendar days at which time renewal of the request may be made. Each renewal of the approval may be granted for a maximum of 60 calendar days.

3. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.9(a)2, 3 and 4 shall apply.

4. Instruction shall be provided for no fewer than 10 hours per week. The 10 hours of instruction per week shall be accomplished in no fewer than three visits by a certified teacher on at least three separate days.

Case Notes

Classified student was properly placed on home instruction due to his disruptive behavior. *East Windsor Board of Education v. B.F.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 195.

Special education school's closure requires unprepared autistic student's home instruction under strict program until attainment of generalization. *J.S. v. High Bridge Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 68.

Home instruction was not better for student than placement in self-contained class for pupils having emotional difficulties. *Hamilton Township v. J.C.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 157.

Escalating misconduct warranted home instruction pending out-of-district placement for behavioral modification. *West Windsor v. J.D.*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 146.

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.

Placement of violent student in home study program pending results of child study team. *Oaklyn Bd. of Educ. v. C.G.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 97.

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.

Gifted student with cerebral palsy was entitled to home instruction as interim placement. *J.M. v. Woodcliff Lake Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (EDS) 249.

6A:14-4.9 Home instruction due to temporary illness or injury for students with or without disabilities

(a) To request home instruction due to temporary illness or injury, the parent shall submit a written determination from a physician documenting the need for confinement at the student's residence for at least a two week period of time. Home instruction for temporary illness or injury shall be provided according to the following:

1. The district board of education shall immediately forward the written request to the school physician, who shall verify the determination of the need for home instruction without delay;

2. Instructional services shall begin as soon as possible but no later than seven calendar days after the school physician's verification;

3. A record of the student's home instruction shall be maintained;

4. The teacher providing instruction shall be appropriately certified as teacher of the handicapped or for the subject or level in which the instruction is given;

5. Instruction shall be provided for no fewer than five hours per week. The five hours of instruction per week shall be accomplished in no fewer than three visits by a certified teacher on at least three separate days;

6. Instruction shall be provided at the student's place of confinement. If the student is confined to a hospital, convalescent home or other medical institution, the following criteria shall also apply:

i. Instruction shall be provided by a district board of education, educational services commission, State-operated facility, jointure commission or approved clinic or agency at the student's place of confinement;

ii. Instruction shall be provided through one to one instruction according to (a)5 above or through instruction to small groups as follows:

(1) When instruction is provided in a small group, the number of hours of instruction per week for the group shall be determined by multiplying the number of students in the group by five hours. The hours of instruction shall be provided in no fewer than three visits by a certified teacher on at least three separate days;

iii. Instruction may be provided by direct communication to a classroom program by distance learning devices. If provided, such instruction shall be provided in addition to the one to one according to (a)5 above or small group instruction according to (a)6ii above;

7. Students shall receive a program that meets the requirements of the district board of education for promotion and graduation;

8. For students with disabilities, the district shall provide a program that is consistent with the student's IEP to the extent appropriate. When the provision of home instruction will exceed 30 consecutive school days in a school year, the IEP team shall convene a meeting to review and if appropriate, revise the student's IEP; and

9. When a nondisabled student is confined at home or to a hospital by a physician for more than 60 calendar days, the school physician shall refer the student to the child study team according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.3(e).

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), deleted a reference to adult student in the introductory paragraph.

6A:14-4.10 Exceptions

(a) Exceptions for the age range and group sizes specified in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.4 through 4.7 shall be granted:

1. On an individual basis;
2. Only with prior written approval of the Department of Education through its county office; and
3. For a period not to exceed the balance of the school year.

(b) The county office shall determine whether the granting of the exception would interfere with the delivery of a free, appropriate public education to the student, or other students in the group and on that basis shall either:

1. Approve the request; or
2. Deny the request.

(c) If the request is denied, the district is still obligated to implement the IEP.

(d) The parent of a student with a disability for whom the exception is requested, and the parents of the students who are affected by the request for an exception shall be informed by the district board of education that such a request is being submitted to the county office of education.

(e) Upon approval of the exception by the county office, the district board of education or the appropriate education agency shall inform the parents of the students with disabilities who are affected by the exception.

(f) As of July 6, 1998, no waivers or equivalencies pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6:3A shall be granted to this chapter. Any waiver or equivalency previously granted under N.J.A.C. 6:3A for N.J.A.C. 6:28 shall expire on July 6, 1998.

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)3, substituted "the balance of the school" for "one" preceding "year"; and in (d), deleted a reference to adult student.

6A:14-4.11 Statewide assessment

(a) Students with disabilities shall participate in Statewide assessments according to the following:

1. Accommodations and/or modifications approved by the Department of Education for the administration of the Statewide assessment shall be provided in accordance with the student's IEP.

2. If the nature of the student's disability is so severe that the student is not receiving instruction in any of the knowledge and skills measured by the Statewide assessment and the student cannot complete any of the questions on the assessment in a subject area with or without accommodations, the student shall participate in a locally determined assessment of student progress.

3. By the year 2000, alternate assessments shall be administered by the Department of Education so that all students are included in the Statewide assessment system.

4. A student with a disability may participate in the Special Review Assessment for the High School Proficiency Test after one administration of the High School Proficiency Test when the student fails one or more sections of the test and when the IEP team determines that the student requires an alternate format to demonstrate the knowledge and skills measured by the High School Proficiency Test.

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

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

In (a)4, inserted "after one administration of the High School Proficiency Test when the student fails one or more sections of the test and" following "when".

6A:14-4.12 Graduation

(a) The IEP of a student with a disability who enters a high school program shall specifically address the graduation requirements. The student shall meet the high school graduation requirements according to N.J.A.C. 6A:8-5.1(c), except as specified in the student's IEP. The IEP shall specify which requirements would qualify the student with a disability for the State endorsed diploma issued by the school district responsible for his or her education.

(b) Graduation with a State endorsed diploma is a change of placement that requires written notice according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-2.3(e) and (f).

1. As part of the written notice, the parent shall be provided with a copy of the procedural safeguards statement published by the Department of Education.

2. As with any proposal to change the educational program or placement of a student with a disability, the parent may resolve a disagreement with the proposal to graduate the student by requesting mediation or a due process hearing prior to graduation.

3. In accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.8(e) a reevaluation shall not be required.

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

APPENDIX D

34 C.F.R. §§300.519 to 529—Discipline Procedures (64 Fed. Reg. 12453-12455, March 12, 1999)

Discipline Procedures**§ 300.519 Change of placement for disciplinary removals.**

For purposes of removals of a child with a disability from the child's current educational placement under §§ 300.520–300.529, a change of placement occurs if—

(a) The removal is for more than 10 consecutive school days; or

(b) The child is subjected to a series of 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 child is removed, and the proximity of the removals to one another.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k))

§ 300.520 Authority of school personnel.

(a) School personnel may order—

(1)(i) To the extent removal would be applied to children without disabilities, the removal of a child with a disability from the child's current placement for not more than 10 consecutive school days for any violation of school rules, and additional removals of not more than 10 consecutive school days in that same school year for separate incidents of misconduct (as long as those removals do not constitute a change of placement under § 300.519(b));

(ii) After a child with a disability has been removed from his or her current placement for more than 10 school days in the same school year, during any subsequent days of removal the public agency must provide services to the extent required under § 300.121(d); and

(2) A change in placement of a child with a disability to an appropriate interim alternative educational setting for the same amount of time that a child without a disability would be subject to discipline, but for not more than 45 days, if—

(i) The child carries a weapon to school or to a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or a local educational agency; or

(ii) The child knowingly possesses or uses illegal drugs or sells or solicits the sale of a controlled substance while at school or a school function under the jurisdiction of a State or local educational agency.

(b)(1) Either before or not later than 10 business days after either first removing the child for more than 10 school days in a school year or commencing a removal that constitutes a change of placement under § 300.519, including the action described in paragraph (a)(2) of this section—

(i) If the LEA did not conduct a functional behavioral assessment and implement a behavioral intervention plan for the child before the behavior that resulted in the removal described in paragraph (a) of this section, the agency shall convene an IEP meeting to develop an assessment plan.

(ii) If the child already has a behavioral intervention plan, the IEP team shall meet to review the plan and its implementation, and, modify the plan and its implementation as necessary, to address the behavior.

(2) As soon as practicable after developing the plan described in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, and completing the assessments required by the plan, the LEA shall convene an IEP meeting to develop appropriate behavioral interventions to address that behavior and shall implement those interventions.

(c)(1) If subsequently, a child with a disability who has a behavioral intervention plan and who has been removed from the child's current educational placement for more than 10 school days in a school year is subjected to a removal that does not constitute a change of placement under § 300.519, the IEP team members shall review the behavioral intervention plan and its implementation to determine if modifications are necessary.

(2) If one or more of the team members believe that modifications are needed, the team shall meet to modify the plan and its implementation, to the extent the team determines necessary.

(d) For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) *Controlled substance* means a drug or other substance identified under schedules I, II, III, IV, or V in section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)).

(2) *Illegal drug*—

(i) Means a controlled substance; but

(ii) Does not include a substance that is legally possessed or used under the supervision of a licensed health-care professional or that is legally possessed or used under any other authority under that Act or under any other provision of Federal law.

(3) *Weapon* has the meaning given the term "dangerous weapon" under paragraph (2) of the first subsection (g) of section 930 of title 18, United States Code.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(1), (10))

§ 300.521 Authority of hearing officer.

A hearing officer under section 615 of the Act may order a change in the placement of a child with a disability to

an appropriate interim alternative educational setting for not more than 45 days if the hearing officer, in an expedited due process hearing—

(a) Determines that the public agency has demonstrated by substantial evidence that maintaining the current placement of the child is substantially likely to result in injury to the child or to others;

(b) Considers the appropriateness of the child's current placement;

(c) Considers whether the public agency has made reasonable efforts to minimize the risk of harm in the child's current placement, including the use of supplementary aids and services; and

(d) Determines that the interim alternative educational setting that is proposed by school personnel who have consulted with the child's special education teacher, meets the requirements of § 300.522(b).

(e) As used in this section, the term *substantial evidence* means beyond a preponderance of the evidence.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(2), (10))

§ 300.522 Determination of setting.

(a) *General.* The interim alternative educational setting referred to in § 300.520(a)(2) must be determined by the IEP team.

(b) *Additional requirements.* Any interim alternative educational setting in which a child is placed under §§ 300.520(a)(2) or 300.521 must—

(1) Be selected so as to enable the child to continue to progress in the general curriculum, although in another setting, and to continue to receive those services and modifications, including those described in the child's current IEP, that will enable the child to meet the goals set out in that IEP; and

(2) Include services and modifications to address the behavior described in §§ 300.520(a)(2) or 300.521, that are designed to prevent the behavior from recurring.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(3))

§ 300.523 Manifestation determination review.

(a) *General.* If an action is contemplated regarding behavior described in §§ 300.520(a)(2) or 300.521, or involving a removal that constitutes a change of placement under § 300.519 for a child with a disability who has engaged in other behavior that violated any rule or code of conduct of the LEA that applies to all children—

(1) Not later than the date on which the decision to take that action is made, the parents must be notified of that decision and provided the procedural

safeguards notice described in § 300.504; and

(2) Immediately, if possible, but in no case later than 10 school days after the date on which the decision to take that action is made, a review must be conducted of the relationship between the child's disability and the behavior subject to the disciplinary action.

(b) *Individuals to carry out review.* A review described in paragraph (a) of this section must be conducted by the IEP team and other qualified personnel in a meeting.

(c) *Conduct of review.* In carrying out a review described in paragraph (a) of this section, the IEP team and other qualified personnel may determine that the behavior of the child was not a manifestation of the child's disability only if the IEP team and other qualified personnel—

(1) First consider, in terms of the behavior subject to disciplinary action, all relevant information, including —

(i) Evaluation and diagnostic results, including the results or other relevant information supplied by the parents of the child;

(ii) Observations of the child; and

(iii) The child's IEP and placement; and

(2) Then determine that—

(i) In relationship to the behavior subject to disciplinary action, the child's IEP and placement were appropriate and the special education services, supplementary aids and services, and behavior intervention strategies were provided consistent with the child's IEP and placement;

(ii) The child's disability did not impair the ability of the child to understand the impact and consequences of the behavior subject to disciplinary action; and

(iii) The child's disability did not impair the ability of the child to control the behavior subject to disciplinary action.

(d) *Decision.* If the IEP team and other qualified personnel determine that any of the standards in paragraph (c)(2) of this section were not met, the behavior must be considered a manifestation of the child's disability.

(e) *Meeting.* The review described in paragraph (a) of this section may be conducted at the same IEP meeting that is convened under § 300.520(b).

(f) *Deficiencies in IEP or placement.* If, in the review in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, a public agency identifies deficiencies in the child's IEP or placement or in their implementation, it must take immediate steps to remedy those deficiencies.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(4))

§ 300.524 Determination that behavior was not manifestation of disability.

(a) *General.* If the result of the review described in § 300.523 is a determination, consistent with § 300.523(d), that the behavior of the child with a disability was not a manifestation of the child's disability, the relevant disciplinary procedures applicable to children without disabilities may be applied to the child in the same manner in which they would be applied to children without disabilities, except as provided in § 300.121(d).

(b) *Additional requirement.* If the public agency initiates disciplinary procedures applicable to all children, the agency shall ensure that the special education and disciplinary records of the child with a disability are transmitted for consideration by the person or persons making the final determination regarding the disciplinary action.

(c) *Child's status during due process proceedings.* Except as provided in § 300.526, § 300.514 applies if a parent requests a hearing to challenge a determination, made through the review described in § 300.523, that the behavior of the child was not a manifestation of the child's disability.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(5))

§ 300.525 Parent appeal.

(a) *General.* (1) If the child's parent disagrees with a determination that the child's behavior was not a manifestation of the child's disability or with any decision regarding placement under §§ 300.520–300.528, the parent may request a hearing.

(2) The State or local educational agency shall arrange for an expedited hearing in any case described in paragraph (a)(1) of this section if a hearing is requested by a parent.

(b) *Review of decision.* (1) In reviewing a decision with respect to the manifestation determination, the hearing officer shall determine whether the public agency has demonstrated that the child's behavior was not a manifestation of the child's disability consistent with the requirements of § 300.523(d).

(2) In reviewing a decision under § 300.520(a)(2) to place the child in an interim alternative educational setting, the hearing officer shall apply the standards in § 300.521.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(6))

§ 300.526 Placement during appeals.

(a) *General.* If a parent requests a hearing or an appeal regarding a disciplinary action described in § 300.520(a)(2) or 300.521 to challenge

the interim alternative educational setting or the manifestation determination, the child must remain in the interim alternative educational setting pending the decision of the hearing officer or until the expiration of the time period provided for in § 300.520(a)(2) or 300.521, whichever occurs first, unless the parent and the State, agency or local educational agency agree otherwise.

(b) *Current placement.* If a child is placed in an interim alternative educational setting pursuant to § 300.520(a)(2) or 300.521 and school personnel propose to change the child's placement after expiration of the interim alternative placement, during the pendency of any proceeding to challenge the proposed change in placement the child must remain in the current placement (the child's placement prior to the interim alternative educational setting), except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section.

(c) *Expedited hearing.* (1) If school personnel maintain that it is dangerous for the child to be in the current placement (placement prior to removal to the interim alternative education setting) during the pendency of the due process proceedings, the LEA may request an expedited due process hearing.

(2) In determining whether the child may be placed in the alternative educational setting or in another appropriate placement ordered by the hearing officer, the hearing officer shall apply the standards in § 300.521.

(3) A placement ordered pursuant to paragraph (c)(2) of this section may not be longer than 45 days.

(4) The procedure in paragraph (c) of this section may be repeated, as necessary.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(7))

§ 300.527 Protections for children not yet eligible for special education and related services.

(a) *General.* A child who has not been determined to be eligible for special education and related services under this part and who has engaged in behavior that violated any rule or code of conduct of the local educational agency, including any behavior described in §§ 300.520 or 300.521, may assert any of the protections provided for in this part if the LEA had knowledge (as determined in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section) that the child was a child with a disability before the behavior that precipitated the disciplinary action occurred.

(b) *Basis of knowledge.* An LEA must be deemed to have knowledge that a child is a child with a disability if—

(1) The parent of the child has expressed concern in writing (or orally if the parent does not know how to write or has a disability that prevents a written statement) to personnel of the appropriate educational agency that the child is in need of special education and related services;

(2) The behavior or performance of the child demonstrates the need for these services, in accordance with § 300.7;

(3) The parent of the child has requested an evaluation of the child pursuant to §§ 300.530–300.536; or

(4) The teacher of the child, or other personnel of the local educational agency, has expressed concern about the behavior or performance of the child to the director of special education of the agency or to other personnel in accordance with the agency's established child find or special education referral system.

(c) *Exception.* A public agency would not be deemed to have knowledge under paragraph (b) of this section if, as a result of receiving the information specified in that paragraph, the agency—

(1) Either—

(i) Conducted an evaluation under §§ 300.530–300.536, and determined that the child was not a child with a disability under this part; or

(ii) Determined that an evaluation was not necessary; and

(2) Provided notice to the child's parents of its determination under paragraph (c)(1) of this section, consistent with § 300.503.

(d) *Conditions that apply if no basis of knowledge.* (1) *General.* If an LEA does not have knowledge that a child is a child with a disability (in accordance

with paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section) prior to taking disciplinary measures against the child, the child may be subjected to the same disciplinary measures as measures applied to children without disabilities who engaged in comparable behaviors consistent with paragraph (d)(2) of this section.

(2) *Limitations.* (i) If a request is made for an evaluation of a child during the time period in which the child is subjected to disciplinary measures under § 300.520 or 300.521, the evaluation must be conducted in an expedited manner.

(ii) Until the evaluation is completed, the child remains in the educational placement determined by school authorities, which can include suspension or expulsion without educational services.

(iii) If the child is determined to be a child with a disability, taking into consideration information from the evaluation conducted by the agency and information provided by the parents, the agency shall provide special education and related services in accordance with the provisions of this part, including the requirements of §§ 300.520–300.529 and section 612(a)(1)(A) of the Act.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(8))

§ 300.528 Expedited due process hearings.

(a) Expedited due process hearings under §§ 300.521–300.526 must—

(1) Meet the requirements of § 300.509, except that a State may provide that the time periods identified in §§ 300.509(a)(3) and § 300.509(b) for purposes of expedited due process hearings under §§ 300.521–300.526 are not less than two business days; and

(2) Be conducted by a due process hearing officer who satisfies the requirements of § 300.508.

(b)(1) Each State shall establish a timeline for expedited due process hearings that results in a written decision being mailed to the parties within 45 days of the public agency's receipt of the request for the hearing, without exceptions or extensions.

(2) The timeline established under paragraph (b)(1) of this section must be the same for hearings requested by parents or public agencies.

(c) A State may establish different procedural rules for expedited hearings under §§ 300.521–300.526 than it has established for due process hearings under § 300.507.

(d) The decisions on expedited due process hearings are appealable consistent with § 300.510.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(2), (6), (7))

§ 300.529 Referral to and action by law enforcement and judicial authorities.

(a) Nothing in this part prohibits an agency from reporting a crime committed by a child with a disability to appropriate authorities or to prevent State law enforcement and judicial authorities from exercising their responsibilities with regard to the application of Federal and State law to crimes committed by a child with a disability.

(b)(1) An agency reporting a crime committed by a child with a disability shall ensure that copies of the special education and disciplinary records of the child are transmitted for consideration by the appropriate authorities to whom it reports the crime.

(2) An agency reporting a crime under this section may transmit copies of the child's special education and disciplinary records only to the extent that the transmission is permitted by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

(Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1415(k)(9))