

State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. EDS 19406-15

AGENCY DKT. NO. 2016 23585

C.J. on behalf of A.D.,

Petitioner,

v.

WILLINGBORO TOWNSHIP

BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Respondent.

C.J., on behalf of A.D., petitioner, pro se

Kim C. Belin, Esq., for respondent (Florio, Perruci, Steinhardt & Fader, attorneys)

Record Closed: January 18, 2017

Decided: February 10, 2017

BEFORE **SOLOMON A. METZGER**, ALJ t/a:

This matter arises out of a claim filed with the Department of Education by C.J., on behalf of her daughter A.D., asserting violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C.A. §1400 to 1487 (IDEA) and associated regulations. The Department transmitted the matter to the Office of Administrative Law for determination. Petitioner seeks; compensatory education for failure to provide a free appropriate education (FAPE), tuition reimbursement for a unilateral placement, transportation expenses and recreational and enrichment services.

Certain facts are either stipulated or undisputed. A.D. was born on August 15, 2003, and she entered Willingboro School District in September 2012 as a fourth grade student. She resided previously in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. A.D. has a hearing deficit in the left ear and uses a Frequency Modulation (FM) system in school to amplify sound. This requires the teacher to wear a microphone and A.D. to wear earphones or an earpiece. The use of this system began in Philadelphia and continued in Willingboro. A.D. entered the District as a regular education student. Audiological testing in January 2013 confirmed a profound deficit in the left ear. A 504 Plan, under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C.A. 794 et seq., was devised in March 2013 to accommodate use of the FM System and modifications were introduced. These included seating near the teacher, additional attention, and extended time for assignments. A.D.'s report cards were disappointing in fourth grade. In May 2013 the parties moved to develop an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for fifth grade; the 2013/14 school year. The regular education setting was retained in accordance with petitioner's preference. The program was revised in November 2013 to substitute inclusion classes, which are considered special education. This program mixes regular and special education students and has the benefit of two teachers in the room. The lead teacher presents the general lesson and the second teacher, trained in special education, assures that modifications such as prompting, immediate feedback, special directions and positive reinforcement, are appropriately delivered. For sixth grade, inclusion classes were continued. The District's proposed IEP for seventh grade, prepared in May 2015, continued inclusion classes with modifications and added counseling. Other CST members recommended a smaller group setting, but petitioner did not agree. The IEP also made specific the requirement that A.D. be responsible for the FM System and added instructions to teachers for prompting A.D. to get the System if she forgets to bring it to class. Petitioner was dissatisfied both with the IEP and with the District's performance to that point and she removed A.D. from the District. For seventh grade, the 2015/16 school year, A.D. attended the Pope John Paul II School (PJP), a sectarian regular education organization. Although petitioner notified the District of her intention to remove A.D. she did not contemporaneously demand reimbursement for a unilateral placement.

Abdel Gutierrez is the Director of Special Services in the Willingboro District. He was called to testify by both sides. Mr. Gutierrez related that students needing an FM System are not necessarily classified under the IDEA. When A.D. arrived in 2012 she had a draft IEP from Philadelphia, but that did not immediately give rise to evaluation by the Child Study Team (CST). She was placed in general education classes. A.D. had an FM System and at some point it broke; the District supplied a substitute. There are other students in the District that use FM Systems and these devices are available. They are loaned to the student at the beginning of the school year and are to be returned at the end of the year. A.D. was responsible to carry the FM System from class to class and make sure it was charged. Mr. Gutierrez testified that the FM System is simple to operate, akin to a walkie-talkie.

Fay Whitaker is a school social worker and member of the Child Study Team (CST). She was case manager for A.D. in 2013, during fourth grade. A.D. was receiving failing grades in math and reading and this initiated the classification process. Ms. Whitaker performed a social assessment in June 2013. She spoke with A.D. several times about using the FM system and relayed this to petitioner as well.

Linda Headley is a Learning Disabilities Teacher Consultant (LDTC) and member of the CST. She evaluated A.D. in May 2013 and found no learning disability. Ms. Headley was mindful; however, that a separate cognitive assessment had reported a full-scale IQ of 77. That resulted in program modifications supporting focus and information retention. Nonetheless, the most presenting difficulty was hearing.

Patricia Neiswender has taught in the Willingboro District since 2000. She taught A.D. during the 2014/15 school year in the sixth grade reading class. This was a small group of about a dozen students and was designed for those at least two grades below level in reading. Ms. Neiswender testified that A.D. read at a second-grade level and overall received a grade of "C". She was capable of good effort, but could also be distracted and disruptive. There were times when A.D. did not bring her FM system to class, or failed to charge it in advance. Other than instances of that kind, Ms.

Neiswender testified that she used the System. The FM System was helpful to A.D. during lecture-type instruction, but class activities were more often arranged around individual reading or computer time, where the system was unnecessary.

Patricia Crawford is a special education teacher and has been with the District for about sixteen years. During the 2014/15 school year she was the inclusion teacher for sixth grade science and social studies. A lead teacher was in charge of the class as a whole and Ms. Crawford moved about the room to insure that the special education students were receiving the extra help they needed. A.D. was inconsistent in academic performance and behavior. There were times when A.D. would not use the FM system and her cooperation could not be compelled. Ms. Crawford believed A.D. was self-conscious about the device. Ms. Crawford testified that she spoke with or e-mailed petitioner on a number of occasions asking her to reinforce the use of the FM System.

Mark Odenheimer was A.D.'s sixth grade math teacher in an inclusion class. A.D. received a "D" for the year and had some conduct infractions. He understood that A.D. was to have the FM System with her ready to use. She sometimes failed to bring it to class, or had not charged it, or simply didn't wear it. Mr. Odenheimer testified that he e-mailed petitioner about this, but she seemed to feel he was the problem. Mr. Odenheimer denied any knowledge of an incident in which he accidentally damaged the FM System by spilling water on it.

Douglass Key has been a school counselor in Willingboro for some sixteen years. He spoke often with A.D. during the 2014/15 school year about the importance of using the FM System. She frequently charged the System in his office, but then did not return for it. Teachers would inform him that A.D. either did not bring the FM System to class, or wasn't using it; he relayed the information to her case manager. Occasionally A.D. would say that she preferred not to use the FM System. At one point there was a problem with another student teasing her about the System and a mediation session with that student followed.

Petitioner also presented a series of witnesses. A.D. was age thirteen at the time of her testimony in August 2016. A.D. related that she liked using the FM System, brought it to classes, and wore the earpieces. Generally the teachers did not wear the microphone. This non-compliance by the teachers made it difficult to hear and she became frustrated and angry. Further, the teachers weren't helpful even when she asked for assistance. A.D. testified that she was not responsible for charging the system and never brought it home. It was available in her first class and she walked around with it from class to class. At the end of the day she left it. A.D. testified that she was not permitted to go on class trips owing to behavior issues. On one occasion when she was seated near Mr. Odenheimer's desk he spilled water all over his papers and it flowed onto the FM System. Thereafter, the System stopped functioning. He told her not to tell her mother or he would lose his job.

A.D. testified that once she arrived at PJP for seventh grade, matters improved. Although she did not have an FM System for the first half of the school year, once it was provided the teachers used it and she was much happier. The other students were curious about the FM System, but in a positive way.

Kathleen Lewis holds a Doctorate in Clinical Audiology. She first saw A.D. in 2005. Dr. Lewis opined that children with profound unilateral hearing loss tend to have difficulty in school. Background noise blurs sound and they can feel isolated and seem "spaced out." The FM System as well as supports are recommended. Dr. Lewis thought that seat positioning in class as well as small class size would be helpful. She was unaware of the specific circumstances of A.D.'s educational history. Dr. Lewis thought that A.D. would need to be vigilant when crossing streets, roller-blading, or engaging in like activities.

Catherine Zagola is the principal at PJP. She recalled that A.D. had some adjustment issues at the outset, but by the end of the school year was more aligned with the program. Ms. Zagola recalled that the FM System arrived for A.D. sometime in April 2016 and the teachers and students accepted it without incident. The final grades

that A.D. received in seventh grade were generally in the range of "C." Ms. Zagola was aware that petitioner preferred to have her daughter in general education classes.

Eileen Wachter is a school psychologist and member of the Burlington County Special Services Unit. She serves on the non-public school CST, which is contracted to PJP. A triennial evaluation was undertaken for A.D. in the summer of 2016, following seventh grade and an Individual Service Plan (ISP) was developed. This is used for non-public school students, but does not provide for special education services as would an IEP. The ISP included modifications like reinforcement of ideas, visual and verbal cues, organizational support, extended test times, use of a calculator, and clear rules. Ms. Wachter thought these were similar to the modifications crafted by the Willingboro CST. Ms. Wachter testified that A.D.'s teachers at PJP had an extensive list of ongoing concerns about her that included hyperactivity, aggression, manipulation, and disobedience. They also reported that she was easily redirected. Ms. Wachter offered that in her experience students that use an FM System are responsible for bringing it to school, carrying it from class to class, and charging it. She opined as well that a student cannot be made to wear the FM earpieces.

Lisa Bungarden is certified as a school social worker and is employed by the Burlington County Educational Services Unit. She met with groups of seventh graders at PJP for about thirty minutes per week to develop social skills. Initially, A.D. was a bit disruptive, but over time she adjusted and contributed well to group discussions.

Susan Barrall is a special education teacher employed by the Burlington County Special Services Unit. She was assigned to PJP and worked with A.D. on speech and language. Sometime in April 2016 she began to show improvement and Ms. Barrall attributed it to introduction of the FM System. She acknowledged that the progress might also reflect developmental maturity.

Richard Bernstein operates the Huntington Learning Center in Cherry Hill, New Jersey, where A.D. was tutored during the summer of 2015. Mr. Bernstein was not

A.D.'s tutor and did not perform the testing done by the Center. The records reflect that she was performing below grade level; he was unfamiliar with her cognitive profile.

Petitioner also testified. A.D. was classified in Philadelphia and had an IEP. Initially she brought a draft document to Willingboro, but then returned with the actual IEP. A.D. was not behind in her school work in Philadelphia and although grades could fluctuate she mainly performed well. Petitioner did not believe it was appropriate for the District to make A.D. responsible for charging and transporting the FM System to classes. The behavior and learning problem's A.D. experienced during her three years in Willingboro were primarily caused by the staff's unwillingness to use the FM System. Petitioner testified that during fourth grade she went to the school thirty-one times to inquire why the FM System wasn't being used; she maintained a log. At some point in 2015 there was a meeting with the teachers, who agreed to carry their part of the FM System and hand it off to the next teacher as the day progressed. Petitioner testified that Dr. Dorvill, the 2014/15 case manager, confirmed that the District had investigated and that students in Mr. Odenheimer's class had seen him spill water onto the FM System. Moreover, petitioner took the system to a repair shop and they found that it had been damaged beyond repair by water.

Petitioner testified that her dissatisfactions with the District's failures around the FM System led her to PJP. There her daughter was happier and improved performance followed.

Petitioner testified as well that the refusal to take A.D. on school trips and her exclusion from school dances was a form of social isolation. In rebuttal Sabina Sanders, the fifth grade general education teacher, testified that the class went to Sandy Hook National Seashore at the end of the school year and she has no recollection of A.D. being excluded. A record would typically exist in such circumstances and there is none. Similarly Marie Brown, the sixth grade inclusion teacher, went to Washington D.C. with the class and has no awareness that A.D. was excluded for behavior.

Alberto Silva, the transportation coordinator for Willingboro, testified that petitioner's address is 1.4 miles from PJP. Remote bussing for primary school children begins at two miles from school.

This is the substance of the record.

The IDEA establishes a floor of opportunity for children with disabilities and thus the IEP must be reasonably calculated to deliver meaningful educational benefit, Hendrick Hudson Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Rowley, 458 U.S. 176 (1982); Chambers v. Sch. Dist. of Philadelphia Bd. of Educ., 587 F.3d 176 (3rd Cir. 2009). Material failure in IEP implementation can be construed as a failure of FAPE, Van Duyn v. Baker Sch. Dist. 5J, 481 F.3d 770 (9th Cir. 2007). The threshold finding of FAPE deprivation must precede consideration of reimbursement for a unilateral placement, see Forest Grove Sch. Dist. V. T.A., 557 U.S. 230 (2009). The burden of proof rests with the District, N.J.S.A. 18A:46-1.1.

Petitioner did not attack the adequacy of the IEP's developed over the three years in which A.D. attended the Willingboro Schools. All agree that the FM System is appropriate and that oftentimes it was not used. The central question posed by the record is whether the District is primarily at fault for this uneven implementation. The testimony is starkly contrasted. From the District's perspective A.D. arrived in Willingboro in the summer of 2012 for fourth grade as a general education student with an FM System. In 2013, following testing, an IEP was developed that classified A.D. as hearing impaired for fifth grade and she remained in general education. A.D.'s IEP was further modified in November 2013 to substitute inclusion classes. There it was thought she could benefit from further supports that reinforced information retention. There was a second teacher in the room trained in special education. The teachers and administrators related that A.D. was uncooperative. She frequently failed to bring the FM System to school, or had not charged it, or wouldn't wear it. To both petitioner and her daughter District personnel flouted the requirements of the IEP. Petitioner believes that any behavioral shortcomings that arose in Willingboro were chiefly occasioned by teacher failure to use the FM System. This was an ongoing source of irritation to A.D.

Moreover, petitioner questioned the wisdom of having the student be responsible for the System.

I underscore that I did not hear the witnesses and am reconstructing facts from the dry record. That said, in the absence of substantial corroboration, the story told by petitioner and A.D. is improbable. It suggests with minor exception that an entire staff of teachers, counselors and CST members were oblivious to the central IEP requirement for use of the FM System. None served as a check on others and more generally these personnel were unhelpful, or insincere. Though the record is extensive, the motive for so widespread a dereliction is not plain¹. The exhibits present a staff that prepared multiple IEP's, met with petitioner, and exchanged a great many e-mails with her. There is no suggestion in these documents that the District was unresponsive. The e-mails are mostly cordial and reflect the interactions of a concerned parent and a supportive staff. Some of the e-mails write past each other as staff relays that A.D. is non-compliant with the FM System and petitioner exhorts staff to use the System. Importantly, petitioner's critique of the implementation process rests extensively on the recollections of a child of thirteen with focus limitations, concerning details that occurred some years earlier. Except for the occasional class visit, petitioner did not witness the events that underlie her complaint. I find that A.D.'s IEP's were reasonably calculated to deliver FAPE and that school personnel stood ready and worked to implement these directions.

As to who should have been responsible to move and charge the System, the District's testimony is that it has other students using FM Systems and that the student is generally held to these tasks. Ms. Wachter, petitioner's witness and an experienced school psychologist, confirmed that this is the norm. Petitioner is entitled to dissent, but this record does not warrant counting the practice as a failing.

In assessing whether there has been a deprivation of FAPE it can be useful to look at grades. A.D.'s third grade report card from Philadelphia shows a B-C student.

¹ Petitioner sought to introduce documents purporting to show that the District had general compliance issues within its special education program. These were largely excluded by Judge Bingham, but the record does reflect that any issues that had existed were largely corrected by the time A.D. entered fourth grade.

There was a severe drop off in performance when she entered fourth grade in the District, but then grades recovered to the B-C level and remained that way through the end of her tenure in District. Grades at PJP were in the B-C range. Petitioner sought to counter this data by suggesting that Willingboro's expectations for A.D. were set low, while they were high in Philadelphia and PJP. The record did not study this subject at any depth and curriculum evaluation involves an element of expertise. Petitioner opines as a parent, but a finding that grades in Willingboro skewed to the high side because expectations dropped, requires substantial proofs. Interestingly, petitioner relies to advantage upon declining fourth grade results, but discounts recovering grades.

The transcripts also reflect specific moments of weakness in petitioner's testimony. She offered that during the 2012/13 school year, A.D.'s fourth grade, she went to the school thirty-one times to prod the District to use the FM System. She knew the exact number because she kept a log. Judge Bingham inquired after the log, but it was not produced. Instead petitioner referenced a few e-mails concentrated in May/June 2013, in which she complained of a disappointing year. Another anomalous example is petitioner's testimony concerning the water spilling incident in Mr. Odenheimer's class. A.D. was the only witness to describe this event; Mr. Odenheimer denied any knowledge of it. Petitioner added that school personnel informed her that they had investigated and that children in the class had corroborated this story. An inquiry of this kind would typically give rise to documentation, particularly as expensive equipment was involved. Nothing to that effect was presented.

Petitioner also testified that she was quite satisfied with the program at PJP, that A.D. showed marked improvement there, and that the school diligently managed the FM System. Yet, it appears the FM System did not arrive at PJP until April 2016. The PJP report cards reflect grades roughly in line with 6th grade performance in Willingboro. Ms. Wachter reported that A.D.'s teachers had persistent concerns about her attitude and behavior. While it may be useful to accentuate the positive at PJP, the narrative is not fully aligned with the data.

The record did not assess alternate steps that might have been taken to induce A.D. to wear the FM System consistently. All of the witnesses who were asked testified that a child with a hearing deficit cannot be forced to comply. Beyond classroom modifications needed to assist with the hearing deficit, behavior plans and counseling can sometimes be employed to encourage compliance. Petitioner was opposed to such efforts, as she made plain in her e-mail of June 2, 2015, in reaction to the District's proposed May 2015 IEP. Petitioner was persuaded that this course misidentified the source of difficulty, i.e., teacher disinclination to use the FM System. C.J. was a member of the IEP team and the collaborative process suggests that her views be considered.

"Related services" under the IDEA can include transportation as needed by a child to attend a placement, N.J.A.C. 6A:27-5.1. There is nothing in any of A.D.'s IEP's that suggests she requires transportation. Moreover, it appears undisputed that the proximity of her residence to PJP does not trigger the general requirement for transporting children remote from school, N.J.S.A. 18A:39-1. The demand for compensatory education and enrichment services fall also with the District's showing that it provided FAPE.

Based on the foregoing, I **CONCLUDE** that the District has carried its burden of proof and this matter is **DISMISSED**.

This decision is final pursuant to 20 U.S.C.A. § 1415(i)(1)(A) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.514 (2016) and is appealable by filing a complaint and bringing a civil action either in the Law Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey or in a district court of the United States. 20 U.S.C.A. § 1415(i)(2); 34 C.F.R. § 300.516 (2016). If the parent or adult student feels that this decision is not being fully implemented with respect to program or services, this concern should be communicated in writing to the Director, Office of Special Education Programs.

February 10, 2017 _____
DATE

SOLOMON A. METZGER, ALJ t/a

Date Received at Agency _____

Date Mailed to Parties: _____

mph

WITNESSES:

For petitioner:

Abdel Gutierrez
A.D.
Richard Bernstein
C.J.
Catherine Zagola
Lisa Bungarden
Susan Barrall
Eileen Wachter
Kathleen Lewis

For respondent:

Abdel Gutierrez
Patricia Neiswender
Douglass Key
Patricia Crawford
Fay Whitaker
Linda Headley
Mark Odenheimer
Sabina Sanders
Marie Brown

EXHIBITS:

Joint Exhibits:

J-1 E-mail, C.J. to B. Haake, dated 1/3/13

- J-2 E-mails between B. Haake to C.J., dated 1/15/13
- J-3 E-mails between S. Sanders and C.J., dated 1/ 9 and 10/14
- J-4 E-mails between R. Abdalla to C.J., dated 5/26 and 27/14
- J-5 E-mails M. Brown to C.J., dated 10/7/14
- J-6 IEP, dated 11/14/13
- J-7 IEP, dated 8/23/13
- J-8 IEP, dated 5/27/15
- J-9, IEP, dated 5/20/13
- J-10 Re-evaluation Plan, dated 5/20/13
- J-11(a) Education Evaluation, dated 5/22/13
- J-11(b) Education Evaluation, dated 7/20/16
- J-12 Social Assessment, dated 6/14/13
- J-13 IEP, dated 9/4/13
- J-14 Consent Form, dated 9/4/13
- J-15 Speech and Language Evaluation, dated 9/12/13
- J-16(a) Psychological Evaluation, dated 6/10/13
- J-16(b) Psychological Evaluation, dated 7/21/16
- J-17 Pupil Records 2015/16 school year
- J-18 Individual Service Plan, dated 8/1/16
- J-19 Burlington County Educational Services Unit, dated 6/9/16
- J-20 E-mail exchange between Odenheimer and C.J., dated 8/8/16 and 12/19/14
- J-21 E-mail exchange between Odenheimer and C.J., dated 8/8/16 and 1/5/15
- J-22 E-mail exchange between Odenheimer and C.J., dated 8/8/16 and 1/30/15

For petitioner:

- P-1 Student profile, Philadelphia Schools, generated 4/12/16
- P-2 IEP, Philadelphia, date of creation 1/13/12 (some pages marked draft)
- P-3 Willingboro fifth grade report card, first marking period
- P-4 E-mail exchange between C.J. to B. Haake, dated 5/13/13

- P-5 Letter from C.J. to B. Haake, dated 5/28/13
- P-6 E-mail exchange between C.J. to F. Whitaker, dated 6/07/13
- P-7 E-mail exchange between C.J. to B. Haake, dated 11/06/13
- P-8 E-mail exchange between C.J. and S. Sanders, dated 1/10/13
- P-9 E-mail exchange between C.J. and District, dated 1/10/14
- P-10 E-mail exchange between C.J. and S. Sanders, dated 1/14/14
- P-11 E-mail exchange between S. Sanders and C.J., dated 1/15/15
- P-12 E-mail exchange between C.J. to S. Sanders, dated 1/21/14 and 1/22/14
- P-13 E-mail from C.J. to S. Sanders, dated 1/29/14
- P-14 E-mail exchange between C.J. & S. Sanders, 2/7/14
- P-15 E-mail exchange between C.J. and R. Abdalla, dated 2/9/14 and 2/10/14
- P-16 E-mail from C.J. to the District, dated 5/26/14
- P-17 E-mail exchange between C.J. & R. Abdalla, dated 5/27/14
- P-18 E-mail exchange between C.J., B. Haake and A. Lee, 9/26/14
- P-19 E-mail exchange between C.J. to F. Lombardo, dated 9/27/14 and 9/28/14
- P-20 E-mail exchange between C.J. & M. Baczynski, dated 10/9/14
- P-21 Handwritten letter from C.J. to B. Haake, dated 10/23/14
- P-22 E-mail exchange between C.J. and B. Haake, 10/20/14, 10/23/14 and 10/27/14
- P-23 E-mail exchange between C.H. and P. Neiswender, dated 11/17/14 and 11/18/14
- P-24 E-mail from M. Brown to C.J., dated 11/24/14
- P-25 E-mail exchange between C.J. and M. Brown, dated 11/25/14
- P-26 E-mail exchange between C.J. and P. Neiswender, dated 1/21/15
- P-27 Inter-district Public School Choice form, dated 1/29/15
- P-28 E-mail from P. Neiswender to C.J., dated 1/30/15
- P-29 E-mail from P. Neiswender to C.J., dated 2/24/15
- P-30 E-mail from P. Crawford to C.J., dated 2/25/15
- P-31 E-mail R. Taylor to C.J., dated 3/16/16
- P-32 Email from P. Neiswender to C.J., dated 3/20/15
- P-33 E-mail from P. Neiswender to C.J., dated 3/24/15

- P-34 E-mail from M. Brown to C.J., dated 3/26/15
- P-35 E-mail from E. Reuben to C.J., dated 3/26/15
- P-36 E-mail from C.J. to P. Crawford, dated 5/6/15
- P-37 E-mail M. Brown to C.J., dated 5/7/15
- P-38 E-mail Neiswender & C.J. 5/12/15
- P-39 E-mail C.J. to staff, 5/21/15
- P-40 E-mail exchange C.J. & Willingboro, 5/25/15
- P-41 E-mail exchange Odenheimer & C.J., 5/22/15
- P-42 Letter Dorvil to C.J., 5/27/15
- P-43 Letter C.J. to District, 5/27/15
- P-44 Letter C.J. to Haake, 5/27/15
- P-45 E-mail exchange Neiswender & C.J., 5/28/15
- P-46 Letter C.J., 5/28/15
- P-47 E-mail C.J. to Odenheimer, 5/22/15
- P-48 E-mail C.J. to administration, 6/02/15
- P-49 E-mail C.J. to Crawford, 6/09/15
- P-50 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 6/11/15
- P-51 email C.J. to Gutierrez, 7/19/15
- P-52 email C.J. to Gutierrez, 9/8/15
- P-53 email D. Cabana to C.J., 12/22/15
- P-54 Burlington County Special Services Report, 6/09/16
- P-55 Burlington County Special Services Report, 2015/16
- P-56 Burlington County Special Services Report
- P-57 Excluded
- P-58, Dr. Lewis, Audiology report, 1/29/16
- P-59 Dr. Lewis, Audiology report, 4/21/15
- P-60 Article, American Speech & Language Association
- P-61 Huntington Learning Center test scores, 7/2/15
- P-62 Letter C. Zagola, 4/12/16
- P-63 A.D.'s FM System (not available)
- P-64 Not admitted
- P-65 Huntington Learning Center test results

P-75(a) Map depicting location, Steward School

P-75(b) Map depicting location PJP

P-76 OSEP monitoring report, 7/06/10

P-77 Report card, 2012/13 school year

For respondent:

R-1 Initial Registration Form, 8/27/12

R-2 504 Accommodation Plan, 3/26/13

R-3 Eligibility Form

R-4 IEP, 5/20/13

R-5 Reevaluation Plan, 5/20/13

R-6 Educational Evaluation, 5/22/13

R-7 Confidential Social Assessment, 6/14/14

R-8 Consent to Amend an IEP Without a Meeting, 9/4/13

R-9 Reevaluation/annual review, 9/04/13

R-10 IEP revision, 11/14/13

R-11 E-mail Haake to C.J. 5/14/13

R-12 School Assignment form, 11/15/13

R-13 Student discipline

R-14 2015 gradebook assignments

R-15 Student transfer card, 9/09/15

R-16 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 2/23/15

R-17 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 3/31/15

R-18 E-mail Neiswender to various recipients, 4/20/15

R-19 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 4/20/15

R-20 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 4/24/15

R-21 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 5/12/15

R-22 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 5/20/15

R-23 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 5/28/15

R-24 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 6/11/15

R-25 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 6/12/15

- R-26 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 2/03/15
- R-27 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 2/11/15
- R-28 Progress Report, grade 6, 1/27 through 2/27/15
- R-29 Progress Report, grade 6, 4/13 through 5/15/15
- R-30 Report card, grade 6, fourth marking period
- R-31 Progress report, grade 6, 11/10/14 through 12/12/14
- R-32 E-mail Sanders to C.J., 1/10/14
- R-33 E-mail C.J to staff, 6/08/15
- R-34 Hubsters Report, 3/24/16
- R-35 Annual IEP review, 10/15/14
- R-36 IEP revision, 10/15/14
- R-37 Progress report, grade 6, 9/04/14 through 10/03/14
- R-38 IEP
- R-39 Gradebook Assignments
- R-40 E-mail Neiswender to C.J., 10/31/14
- R-41 E-mail C.J. to multiple individuals, 11/17/14
- R-42(a) Letter of P. McDonald, 10/23/12
- R-42(b) Letter of P. McDonald, 5/07/12
- R-42(c) Letter of P. McDonald, 12/21/11
- R-43 Field Trip Request Form & Attendance Record
- R-44 Field trip roster sixth grade class trip
- R-45(a) Transport Request Form, 11/19/13
- R-45(b) Printout for A.D., 12/09/15
- R-45(c) Application for private school transportation