



State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

FINAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. EDS 11292-23

AGENCY DKT. NO. 2024-36543

T.W. AND T.W. ON BEHALF OF T.W.,

Petitioners,

v.

**MANTUA TOWNSHIP BOARD OF
EDUCATION, GLOUCESTER COUNTY,**

Respondent.

AND

T.W. AND T.W. ON BEHALF OF T.W.¹,

Petitioners,

v.

**MANTUA TOWNSHIP BOARD OF
EDUCATION, GLOUCESTER COUNTY,**

Respondent.

OAL DKT. NO. EDS 11295-23

AGENCY DKT. NO. 2024-36544

(CONSOLIDATED)

T.W. and T.W., parents, pro se

William C. Morlock, Esqs., for respondent (Gorman, D'Anella and Morlock, LLC,
attorneys)

Record Closed: May 28, 2024

Decided: July 12, 2024

BEFORE **CARL V. BUCK III, ALJ:**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

¹ In these two cases the parents (who have the same initials) have filed two separate actions contemporaneously. One action each for their two twin daughters. The first action, captioned EDS 11292-23, is for the first twin who will be referred to as "NW" due to a letter in her first name. The second action, captioned EDS 11295-23, is for the second twin who will be referred to as "LW" due to a letter in her first name. These actions were consolidated by me by Order, dated July 12, 2024.

This case² arises under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, 20 U.S.C. 1400 to 1482 (IDEA). Petitioners T.W. and T.W. filed actions on behalf of minor twin children T.W. and T.W.³. The students attended kindergarten in academic year 2021-2022, first grade in 2022-2023 (the first first grade), and were then retained in first grade in the current, 2023-2024 (the second first grade) academic year. Parents seek a finding that the special education and related services for the students' in their individual education programs (IEPs) proposed by the Mantua Township Board of Education (Mantua or Board or District) for the 2023-24 school year are:

1. Inappropriate and not geared toward providing the students with appropriate educational benefit;
2. Fail to confer a free, appropriate public education (FAPE);
3. Do not comply with the requirements of the IDEA.

Parents on behalf of their daughters argue that Mantua failed to offer the students a FAPE as it failed in disregarding parents' requests for assistance in the 2022-2023 academic year and filed due process petitions seeking, in part, elevation to the next grade and appropriate supports.

Respondent argues that the record demonstrates that the attempted activities of staff in the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 years were geared to providing FAPE and the activities in the 2023-2024 academic year and the IEPs in question provided a FAPE in the least restrictive environment (LRE) appropriate to the students' needs and an opportunity for meaningful learning based on their academic, social and emotional potential as students in the district

² Notwithstanding that this is a consolidation of two cases I reserve the right to refer to the case in the singular rather than the plural.

³ In this, the first instance where I have dealt with four individuals with the same initials, I will use the appellations "Mom", "Dad" (or jointly "Parents"), the children will be referred to as "LW" and "NW" due to letters in their respective names (or jointly "Students" or "daughters" or "girls").

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 13, 2023, petitioner filed a request for due process with the Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), which was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and filed as a contested matter on October 25, 2023. The companion case, as Docket EDS 11295-23 was filed on the same date.

On November 2, 2024 a settlement conference before The Honorable Dean J. Buono, ALJ was scheduled. The settlement conference did not achieve a settlement. On November 14, 2023, the parties appeared before me. After preliminary discussions the parties were unable to settle. A number of status/ settlement conferences hearings were held and the matter was scheduled for hearing on February 29, 2024. Petitioners requested an adjournment due to work concerns which concerns would not be resolved for several weeks and the matter was rescheduled for May 6, 2024. Shortly before this date petitioners contacted me to inform me that an additional adjournment may be needed due to jury duty. This was not the case and the matter proceeded on May 6, 2024.

Briefs were filed on May 28, 2024 and the record closed.

FACTUAL DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Issues Presented/Positions of the Parties

The dispute in this matter is whether the students have placed in the appropriate grade to provide them a FAPE in the LRE. Parents, in their filing, are asked to **“Provide a description of how this problem could be resolved”**. The response from the parents was “It can be resolve (sic) by our children being placed in their correct grade with specialized services.” The parents, therefore, are requesting that the students be elevated a grade level with services needed for them to succeed at that level.

Board contends that the students, by being retained at the first-grade level and being provided with services under an IEP, are being educated at a level needed to provide the students with a FAPE in the LRE.

Testimony

Respondent called four witnesses; petitioner testified on their behalf. The following is not a verbatim account of the testimony but a summary of the testimony and documentary evidence I found relevant to resolving the above-described issue. Note that the testimony offered by several witnesses (and particularly, that of respondent's witnesses) is corroborative.

Respondent's Witnesses

Katelyn Donocoff (Donocoff) is the kindergarten principal at Sewell Elementary School serving pre-school and kindergarten. She is state and nationally certified school psychologist and certified as a principal and has certificates in advanced graduate study in applied behavior analysis and has a standard principal certificate in NJ among other certifications.

Donocoff explained the multi-tiered interventions that were offered to the students, to include Basic Skills Instruction, as well as Intervention and Referral Services. She stated that the students did not go to pre-schools where most students learn to come to kindergarten with more skills, soft skills that teach them how to be students. They had no behavioral problems. The students needed assistance regarding basic skills which is a literacy intervention service at the beginning of the year that score lower on assessments where they may need assistance with developing. They came through the intervention and referral services (INS) team to assist students to make progress with their area of need in helping with evidence-based need. Students in preschool and kindergarten do not get IEP's due to their wide range of abilities. You don't jump to the most excessive system; you work on levels to see what the needs of the students are.

She testified to an intervention referral services referral and intervention plan for LW. (R-13.) The plan tells her the areas that the teachers identified as areas of need, information

regarding their assessment data, that they were referred to INS in November in their kindergarten year. LW received a number of assistance levels and basic skills instruction. She testified to an intervention referral services referral and intervention plan for NW. (R-27.) The plan tells her the areas that the teachers identified as areas of need, information regarding their assessment data, that they were referred to INS in November in their kindergarten year. NW received a number of assistance levels. She testified to a quantifiable retention scale regarding retention in a grade level (R-14) and what the students work on in kindergarten and early intervention benchmarks and social and emotional considerations. She referred to R-14 dealing with basic early literacy benchmarks taking factors such as age, social, emotional any other related concerns into consideration. They also hold a parent conference and get input from any relevant support staff, the teacher and then the school makes a recommendation to the parents. The students' skills are based on a standardized retention scale. The potential retention score for LW was a sixty which is indicated as retention should be considered. If parents had recommended retention also the score would be sixty-four. A handwritten note from the teacher says that mom did not recommend but is on board with retention. She testified to R-28 which is the same quantifiable retention scale for NW whose scoring summary result was sixty-five. She met with the parents in June of the girls' kindergarten year, and they were very collaborative in the meeting but disagreed with the skill levels of the girls and the indicators that the girls did not master early literacy skills. The parents were told that the school's recommendation was going to be retention for their kindergarten year and the parents did not want to come to a decision at that meeting they wanted to follow up with me. Mrs. W. reached out via email, and she had indicated that she did not want the girls retained for their kindergarten year.

Donocoff sent a spreadsheet of all students monitored by the intervention and referral services committee throughout the year to the first-grade principal Jenny Cavalieri and they also review this information in a meeting to ensure that students in first grade receive the services they need.

LW was noted as a September birthday, that NW and LW have low skills – and called for all around basic skills intervention tier three services. The school requested counseling for LW, and the parents would not consent. Donna Croft recommended retention for both girls at a retention conference on June 3, 2022, but the parents did not provide consent for retention or for the girls to attend summer school. NW was noted as having low skills all around and tier three

services. We requested a speech language consultation for NW and the parents would not consent. "Summer skills" is a program that is four weeks long in the summer at the elementary school and is offered to a small group of students so that they can maintain some structure on those early literacy skills so that they don't have a summer slide to keep skills current, but the parents did not agree to allow the students to go to this program.

Both principals testified that the students were young for their grades, having September birthdays, and that neither had formal schooling prior to kindergarten. That is why they both recommended retentions. Donocoff offered both students summer skills instruction, but the family declined. The concerns that were presented were developmental in nature and they were falling behind the others in the class.

Donocoff served as a member of the child study team for seven or eight years and performed in excess of a thousand evaluations and assisted in preparation of the same number of IEP's. She didn't recommend the students to the CST as she felt the girls were presenting that the concerns in kindergarten that were developmental in nature because for in relation to some of their peers they were almost a full-year younger. She was confident in making the retention recommendation to give them another year of kindergarten level instruction which would have ultimately helped prevent more intensive services down the line by really solidifying early literacy skills. She stated she stood by her decision to recommend speech skills, speech language consultation, summer skills and retention for the students. There was an alteration that the parents did agree to summer skills, but the girls did not attend as the parents retained a private tutor.

Jennifer Cavalieri (Cavalieri) is the principal at Center City Elementary School which is first, second and third grade. She reviewed her experience and a number of certificates pertinent to her employment. She expressed that the girls were wonderful loving students who are in their second year of first grade. Cavalieri could not say enough about how wonderful they both are. She stated in the first year they were provided with review of basic skills instruction and the tiers of instruction. She stated that basic skills is to fill in the gaps in holes of their education and to create building blocks for their future and that is the most appropriate action to take. In January or February of their first year we look at students to see if they are ready for the next year and at that point, she was made aware of the concerns of the girls. Retention is not taken lightly, and

we weigh all the standards and compare local and national scores. They look at age and maturity. The second year is going well with the girls making material improvement and she has heard that this is a good transition. Cavalieri explained the district's reasons for relying upon multi-tiered interventions instead of immediately referring the students for an IEP. Cavalieri stated she stood by her decision to recommend retention last year, but the girls are on track to proceed to second grade this year as they are making appropriate progress.

Dr. Stephanie Logan (Logan) the Mantua Director of Special Services testified to her background and certifications. She was admitted as an expert in special education, the identification of special education students, and special education timelines. She testified that the regulations allow twenty days to schedule a meeting once evaluations are requested, and that if evaluations are warranted and consent is obtained, the District has ninety days provided to evaluate and meet to review the same. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.3(e); N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.4(e). The fastest this timeline can occur is one-hundred and ten days.

Logan testified that when she received emails regarding requests for evaluations from the parents in April of 2023, the Students received their IEPs within the appropriate timelines. Petitioners stated they made a request on February 27, 2023, and Logan testified that even if that was the case, the combined one hundred and ten days to meet and evaluate would not have occurred until the day after school ended, meaning the students' IEPs would not have been in place until September of 2023, using either request date, and that is what occurred. Petitioners asked every respondent witness if they believed a referral for special education evaluations was made on February 27, 2023, and they all replied "no."

Logan described that petitioners withdrawing SEMI consent did not impact services, just the ability for the District to seek reimbursement. When she explained that to petitioners both in person and in writing, they maintained their position. Finally, she stated that it is her professional opinion that both students were making progress and receiving FAPE.

Elizabeth Dunlap (Dunlap) was admitted as an expert in special education and reading instruction. She teaches the girls this year, 2023-2024, in her pull-out replacement English language arts classroom, where there are seven students and two adults. Both students are behaviorally and socially appropriate for her classroom. L.W.'s progress was reviewed (R-12)

as well as N.W.'s progress (R-26), whereby Dunlap explained how assessment data and her observations show impressive progress. To that end, N.W. will be recommended for in-class resource for English language arts for the upcoming year. She stated that it is her expert opinion that both students were making reading progress and receiving FAPE.

The District's witnesses reviewed R-3 to R-14, as well as R-17 to R-34, which show the intervention services petitioners were receiving, retention rubrics, evaluations, IEPs, progress monitoring, and related special education documents. These were the exhibits that were moved into evidenced by the tribunal.

Petitioners' Witnesses

T.W.⁴ (father) testified that he is a teacher in a charter school in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He has been a teacher for nine years. In this position he teaches special education students and does review IEPs of a number of his students to assist in their instruction. For a significant part of his career, he has reviewed IEPs. He has had training on special education issues but has no special education certifications. He did not follow up with the February 27, 2023 email as he knew there was a 20-day period for the district to act. He did not follow up to ask specifically for child study team evaluations. His wife followed up to this in April. He did not consent to the speech observation referenced by Donocoff or counseling services for LW because he did feel it was necessary or needed in first grade. He was offered summer skills learning but did not send them to this program at Mantua as he sent them to another program. He stated that he withdrew consent for billing to SEMI (which would allow the district to seek money for services rendered to the students without expense to him) without asking about that program. He stated he did not intend to penalize the district – he was concerned about his insurance.

T.W. (mother) testified that if their initial requests for special education had been heeded, the girls would be in a better education place. She stated that both girls are growing by “leaps and bounds” but does not know if that is from being retained in first grade or from the benefits of their special services. She stated she had requested services in March of 2023, and this request was disregarded. She made appropriate requests for what she

⁴ T.W. (father) was called to testify by Mr. Morlock, counsel for respondent.

wanted and the process began in April but should have begun before April.

Background and Eligibility

The twin girls were born in late September, 2016.

Their most recent evaluations show as follows:

LW

Most recent evaluation was from January 17 2024. The progress report indicated the child's progress towards meeting the goals as stated in her IEP. The goal progress report stated that goals were achieved, and the objective/ benchmark progress mark legend stated that the student was progressing satisfactorily. Her February 2024, PLAAFP review states that when she is "given a set of 21 letters at random for sound identification, LW is able to identify with 96% accuracy. She consistently struggles with switching the B and D sound. When given a set of flash cards with 28 first grade sight words, LW can immediately read 23 / 28. This is a growth from 16 slash 28 words in November. When presented with 10 words containing digraphs, LW read with 90% accuracy. This is a growth from 70% in November and 40% in January. "When last assessed using the Fountas & Pinnell Leveling System LW has grown from 50% accurate on a Level A to 96% accurate on a Level B. She was presented with a Level C and can read with less than 90% accuracy." She showed progress in other areas but was still shown to be in the "intensive support" and "medial support" range for a number of the studies. She has made progress on these reports.

NW

Most recent evaluation was from January 17 2024. The progress report indicated the child's progress towards meeting the goals as stated in her IEP. The goal progress report stated that goals were achieved, and the objective/ benchmark progress mark legend stated that the student was progressing satisfactorily. Her February 2024 PLAAFP review states that when she is "given a set of flash cards with 28 first grade sight words, NW can immediately read 26 / 28. This is a growth from 22/28 words in November. When presented with 10 words

containing digraphs, NW read with 90% accuracy. This is a growth from 70%". She showed progress in other areas but was still shown to be in the "intensive support" and "medial support" range for a number of the studies. She has made progress on these reports.

Discussion

After listening to the testimony and reviewing the exhibits provided, it is plain that the students were not performing to an acceptable academic level in first grade during the 2022-2023 academic year and that retention was the appropriate measure to take in order to allow for meaningful and needed academic, social, and emotional progress.

I am not persuaded by the testimony petitioner provided. They are obviously concerned for their daughters' educational welfare but have forgone a number of opportunities within the past three years that would have inured to the benefit of the children's education and well-being. The Board witnesses stated not just that it was not appropriate to instantly look at a CST or IEP evaluation, but to look at the students themselves and then formulate a plan for moving forward with recommendations and actions. The school representatives made a number of suggestions to parents which were not approved by the parents.

The unwillingness of parents to accept the recommendations of the school employees over this period undermined their credibility even though it was evident that their goal is the best interest of their daughters. Petitioners' argument that the Board failed to act quickly enough in providing IEPs for the students is undermined by the fact that parents did not avail themselves of the programs the school recommended. It is specious to argue that the students were wronged in their first year of first grade when the opportunities offered to the students were not used. The result of using those opportunities, be it counseling, therapy or summer skills session, would have provided **some** benefit to the students. How much and what impact on their future academic social and emotional progress cannot be ascertained but it is imperative that these benefits be utilized now.

LEGAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

As a recipient of Federal funds under the IDEA, the State of New Jersey must have policies and procedures that assure all children with disabilities the right to a free appropriate public education (FAPE). 20 U.S.C. §1412. State regulations track this requirement that a local school district must provide FAPE as that standard is set under the IDEA. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.1. A free, appropriate special education and related services must be provided to all students with disabilities from age three through twenty-one: a.) at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge; b.) to the standards of the State educational agency; c.) include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education in the State involved; and d.) in conformity with the individualized education program (IEP) required under 20 U.S.C. §1414(d). 20 U.S.C. §1401(9); N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.1 et seq. The responsibility to deliver these services rests with the local public-school district. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.1(d).

In order to provide a FAPE, a school district must develop and implement an IEP for every student eligible for SE and related services. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.7. An IEP is “a comprehensive statement of the educational needs of a handicapped child and the specially designed instruction and related services to be employed to meet those needs.” Sch. Comm. of Burlington v. Dep’t of Educ. of Mass., 471 U.S. 359, 368, 105 S. Ct. 1996, 2002, 85 L. Ed. 2d 385, 394 (1985). An IEP should be developed with the participation of parents and members of a district board of education’s CST who have participated in the evaluation of the child’s eligibility for SE and related services. N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.7(b). The IEP team should consider the strengths of the student and the concerns of the parents for enhancing the education of their child; the results of the initial or most recent evaluations of the student; the student’s language and communications needs; and the student’s need for assistive technology devices and services. The IEP establishes the rationale for the pupil’s educational placement, serves as the basis for program implementation, and complies with the mandates set forth in N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.1 to -10.2.

Parents who are dissatisfied with an IEP may seek an administrative due-process hearing. 20 U.S.C. §1415(f). The school district bears “the burden of proving the appropriateness of the [IEP that it has proposed] but the school district is not required to prove the inappropriateness of any alternative IEP that a student’s parents might suggest.” Carlisle Area Sch. v. Scott P. by and Through Bess P., 62 F.3d 520, 533 (3rd Cir. 1995); N.J.S.A. 18A:46-1.1.

The IDEA does not require the Board to provide the students with the best possible education, S.H. v. State Operated Sch. Dist. of Newark, 336 Fed. 3d 260, 271 (3rd Cir. 2003), but must provide personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit G.F. to benefit educationally from instruction. Hendrick Hudson Cent. Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Rowley, 458 U.S. 176, 203, 102 S. Ct. 3034, 3049 (1982). Noting that Rowley involved a student who, though disabled, was fully integrated in a GE classroom, the United States Supreme Court explained that while “a child’s IEP need not aim for grade-level advancement if that is not a reasonable prospect, [the IEP] must be appropriately ambitious in light of his circumstances[.]” Endrew F. v. Douglas Cnty. Sch. Dist. RE-1, 580 U.S. ___, 137 S.Ct. 988, 992 (2017). The Third Circuit found the directions of the Supreme Court in Endrew to treat “a child’s intellectual abilities and potential as among the most important circumstances to consider” to be consistent with its standard that an “IEP must provide significant learning and confer meaningful benefit” Dunn v. Dowlingtown Area Sch. Dist., 904 F.3d 248, 254 (3rd Cir. 2018). “IEPs must be reasonable, not ideal [and] slow progress does not prove” the deficiency of an IEP. Ibid.

As to retention of the students, “promotion and retention are matters within the Board’s discretion and the courts give substantial deference to school boards on these issues.” R.L. and D.L. o/b/o/ E.L. v. Holmdel Twp. Bd. Of Educ., EDS 8811-09 (Decided September 2, 2009). Therefore, it has been determined that, “it would be difficult to reverse a board’s decision to retain a student on the limited record provided in an emergent relief application.” Id. Finally, it was noted that “there does not appear to be a legal right to be promoted such that one could say that the law is settled.” Id. Our Courts have found that such an appeal is not appropriate for IDEA litigation, but “Under N.J.A.C. 6A:3-1.3(i), a petitioner shall file a petition no later than the 90th day from the date of receipt of the notice of a final order, ruling, or other action by the district board of education, individual party, or agency that is the subject of the case.” C.B. o/b/o J.B. v. Bd. of Educ. of the City of Newark, 315-, 2020 WL 769531, at *3 (N.J. Adm. Jan. 16, 2020).

While none of the aforementioned special education laws and regulations discuss promotion and retention, case law is clear that N.J.A.C. 6A:3-1.3(i), a regulation outside of 6A:14 (New Jersey’s Special Education Regulations) controls, meaning that retention is not ripe for review in this special education matter. Notwithstanding, I **FIND** that the actions of the District are appropriate and necessary for the students to receive FAPE.

We are in a situation where parents allege that their request for special education in February 2023 would have resulted in material benefit for their students. The board avers that it took action in April 2023 and considering school year dates the result would not have been altered. I **FIND** that implementation of the IEP based on a presumed request date of February 27, 2023 would have resulted in one (1) academic day of benefit in the 2022-2023 academic year if the process was begun on February 27, 2023. Having one day – at the end of the academic year – would be negligible and no material benefit to the student.

As to the benefit of the students, I **FIND** that the parents, T.W. and T.W. refused services offered by the district for the benefit of one, or both, students including, but not limited to:

1. speech skills;
2. speech language consultation;
3. summer skills;
4. retention in kindergarten; and
5. counseling.

All of which services were calculated to provide academic or social or emotional benefit to L.W. and or N.W.

I **CONCLUDE** that the respondent has met its burden of showing by a preponderance of the credible evidence that it offered L.W. and N.W. IEPs for 2023-2024 with appropriate placements in the LRE that were reasonably calculated to enable them to make progress in light of their circumstances. Accordingly, I **CONCLUDE** that the Board provided L.W. and N.W. with a FAPE.

I further **CONCLUDE** that the respondent has met its burden of showing by a preponderance of the credible evidence that its actions in retaining L.W. and N.W. in first grade for the 2023-2024 were appropriate and justified by the documentation and evidence provided showing that the students did not have the academic and/ or social and/ or emotional capacity necessary to succeed in an elevated academic level.

ORDER

Given my findings of fact and conclusions of law, I **ORDER** that this case be dismissed in its entirety.

This decision is final pursuant to 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(1)(A) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.514 (2024) 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. § 1415(i)(2); 34 C.F.R. § 300.516 (2024). 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.

July 12, 2024

DATE



CARL V. BUCK III, ALJ

Date Received at Agency:

Date Mailed to Parties:

CVB/tat

APPENDIX

WITNESSES

For Petitioner:

Katelyn Donocoff
Jenifer Cavalieri
Stephanie Logan
Elizabeth Dunlap

For Respondent:

T.W. (father)
T.W. (mother)

EXHIBITS

For Petitioner:

P-1 Documents

For Respondent:

L.W. Documents

1. L.W. Prior Report Cards (R001)
2. L.W. 2023/2024 Report Card (R013)
3. L.W. May 3, 2023 ID Meeting Invitation (R015)
4. L.W. Social Evaluation (R018)
5. L.W. Psychological Evaluation (R021)
6. L.W. Learning Evaluation (R027)
7. L.W. Speech and Language Evaluation (did not qualify) (R035)

8. L.W. July 31, 2023 Initial IEP (R040)
9. L.W. December 5, 2023 IEP (R054)
10. L.W. February 2, 2024 Draft IEP (R068)
11. L.W. Progress Report December 2023 (R084)
12. L.W. Progress Information from Ms. Dunlap (R089)
13. L.W. Referral Form for I&RS Kindergarten (R110)
14. L.W. Retention Rubric Kindergarten (R116)

N.W. Documents

1. N.W. Prior Report Cards (R118)
2. N.W. 2023/2024 Report Card (R133)
3. N.W. May 3, 2023 ID Meeting Invitation (R135)
4. N.W. Social Evaluation (R138)
5. N.W. Psychological Evaluation (R141)
6. N.W. Learning Evaluation (R147)
7. N.W. Speech and Language Evaluation (R155)
8. N.W. July 31, 2023 Initial IEP (R160)
9. N.W. December 5, 2023 IEP (R175)
10. N.W. February 5, 2024 Draft IEP (R190)
11. N.W. Progress Report December 2023 (R207)
12. N.W. Progress Information from Ms. Dunlap (R213)
13. N.W. Referral Form for I&RS Kindergarten (R242)
14. N.W. Retention Rubric Kindergarten (R297)

General Documents

1. Kindergarten I&RS Summary (R299)
2. Emails, Various Ordered Oldest to Newest (R300)

Resumes

1. Katelyn Donocoff (R319)
2. Jennifer Cavalieri (R322)
3. Stephanie Logan (R325)
4. Elizabeth Dunlap (R329)