



State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

FINAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO.: EDS 07140-25

AGENCY DKT. NO.: 2025-38956

R.N. AND J.B. ON BEHALF OF R.N.,

Petitioners,

v.

NORWOOD BORO BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Respondent.

Beth A. Callahan, Esq., for petitioners (Callahan & Fusco, attorneys)

Kerri A. Wright, Esq., for respondent (Porzio Bromberg & Newman, attorneys)

Record Closed: November 26, 2025

Decided: January 2, 2026

BEFORE **ANDREA PERRY VILLANI, ALJ:**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On June 12, 2025, Norwood proposed an Individualized Education Program (IEP) for R.N., which included, among other things, placement in the district's multiply disabled program, a 1:1 aide, occupational therapy, speech therapy, and an augmentative alternative communication (AAC) device. Petitioners, however, wanted more. Did Norwood provide R.N. with an appropriate IEP? Yes. An IEP must be reasonably

calculated to provide meaningful educational benefit, not maximize the potential of each child.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 14, 2025, R.N. and J.B., on behalf of their son, R.N., filed a petition for a due process hearing with the Office of Special Education Programs. At the time, R.N. was four years old, in preschool, and approaching the age of eligibility for kindergarten. In the petition, R.N.'s parents requested that the Norwood Board of Education (Norwood) place R.N. at the Institute for Educational Achievement (IEA) for the extended school year (ESY) and for kindergarten during the 2025-2026 school year.

On May 19, 2025, the parties participated in a mediation with an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ). The mediation was unsuccessful.

On May 20, 2025, the Office of Special Education Programs transmitted the case to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) under the Administrative Procedure Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15, the act establishing the OAL, N.J.S.A. 52:14F-1 to -23, and the Special Education Program, N.J.A.C. 1:6A-1.1 to -18.5.

On May 28, 2025, Norwood held an IEP meeting and offered R.N. the in-district multiply disabled (MD) program for the 2025-2026 school year. On June 12, 2025, Norwood issued the IEP.

On July 7, 2025, R.N.'s parents filed an amended petition for due process. On July 15, 2025, they filed a second amended petition for due process. In the second amended petition, R.N.'s parents challenged the June 12, 2025 IEP and again requested placement at IEA for the 2025-2026 school year. However, they clarified that they were no longer seeking a ruling on ESY or compensatory education. On July 22, 2025, Norwood filed an answer.

I conducted the hearing on September 9, 2025, September 16, 2025, September 17, 2025, and September 25, 2025. At the conclusion of the hearing, counsel for both parties

asked to obtain transcripts and submit briefs. I granted their request and closed the record on November 26, 2025, upon receipt of the briefs.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

R.N. lives with his parents, J.B. and R.N., in Norwood, New Jersey. R.N. is diagnosed with autism and eligible for special education and support services from Norwood. R.N. has a younger brother, E.N., who is also diagnosed with autism. R.N. is currently five years old.

R.N.'s initial eligibility with Norwood was as a preschool child with a disability. He was classified on June 5, 2023. Since September 2023, R.N. has attended an out-of-district placement in Tenafly, New Jersey, where his mother, J.B., works as a teacher. R.N. is currently in stay put at the Tenafly program.

On April 1, 2025, Norwood held a reevaluation planning meeting for R.N. with R.N.'s parents and the child study team (CST). The parents and CST discussed ESY for 2025, and they agreed on a reevaluation plan, which they signed electronically on April 3, 2025. In the reevaluation plan, the parents specifically agreed to certain evaluations and a "behavioral observation," which would later take place. The CST sent the IEP to the parents on or about April 4, 2025.

On April 9, 2025, the parents rejected the IEP and requested placement for R.N. at IEA. The parents then filed for due process on April 14, 2025, as set forth above.

Bonnie Malora

On May 16, 2025, Bonnie Malora, R.N.'s Norwood case manager, performed a functional assessment of R.N. for purposes of planning his transition to kindergarten.

Malora is familiar with R.N. as she has been his case manager since he was two years old. Malora has met R.N. in his home and in school in Tenafly at least three times. She has reviewed his file and records.

Malora has been employed by Norwood for thirty-one years. She has New Jersey State certifications for teaching preschool through eighth grade in general education, teaching preschool through twelfth grade in special education, as a learning disabilities teacher consultant (LDTC), and as a supervisor. She has performed over three hundred evaluations as an LDTC over the course of her career.

Malora's assessment of R.N. included teacher and parent input, a classroom observation, and use of the Gilliam Autism Rating Scale (GARS 3). Malora generally describes R.N. as having difficulty with communication, but he is willing to work and wants to please.

Malora solicited input from R.N.'s Tenafly teacher, Noelle Benz. Benz did not testify, so her out-of-court statements to Malora are hearsay. However, the statements are admissible to establish what Malora knew about R.N.. Benz told Malora that R.N.: was performing well in the classroom; is typically happy with no significant mood disturbances; and, he can be distractible and impulsive, but he plays quietly when required. Benz did not share any behavioral concerns with Malora. Indeed, Malora wrote in her report that Benz said R.N. "is not considered overtly anxious or aggressive" (emphasis added).

Malora considered the parents' input. She updated the parent input section of the IEP several times, but the parents' concerns and reasons shifted. The day before the IEP meeting, the parents submitted two documents that were about five pages long. Malora did not include the documents in their entirety in the IEP. Malora effectively summarized the parents' concerns in the IEP.

During her classroom observation of R.N., Malora did not see him engage in any maladaptive behaviors even though he was reportedly having an "off day." R.N. engaged in trials for twenty-five minutes with only one three-minute break. R.N. was using his AAC device for his lessons but not to communicate. R.N. responded well to visual cues and gestures, remained seated during instruction, and was easily redirected.

Malora found that R.N.'s GARS scores showed improvement in restricted and repetitive behaviors, though communication remained a challenge. More specifically, since R.N.'s last GARS assessment approximately two years prior, his restricted and repetitive behaviors decreased in frequency and intensity. His vocalizations for self-stimulation and ritualistic play were still present, but they no longer dominated his play or interactions. R.N. improved in the category of "failing to respond when others attempt interaction." His emotional responses showed mild improvement. He didn't appear to have made as much progress in the area of speech. In sum, the GARS scores revealed both areas of progress and ongoing needs across key developmental domains.

Based on the foregoing, Malora proposed placement for R.N. in Norwood's multiply disabled (MD) class for kindergarten through second grade. The MD class uses Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) and includes discrete trial teaching (DTT) and naturalistic learning opportunities. As part of the intake process in Norwood, staff perform a Verbal Behavior Milestones Assessment and Placement Program (VB-MAPP) of the student and develop DTT lessons in consultation with the classroom teacher and Board-Certified Behavior Analyst (BCBA). Norwood also holds a thirty-day review meeting, so the teacher has an opportunity to revise IEP goals as needed once she starts working with a student. Norwood uses a three-to-one service model, which provides three weeks of therapy and one week of consultation when district staff are available to the parents. Finally, while R.N. would spend most of his time with four other students in Norwood's MD K-2 class (who are functioning very similar to him), he would also be with the general education kindergarten class for homeroom, specials, assemblies, class parties, and field trips.

Malora concluded that Norwood's program is appropriate to meet R.N.'s needs in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Her conclusion is based on over thirty years of experience, her observations of R.N., the GARS scores, her colleagues' evaluations and observations of R.N., her knowledge of the MD program, her observations of the MD teacher, Elizabeth Giampaglia, and her familiarity with other special needs students who have moved to the district in the past year or returned from out-of-district placements that have transitioned successfully.

R.N.'s parents, however, argue that Malora's assessment and the resulting IEP lack important information and, therefore, would not meet his needs. For instance, R.N.'s IEP does not include a functional behavioral assessment (FBA), behavioral intervention plan (BIP), or specific programming and goals to address significant maladaptive behaviors like aggression; but, none of the professionals advised Malora of any such behaviors prior to the June IEP meeting. The IEP does not state that the MD program includes ABA instruction; but, Malora advised the parents at the IEP meeting that the MD class is, indeed, an ABA program. The IEP does not include data from formal progress reports, as Malora relied instead on teacher input summaries called "PLAFF"; but, when Malora reached out to Tenafly, they told her that they don't do progress reports as a common practice. The IEP does not specify the frequency or duration of parent training or BCBA services; but, the IEP does provide for a behaviorist to consult and implement goals and objectives, as well as a three-to-one service model, wherein parent training would happen organically based on the parents reaching out and the behaviorist responding with a plan.

R.N.'s parents also maintain that Norwood's MD class, as described by Malora and above, was not actually offered to them, due to the lack of specificity in the IEP and because the MD program was relatively new. However, Malora advised the parents at the May 2025 IEP meeting that Norwood's MD class, formerly known as the Language Learning Disabled (LLD) class, was already in place and "really took off" in March 2025, and it included ABA programming. Malora further explained that the LLD class was rebranded and changed to MD to provide more individualized instruction, discrete trials, services, and create a higher level of support.

Laurie Zeltzer

On May 8, 2025, Laurie Zeltzer, MS OTR/L, completed an occupational therapy reevaluation of R.N.. The parties agree that occupational therapy (OT) is not at issue in this case, and Zeltzer did not testify. However, R.N.'s parents emphasize that the following statement in Zeltzer's report is not accurate: "[R.N.] is reportedly potty trained and is able to push down his pants independently but requires assistance to pull them back up." The parents brought this inaccuracy to Malora's attention. Malora then confirmed with Zeltzer

that the teacher had indeed shared this information. The parents, however, clarified that R.N. is time-trained for urination in the toilet.

Elizabeth Belfiore

On May 14, 2025, Elizabeth Belfiore, MS CCC/SLP, completed a speech and language reevaluation. She is Norwood's preschool speech and language therapist.

Belfiore is familiar with R.N. because she previously evaluated him in 2023. She is also familiar with his file and records.

Belfiore has a New Jersey State certification allowing her to provide speech and language services within the school district. She has been providing speech and language services to children with autism for over twenty years.

Belfiore observed R.N. for at least one-and-a-half hours, and she did not observe any significant maladaptive behaviors. Once the teacher gave R.N. his preferred item, a backpack, he had no problem transitioning to the therapy room. In the room, he took the backpack off. He also transitioned from one activity (painting) to another activity ("feeding" pretend food items to a pretend caterpillar) without issue.

Belfiore's other notable observations included R.N. using his AAC device to communicate, imitating Belfiore's modeling of sounds, and using verbal speech. For instance, at one point R.N. said, "all done," and he also hit the "all done" button on his AAC device. He used his AAC device to choose colors he wanted to paint with. He imitated the word "cookie." He stated "out" when he wanted his coat off.

Belfiore acknowledged that she didn't get to see a "full picture" of R.N.'s skills. The teacher advised her that he was having an "off day." Also, the observation took place at the end of the day, so Belfiore did not see R.N. independently use his AAC device in circle time or otherwise. She got a "decent picture" of his skills, but it was nevertheless a "snapshot of time." She admitted that it would have been best to return and observe R.N. on another day

that he wasn't "off." However, because R.N. was having a bad day when she observed, he probably had more capabilities – not less – than what he showed her.

Belfiore concluded that the speech language goals contained in R.N.'s IEP will allow him to make meaningful educational progress in speech and language. This is because the goals are achievable and address R.N.'s weaknesses, staff in Norwood are working successfully with similar students, and the potential for integration is important in speech and language development. In Belfiore's opinion, there is nothing more motivating than playing with another child.

Kelli Cassetta

On May 15, 2025, Kelli Cassetta, M.S.Ed., Ed.S, BCBA, conducted a behavioral observation of R.N. in Tenafly. Cassetta did not testify. She did not report any significant maladaptive behaviors. Rather, her report states that R.N.: actively engages in discrete trial training; engages in minimal noncommunicative verbalizations; is predominantly receptive to instruction; emits low-volume vocalizations; independently uses a communication device; engages in sensory play; and, uses a token board.

Erika Duffy

On May 21, 2025, Erika Duffy, MA CCC-SLP, of the Valley Regional Program, conducted an AAC evaluation to determine the appropriateness of R.N.'s AAC device and the best communication options for him.

Duffy has been a speech language pathologist for thirty-three years. She has a New Jersey State supervisor certificate and a national certificate of clinical competence in speech language pathology. She has completed over fifty AAC evaluations.

Duffy conducted her evaluation by observing R.N. and speaking with his teacher and speech language therapist.

During her observation, Duffy noted that R.N.'s teaching assistant "brought his [device] out at times for programming and then at times to help support his communication," which was not the best use of the device. The device should be available to R.N. at all times for communication and only used for communication, not programming, so he maintains a positive association with it and does not associate it with "work."

Duffy also observed that R.N. transitioned well and participated "nicely" in her observation. He was interested as she navigated in his device and watched what she was doing. He sat close and didn't try to leave the table. He was making appropriate sounds. He worked with her "for probably a good forty-five minutes."

Duffy believes that the IEP goal, "R.N. will use his AAC device to mand for preferred items," is an appropriate goal. Duffy explained that if an AAC device is not used correctly, it can evoke problem behavior. Conversely, proper use of AAC device typically results in a reduction in problem behavior because the child is able to communicate his wants and needs.

Duffy also believes that R.N. can "definitely" benefit from being in public school placement, having different models for students, and being around students with more language, but the parents need training to use the AAC device.

The IEP Meeting

On May 28, 2025, Norwood held the IEP meeting. R.N.'s parents attended the meeting with their advocate. The meeting lasted over one hour and twenty minutes, so much was discussed.

Notably, during the meeting J.B. acknowledged that R.N. made meaningful progress in Tenafly. J.B. said Tenafly "did an amazing job" and "was a phenomenal program," and R.N. "has come a really long way." Even at hearing, J.B. testified that R.N. "made growth, not the, you know, like exceptional growth, but he's made growth there."

The meeting participants also discussed the Norwood program. Malora and Giampaglia, the MD teacher, advised R.N.'s parents that the MD program is an ABA program: "They have a full-time BCBA providing ABA instruction"; "We provide the services of ABA within the MD program, and we have a full-time BCBA assigned to the district"; and, "It's ABA." Malora said the program is currently in place and "really took off" in March when Giampaglia began teaching the class. Malora also informed the parents that a VB-MAPP will be performed when R.N. enters the program.

Noelle Benz

Benz, R.N.'s Tenafly teacher, also spoke at the IEP meeting, but she did not testify, so her statements are hearsay. I cannot consider Benz's out-of-court statements about R.N.'s alleged maladaptive behaviors in class, because there is no legally competent, non-hearsay evidence to support said statements. Also, Benz's statements could not be challenged via cross-examination. If Benz testified, she would have to explain why she stated that R.N. exhibits significant maladaptive and aggressive behaviors in school when: she didn't report the behaviors to any of the school professionals (like Malora, who said the comments "came out of left field"); she actually told Malora the opposite (that R.N. is *not* overtly aggressive); she didn't report the behaviors in writing anywhere other than the June IEP; and, no other school professional who observed or evaluated R.N. witnessed such behaviors.

If I did consider Benz's out-of-court statements about R.N.'s maladaptive behaviors, I would have to consider her other statements as well. Indeed, Benz reported much more than problem behaviors at the IEP meeting. She also reported meaningful progress. She explicitly stated, "When you compare [R.N.] to [R.N.], he has made a lot of great progress in a lot ways." She described how, in the past, R.N. "was unable to leave the classroom, he would engage in major major tantrum behavior that would go for in excess of an hour just taking one step over the threshold..." Now, however, as observed by all of the school professionals, R.N. can often transition to different rooms and activities without incident, demonstrating that Benz did not need a BIP to help R.N. make meaningful progress, and she did not recommend one.

Parent Observation

On June 2, 2025, the parents and their advocate observed the Norwood MD program. They visited the MD classroom led by Giampaglia, who would be R.N.'s teacher. R.N.'s mother, J.B., did not like the program. Most of the students were older third and fourth graders. They were not doing ABA trials, working with paraprofessionals, or working in cubbies. Giampaglia explained that they were working independently on a lesson she taught the day before. Later, a younger student entered the classroom with his paraprofessional and sat in a "makeshift cubby," sorting buttons. The paraprofessional did not sit next to him. Giampaglia showed J.B. a data sheet and asked if the parents had more questions. They did not.

Elizabeth Giampaglia

Giampaglia has a New Jersey State certificate in special education. She began teaching at Norwood in March 2025, but she taught at the Valley Regional Program for children with autism for ten years prior.

Giampaglia has significant experience with special education students exhibiting a wide range of severe behaviors. She has addressed such behaviors as throwing chairs, kicking, punching, stabbing, eloping, darting, and self-induced vomiting. She was even able to de-escalate problem behaviors by a student when R.N.'s parents visited her class. She described how this student went from not being able to get off the floor, screaming, yelling, kicking, and punching earlier in the year, to copying her words, answering appropriately, and sitting back down when redirected.

Giampaglia has never met R.N.. However, she has read his IEP and evaluations. She was present at the IEP meeting. Everything she has read and heard about R.N. suggests that he is a typical student with autism: "A lot of how he was described whether it be the speech and language...the behavior, his learning readiness skills, he sounds like eighty percent of the students I've had in the past."

Giampaglia is very familiar with the software R.N. uses on his AAC device and, indeed, it's her "favorite AAC device software" as it's "the easiest software to personalize...which is what we do all the time." She knows how to organize the folders in the software. Like Duffy, she believes the AAC device must go everywhere with R.N..

Giampaglia frankly acknowledged that R.N.'s IEP goals are "difficult to measure." For instance, the goals that state "eighty percent of the time" do not include a timeframe. The goals should instead state something like, "eighty percent of the time for three out of four days," to ensure that they can actually be measured and achieved. She openly questioned whether the IEP should be amended. Although she is a Norwood staff member, Giampaglia honestly and fairly criticized Norwood's IEP; thus, she was one of the most credible witnesses.

Despite the lack of timeframe for measurement, Giampaglia believes that she can implement R.N.'s goals and that the goals are appropriate. She intends to use the eighty percent as written in the IEP but follow her own timeframe of three out of four days to determine when a goal has been achieved. Perhaps even more importantly, Giampaglia will also "probe and assess" to make sure the IEP goals continue to be appropriate and determine whether others should be added based on R.N.'s progress.

Giampaglia was clear that Norwood's program is an ABA program where R.N. would be participating in DTT and naturalistic learning. During the parents' visit, she showed them a typical data sheet that she uses when running trials. She described in detail how she would write scripts for R.N.'s paraprofessional, run trials, collect data, determine whether R.N. has reached a criterion or goal, and what future goals would be under the New Jersey State standards. She wrote the curriculum guideline for the MD class in collaboration with the superintendent and principal.

Giampaglia believes that R.N. would make meaningful progress in her class.

The IEP

On June 12, 2025, Norwood issued the IEP. The IEP provides R.N. with placement in Norwood's MD class, as described at length above, and also occupational therapy twice per week, individual speech/language therapy three times per week, speech/language therapy consultation once per week, a 1:1 aide all day, every day, and an AAC device.

Lauren Schnell

On June 11, 2025, Lauren Schnell visited the MD classroom. R.N.'s mother, J.B., contacted and ultimately retained Schnell to determine the appropriateness of Norwood's program.

Schnell is a BCBA, and she has a Ph.D. in ABA and two master's degrees. She has worked with people with autism for over twenty years.

Schnell collected information by having discussions and video calls with R.N.'s parents, observing R.N. in Tenafly, visiting Norwood's program, reviewing records, and conducting the Behavior Language Assessment Form (BLAF), which assesses various domains of behavior and communication.

Schnell criticized R.N.'s IEP. Schnell believes that the IEP goals and objectives are not measurable and difficult to understand. She believes the IEP should explicitly provide parent training and require thirty hours per week of ABA programming supervised by a BCBA for a minimum of six hours per week.

Schnell believes that the IEP should include a BIP because R.N. engages in "severe problem behavior." She testified that he throws himself off furniture, tries to push his brother down the stairs, and has run away from his parents down the beach. Her report states that R.N. "demonstrates severe problem behavior, including aggression, property destruction, self-injury, elopement..." Schnell further testified, "everything that I've seen, that I've read about [R.N.], shares this severe problem behavior..."

However, despite Schnell testifying that everything she's read about R.N. shares this problem behavior, she could not point to even one thing she read during cross-examination. Indeed, Schnell admitted during cross-examination that she did not see any data or reports from Tenafly about aggression, self-injury, elopement, property destruction, or disrobing. She also admitted that she did not observe any behaviors like jumping off furniture, running down the beach, or pushing down the stairs, and these behaviors were not written anywhere, but rather reported to her by J.B.. Schnell did claim to witness R.N.'s tantrums during Facetime calls with J.B., but she did not provide any details or descriptions of these tantrums in her report, and she could not recall how many Facetime calls there were, when they happened, how long they were, etc.

In addition to the IEP, Schnell criticized Norwood's MD class. When she observed during ESY, the class included older students, with one younger student about R.N.'s age working separately with a paraprofessional. Schnell testified that the younger student's paraprofessional "asked him actually the same five questions over and over again for a four-hour period."

However, Schnell's report says something different. Her report states that the younger student "worked on the same five skills that were presented in the morning (sorting blocks by color, standing up, clapping hands, selecting his last name from any array, and matching)." This is very different than being asked the same five questions over and over again.

Cross-examination of Schnell revealed that several quotes in her report did not exist. For instance, she purportedly quoted indicators 10.2 and 9.4 of the Autism Program Quality Indicators (APQI); but, these provisions do not actually appear in any recent version of the APQI, so Schnell acknowledged, "that was an error."

Also of note during cross-examination, Schnell acknowledged that doing a VB-MAPP or creating a BIP is not necessary to determine the appropriateness of a special education program.

Given all of the foregoing, and despite the fact that Schnell is clearly knowledgeable and an expert in ABA, she was not a reliable reporter in this case, and I am constrained to give her testimony little weight.

Kathleen Rotter

Norwood's expert on the appropriateness of its MD program is Kathleen Rotter, Ed.D..

Rotter has been in the field of special education "forever," though she is not a BCBA. She has New Jersey State certifications as a chief school administrator (superintendent), principal, and supervisor. She previously worked as a Director of Special Services and created an ABA program in Hillsborough, New Jersey. More recently, Rotter has been working as a professor, consultant, trainer, and expert witness.

Rotter collected information by reviewing R.N.'s records, visiting the Norwood program, and visiting IEA. However, she did not evaluate or observe R.N., and she "didn't write up a summary of the visit" to Norwood in her report. Thus, her report is essentially a document review of R.N.'s file and is of limited use.

Among other things, Rotter reported on R.N.'s previous and current IEP. Upon conducting a detailed examination of R.N.'s IEP from October 2023 and comparing it to the current IEP, Rotter noticed many changes in the goals and objectives. Specifically, R.N. achieved eleven objectives that are not listed in the current IEP. Fifteen objectives changed from maximum assistance to either moderate or minimal assistance in the current IEP. Also, R.N.'s current IEP contains seven new objectives.

Zachary Craig

On July 1, 2025, Zachary Craig began working for Norwood as their BCBA.

Craig graduated from Yale and began working in ABA in 2008, so he's been working with autistic children for seventeen years. He got his master's degree in 2018. He is licensed by the State of New Jersey as a behavior analyst.

Craig reviewed R.N.'s IEP and recent evaluations. He spoke with R.N.'s Tenafly teacher and BCBA in August 2025. He observed the Tenafly program. Craig did not observe or evaluate R.N. As such, I must give little weight to Craig's testimony about R.N. On the other hand, Craig's testimony about the Norwood MD program generally, including how it compares to the Tenafly program, was very useful.

Craig began working as Norwood's BCBA on July 1, 2025, but he emphasized that the program "didn't just appear out of nothing" on that date. Craig conducted a lesson in the MD class the day before the May IEP meeting, spoke with Giampaglia on the phone in May, and saw a fully functioning ABA program when he began on July 1st. Craig observed ABA strategies "being implemented with fidelity and they were being implemented with skill by people who clearly knew what they were doing and the teacher was reporting that these were strategies that had been implemented consistently." Craig noted that Norwood had employed a different full-time BCBA prior to hiring him.

Craig described his involvement in the MD class. He teaches a social skills lesson in the class, so he is formally there once per day. He also has a formal period once per week for consulting with Giampaglia about the MD students. He has substantial free time every day for consultations when needed. Craig stated that he is "in [the MD] classroom specifically multiple times every single day."

Craig observed the Tenafly ESY program and found room for improvement. He noted that there wasn't a heavy emphasis on communication. In other words, Tenafly staff missed opportunities to prompt communication as a means of decreasing frustration and problem behavior. By contrast, the Norwood program places a heavy emphasis on communication and maximizing each student's voice.

Craig was clear that R.N.'s IEP and Norwood's MD class provide ABA programming. Although the IEP does not specifically use the term ABA, it contains terminology like "VR4" that doesn't mean anything outside of the field of ABA. The goals also reference "charting targeted behaviors," which is a very abnormal way of assessing a goal that is specific to ABA. Indeed, Craig confirmed that the Norwood MD class uses a variety of ABA teaching

methods including discrete trial instruction, natural environment training, visual supports, prompting and fading, and behavioral supports.

Craig and Giampaglia have already written up lessons for R.N. based on his IEP:

We have written up lessons...that we can directly apply from the IEP goals and so these IEP goals can be directly translated into lessons in discrete trial programming...and then the next step as we're getting to know him would be conducting more assessment and so that's where the VB-MAPP skills assessment...would come into play where we would really try to get a better understanding of...what he knows and we would really be able to try to fill in with additional skills and additional lessons.

Craig explained that lessons do not belong in an IEP. Lessons are changing almost daily based on progress. The lessons should fit the goals, but they cannot be laid out in the goals. If the IEP goals contained lessons, every time a lesson is changed to meet the child's needs, teachers would have to stop teaching, call an IEP meeting, amend the IEP, etc.

J.B.

J.B., R.N.'s mother, testified at length about R.N.'s maladaptive behaviors. J.B. was obviously upset, spoke very quickly, and her testimony was confusing, especially as to when R.N.'s problem behaviors began and worsened. J.B. mentioned elopement as early as 2022 and stated that in "23/'24 he had aggression of just screaming, yelling, disrobing, vomit – gagging himself to the point of vomiting, but going into that summer of his second year of school his aggression did get worse and he would...start like grabbing and squeezing me and hurting me and he would harm himself." Then, in April of 2025, at the evaluation planning meeting, J.B. "was addressing that his aggression has gotten worse. Now he physically touches other people." J.B.'s testimony indicates that she recalls R.N. hurting others – such as his mom – as early as 2023 and continuing through 2025; so, it's unclear when and exactly how R.N.'s behavior worsened.

When J.B. spoke about IEA, she emphasized the support that the program provides to parents. She said that, "You get a personal BCBA that is with you specifically to your child who would come into your home and give you parent training." She mentioned more than once that it is "amazing" and "insane" that a BCBA at IEA would go with parents to a child's dentist appointment: "it's amazing to have that help and support." She spoke about how "they come in weekly to your home environment," including how they would help her get R.N.'s haircut. She mentioned that one of the IEA BCBAs even went on a short vacation with a student's family.

IEA's Executive Director later contradicted some of J.B.'s statements. He testified that IEA does not assign a personal BCBA to each family and none of their BCBAs have ever vacationed with a family.

J.B. obviously wants and needs more assistance at home, which is absolutely understandable, as she has two autistic young boys to care for in addition to work and other responsibilities.

Eric Rozenblat

Eric Rozenblat, the Executive Director at IEA, has a master's degree in ABA and a doctorate in behavioral analysis, and he has worked with autistic individuals for his entire career.

Rozenblat testified about the programming at IEA. IEA is a state-approved school. It is a very small program with a capacity of about twenty-eight learners. Staff members undergo a rigorous training and evaluation process. Parent training is an essential part of the program. Everything is taught through behavioral principles, so IEA does not have a speech and language pathologist or an occupational therapist. IEA does not use the VB-MAPP.

SUMMARY

Based on the foregoing discussion of facts, I **FIND** the following.

R.N. made meaningful progress at Tenafly, by J.B.'s own admission.

In the IEP, Norwood offered R.N. the same related services as Tenafly: occupational therapy twice per week; individual speech/language therapy three times per week; speech/language therapy consultation once per week; a 1:1 aide all day, every day; and, an AAC device.

Also in the IEP, Norwood proposed goals similar to those followed by Tenafly, but they are not identical, and they have progressed over time.

In the IEP and at the IEP meeting, Norwood offered R.N. placement in its MD class, which was and is: fully functioning; led by an experienced special education teacher; overseen by a BCBA; using ABA methods; and, following a three-to-one service model, which provides consultation opportunities for the parents and BCBA at least one week per month.

Norwood has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that the IEP is reasonably calculated for R.N. to make meaningful progress in Norwood.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

This case arises under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Act), 20 U.S.C §§ 1400 to 1482. One purpose of the Act, among others, is to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a “free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living.” 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A). This “free appropriate public education” is known as FAPE.

Another purpose of the Act is to assist states in the provision of FAPE. See 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(C). To this end, a state is eligible for assistance if the state has in effect policies and procedures to ensure that it will meet the requirements of the Act. 20 U.S.C. § 1412(a). In New Jersey, such policies and procedures are set forth in the State statute, Special Schools, Classes and Facilities for Handicapped Children, N.J.S.A. 18A:46-1 to -53, and the implementing regulations, Special Education, N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1.1 to -10.2. See Lascari v. Bd. of Educ. of the Ramapo Indian Hills Reg’l High Sch. Dist., 116 N.J. 30, 34 (1989).

In short, the Act defines FAPE as special education and related services provided in conformity with the IEP. See 20 U.S.C. § 1401(9). The Act, however, leaves the interpretation of FAPE to the courts. See Ridgewood Bd. of Educ. v. N.E., 172 F.3d 238, 247 (3d Cir. 1999). In Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley, 458 U.S. 176, 203 (1982), the United States Supreme Court held that a state provides a handicapped child with FAPE if it provides personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit the child to benefit educationally from that instruction. The Court reasoned that the Act was intended to bring previously excluded handicapped children into the public education systems of the states and to require the states to adopt procedures that would result in individualized consideration of and instruction for each child. Id. at 189.

The Act did not, however, impose upon the states any greater substantive educational standard than would be necessary to make such access to public education meaningful. Id. at 192. In support of this limitation, the Court quoted Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 334 F. Supp. 1257 (ED Pa. 1971) and 343 F. Supp. 279 (1972) (PARC), and Mills v. Board of Education of District of Columbia, 348 F. Supp. 866, 876 (DC 1972). Ibid. The Court reasoned that these two cases were the impetus of the Act; that these two cases held handicapped children must be given access to an adequate education; and that neither of these two cases purported any substantive standard. Id. at 192-93.

In addition, the Court noted that available funds need only be expended “equitably” so that no child is entirely excluded. Id. at 193. Indeed, the Court commented that “the furnishing of every special service necessary to maximize each handicapped child’s potential is . . . further than Congress intended to go.” Id. at 199. Therefore, the inquiry is whether the IEP is “reasonably calculated” to enable the child to receive educational benefits. Id. at 206-07.

The Third Circuit has since held that this educational benefit must be more than “trivial.” See Polk v. Cent. Susquehanna Intermediate Unit 16, 853 F.2d 171, 180 (3d Cir. 1988). Stated otherwise, it must be “meaningful.” Id. at 184. Relying on the phrase “full educational opportunity” contained in the Act and the emphasis on “self-sufficiency” contained in its legislative history, the Third Circuit inferred that Congress must have envisioned that “significant learning” would occur. Id. at 181-82. The Third Circuit also relied upon the use of the term “meaningful” contained in Rowley, as well as its own interpretation of the benefit the handicapped child was receiving in that case, to reason that the Court in Rowley expected the benefit to be more than “de minimis,” noting that the benefit the child was receiving from her educational program was “substantial” and meant a great deal more than a “negligible amount.” Id. at 182.

Nevertheless, the Third Circuit recognized the difficulty of measuring this benefit and concluded that the question of whether the benefit is de minimis must be answered in relation to the child’s potential. Id. at 185. As such, the Third Circuit has written that the

standard set forth in Polk requires “significant learning” and “meaningful benefit”; that the provision of “more than a trivial educational benefit” does not meet that standard; and that an analysis of “the type and amount of learning” of which a student is capable is required. Ridgewood, *supra*, 172 F.3d at 247-48. In short, such an approach requires a student-by-student analysis that carefully considers the student’s individual abilities. Id. at 248.

In other words, the IEP must confer a meaningful educational benefit in light of a student’s individual needs and potential. See T.R. ex rel. N.R. v. Kingwood Twp. Bd. of Educ., 205 F.3d 572, 578 (3d Cir. 2000).

Not only must an IEP be reasonably calculated to provide meaningful educational benefit, it must also be provided in the least restrictive environment. See 20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(5)(A). To the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are to be educated with children without disabilities. Ibid. Thus, removal of children with disabilities from the regular education environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. Ibid. Indeed, this provision evidences a “strong congressional preference” for integrating children with disabilities in regular classrooms. Oberti v. Bd. of Educ. of the Borough of Clementon Sch. Dist., 995 F.2d 1204, 1214 (3d Cir. 1993).

To determine whether a school is in compliance with the Act’s mainstreaming requirement, a court must first determine whether education in the regular classroom with the use of supplementary aids and services can be achieved satisfactorily. Id. at 1215. If such education cannot be achieved satisfactorily, and placement outside of the regular classroom is necessary, then the court must determine whether the school has made efforts to include the child in school programs with nondisabled children whenever possible. Ibid. This two-part test is faithful to the Act’s directive that children with disabilities be educated with nondisabled children to the maximum extent appropriate and closely tracks the language of the federal regulations. Ibid.

Accordingly, a school must consider, among other things, the whole range of supplemental aids and services, including resource rooms and itinerant instruction, speech

and language therapy, special education training for the regular teacher, or any other aid or service appropriate to the child's needs. Id. at 1216. "If the school has given no serious consideration to including the child in a regular class with such supplementary aids and services and to modifying the regular curriculum to accommodate the child, then it has most likely violated the Act's mainstreaming directive." Ibid. Indeed, the Act does not permit states to make mere token gestures to accommodate handicapped children, and its requirement for modifying and supplementing regular education is broad. Ibid.

To underscore this point, the Third Circuit has emphasized that just because a child with disabilities might make greater academic progress in a segregated special education classroom does not necessarily warrant excluding that child from a general education classroom or offering the same educational experience that is generally provided for nondisabled children:

Thus, a determination that a child with disabilities might make greater academic progress in a segregated, special education class may not warrant excluding that child from a regular classroom environment. We emphasize that the Act does not require states to offer the same educational experience to a child with disabilities as is generally provided for nondisabled children. To the contrary, states must address the unique needs of a disabled child, recognizing that that child may benefit differently from education in the regular classroom than other students. In short, the fact that a child with disabilities will learn differently from his or her education within a regular classroom does not justify exclusion from that environment.

[Id. at 1217 (citations omitted).]

Finally, the United State Supreme Court warned in Rowley that courts must be careful to avoid imposing their own preferred view of educational methods upon the States. Rowley, supra, 458 U.S. at 207. In particular, the Supreme Court noted that the Act left the primary responsibility for formulating the educational program—and for choosing the most suitable educational method—to the child study team. Ibid. "In the face of such a clear statutory directive," the Court stated, "it seems highly unlikely that Congress intended courts to overturn a State's choice of appropriate educational theories . . ." Id. at 207-08.

Therefore, the Rowley Court concluded that questions of methodology are for resolution by the States once the requirements of the Act have been met. Id. at 208.

Such requirements have been met when the parents are involved in the development of the IEP:

Entrusting a child's education to state and local agencies does not leave the child without protection. Congress sought to protect individual children by providing for parental involvement in the development of state plans and policies and in the formulation of the child's individual educational program.

[Ibid.]

Neither parents nor courts, however, have a right to compel a specific methodology in educating a student:

However, as has been established, "once a court determines that the requirements of the Act have been met" neither parents nor courts have a right to compel a school district to employ a specific methodology in educating a student.

[W.R. v. Union Beach Bd. of Educ., 2011 US App. LEXIS 3131.]

Indeed, a program and placement does not turn on the intensity of the services or the superiority of the program. Calisle Area School v. Scott P., 62 F.3d 520, 535 (3d Cir. 1995). Despite a parent's best intentions in attempting to seek the optimal placement of his or her child, the standard is not what is optimal but what is appropriate. Ibid. A program is appropriate if it confers some educational benefit; it need not be the superior alternative. Ibid. The Act does not require more. Ibid. In short, an IEP must be designed to confer some educational benefit in the least restrictive educational environment. Ibid.

In this case, Norwood's MD placement for R.N. is appropriate because it will confer an educational benefit in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Norwood is clearly the LRE as compared to IEA. In Norwood, R.N. will frequently interact with general education students. He will be with them in homeroom, for specials, at

assemblies, in class parties, on field trips, and more. R.N. will not have this opportunity at IEA.

Furthermore, Norwood has established by a preponderance of the evidence that the services and programming set forth in the IEP and at the IEP meeting will result in an educational benefit to R.N.. R.N. benefitted from Tenaflly's program. Norwood will provide the same services R.N. received at Tenaflly and continue to provide ABA instruction, which R.N. also received at Tenaflly. Moreover, Norwood's special education teacher and BCBA intend to improve on some of Tenaflly's practices via better data tracking and more effective use of R.N.'s AAC device. Thus, R.N. is more than likely to benefit in Norwood.

Many of the issues that R.N.'s parents raise with regard to Norwood's IEP reflect their understandable desire for a better or optimal placement, which the law does not require.

For instance, the parents want a plan for parent training and BCBA services; but, this is not required to provide a FAPE for R.N.. Even without a detailed plan, the behaviorist will be available to implement R.N.'s goals and objectives and consult with the parents. The lack of details in the IEP such as set hours will not result in a deprivation of educational benefit. Norwood's BCBA, Craig, is in the classroom multiple times per day, conducts a daily lesson in R.N.'s class, and uses one out of every four weeks to consult with teachers and parents. The parents argue that this information is inadmissible because Craig joined Norwood after the IEP. However, the IEP does provide for a behaviorist to consult and implement goals, Norwood had a BCBA prior to Craig, Craig was in the process of being hired at the time of the IEP, and he officially joined Norwood a mere two weeks after the IEP was issued. All of this establishes that Norwood offered BCBA services with parent consultation at the time of the IEP.

R.N.'s parents also want more and better goals in the IEP, such as goals that specifically address R.N.'s alleged aggressive behaviors; but, just because certain goals do not appear in the IEP does not render it inappropriate.

An IEP does not need to identify goals for every deficit in order to provide FAPE. J.B. v. New York Cty. Dep't of Educ., 242 F. Supp. 3d 186, 199 (E.D.N.Y. 2017). Instead, the IEP

is to be viewed as a whole in order to determine whether it is reasonably calculated to provide the student with an educational benefit. Id.; see also Karl v. Bd. of Educ., 736 F.2d 873, 877 (2d Cir. 1984) (finding that educational benefits flowing from an IEP must be determined from the combination of offerings).

In this case, it has already been established that the IEP as a whole will provide a meaningful educational benefit; but also, R.N.'s current IEP goals are likely to change. Norwood holds a thirty-day review meeting, so the teacher has an opportunity to revise IEP goals as needed once she starts working with a student. Indeed, Giampaglia testified that she will continue to "probe and assess" for other goals. As to maladaptive behaviors specifically, she testified that she is very experienced in deescalating and improving a wide range of behaviors including, but not limited to, punching, eloping, and vomiting. She gave no indication that she needs a specific goal to help her students in this regard.

Another issue raised by R.N.'s parents is that the IEP goals as written are not measurable, but this is, at worst, a procedural violation that does not result in a deprivation of educational benefit.

The Third Circuit has made clear that, although it is important that a school district comply with the Act's procedural requirements, compliance is not a goal in itself; rather, compliance with such procedural requirements is important because of the "requirements' impact on students' and parents' substantive rights." D.S. v. Bayonne Bd. of Educ., 602 F.3d 553, 564 (3d Cir. 2010). Accordingly, "[a] procedural violation is actionable under the Act only if it results in a loss of educational opportunity for the student, seriously deprives parents of their participation rights, or causes a deprivation of educational benefits." Id. (citing Winkelman v. Parma City Sch. Dist., 550 U.S. 516, 525–26(2007)) (second citation omitted); see also Ridley Sch. Dist. V. M.R., 680 F.3d 260 (3d Cir. 2012) (ruling that to the extent the IEP's failure to specify all of the special education services that the child would receive amounted to a procedural violation, it did not result in the requisite loss to the student or parents in the circumstances of this case); Rodrigues v. Fort Lee Bd. of Educ., 458 F. App'x 124, 128 (3d Cir. 2011) (ruling that imperfect information in an IEP did not deprive the student of any educational opportunity).

Giampaglia testified that she could implement R.N.'s goals even though they were written without a timeframe for measurement. Giampaglia explained that she would still follow the eighty percent benchmark set forth in the IEP, but she would further specify the timeframe to be three out of four days depending on how R.N. performs. She only questioned whether, legally, the IEP would have to be amended to reflect her use of the four-day timeframe.

Another issue raised by the parents is that the IEP does not provide a BIP, but, again, this does not result in lack of a FAPE. None of the school professionals who testified observed R.N. engaging in significant maladaptive behaviors, even though more than one testified that R.N. was "off" or having an "off day." Even if I accepted Benz's out-of-court statements as evidence of significant maladaptive behaviors in school, I would also accept her statement that R.N. "made a lot of great progress," without a BIP. Meanwhile, the IEP does include goals for behaviors that the school professionals actually testified about, such as sitting when directed, remaining seated in a group, transitioning willingly, and following class rules. Thus, when viewed as a whole, again, the IEP is reasonably calculated to benefit R.N..

Similarly, the parents argue that Norwood did not properly reevaluate R.N. in the first place because it did not conduct an FBA. However, Norwood did provide a BCBA to conduct a formal behavioral observation, which the parents agreed to. Then, when the BCBA conducted her observation, she did not report any significant maladaptive behaviors, so there was nothing to assess. The parents further state that if behavior interferes with a child's learning, an FBA must be done prior to the development of an IEP; but, not a single school professional has stated that R.N.'s behavior interferes with his learning.

The parents also argue that the IEP was not based on and does not provide for a VB-MAPP, but, again, this does not mean that Norwood hasn't offered a FAPE. Malora specifically advised the parents at the IEP meeting that Norwood will conduct a VB-MAPP once R.N. enters their program. Schnell, the parents' own expert witness, testified that a VB-MAPP is not necessary to determine the appropriateness of a special education program. And IEA, the parents' preferred program, does not use the VB-MAPP at all.

Another issue raised by the parents is that R.N.'s IEP goals have not significantly changed over the past two years. This isn't entirely accurate, and it also doesn't necessarily indicate a lack of educational benefit.

"[T]he mere fact that a student's IEP goals are continued does not necessarily mean that the similar IEPs were not reasonably calculated to confer educational benefit." James D. v. Bd. of Educ. of Aptakistic-Tripp Cmty. Consol. Sch. Dist. No. 102, 642 F. Supp. 2d 804, 827 (N.D. Ill. 2009) (citing Carlisle Area Sch. v. Scott P., 62 F.3d 520, 534 (3d Cir. 1995)); c.f. Damarcus S. v. D.C., 190 F. Supp. 3d 35, 53 n.7 (D.D.C. 2016) (admonishing that a wholesale, cut-and-paste repetition is symptomatic of a larger, more concerning failure by a school to adapt its approach in the face of continued frustration and lack of progress).

In this case, several of R.N.'s IEP goals were continued in some form, but they were also modified and, as such, reflect that R.N. is receiving a meaningful educational benefit. In other words, the goals are by no means a "cut-and-paste" repetition. Rather, they show growth: from the October 2023 IEP to the current IEP, eleven objectives were presumably achieved as they were no longer listed, fifteen objectives showed improvement from maximum to moderate or minimal assistance, and seven new objectives were added.

Finally, R.N.'s parents argue that "in determining whether an IEP was appropriate, the focus should be on the IEP actually offered and not on one that the school board could have provided if it had been so inclined." Lascari v. Bd. of Educ. of Ramapo Indian Hills Reg'l High Sch. Dist., 116 N.J. 30 (1989). However, some information that the parents argue was missing from the IEP in this case, such as ABA programming, was clearly offered at the IEP meeting. Also, Norwood's IEP, which could be modified as needed, is different from the hypothetical IEP that gave the Court pause in Lascari. See D.M. v. Watchung Hills Reg'l High Sch. Bd. of Educ., 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38057. An ALJ recognizing that "IEPs may be changed in the future depending on [the student's] evolving needs does not mean that the ALJ failed to determine whether [an] IEP at that time provided [the student] with a FAPE." K.G. v. Cinnaminson Twp. Bd. of Educ., Civ. No. 17-04740, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 159909.

Given this analysis, I **CONCLUDE** that a preponderance of the evidence exists that Norwood offered R.N. a FAPE for kindergarten as the IEP is reasonably calculated to provide R.N. with meaningful educational benefit in the LRE.

Having made this conclusion, I need not determine whether the program and placement for R.N. at IEA is appropriate and make no such determination one way or the other.

ORDER

Given my findings of fact and conclusions of law, I **ORDER** that the petition for due process be **DISMISSED**.

This decision is final pursuant to 20 U.S.C.A. § 1415(i)(1)(A) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.514 (2014) 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 (2014). 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.



January 2, 2026

DATE

ANDREA PERRY VILLANI, ALJ

Date Received at Agency

January 2, 2026

Date Mailed to Parties:

January 2, 2026

sej

APPENDIX

Witnesses

Petitioners:

J.B.
Lauren Schnell
Eric Rozenblat

Respondent:

Bonnie Malora
Elizabeth Belfiore
Erika Duffy
Elizabeth Giampaglia
Zachary Craig
Kathleen Rotter

Documents

Joint:

- J-1 Norwood Individualized Education Program, Dated: 6/12/2025 (May 28, 2025 IEP meeting)
- J-2 Parents' objection to IEP and letter to Mr. Gouraige and Ms. Malora with attachment, Dated: 6/18/2025
- J-3 Email to Mr. Gouraige and Ms. Malora enclosing parental input for the IEP and concerns about the evaluations, Dated: 5/27/2025
- J-4 Norwood Evaluation Plan, Dated: 4/3/2025
- J-5 Eligibility Conference Report, Dated: 5/28/2025
- J-6 Bonnie Malora CV
- J-7 Norwood "Functional Review" by Bonnie Malora, Re-Evaluation/Parent Woodcock Johnson Checklist, Dated: 5/16/2025
- J-8 Valley Regional Programs "Augmentative and Alternative Communication Evaluation" by Erika Duffy, Dated: 5/21/2025

- J-9 Kelli Cassetta CV
- J-10 Behavioral Observation by Kelli Cassetta, Dated: 5/15/2025
- J-11 Elizabeth Belfiore CV
- J-12 Norwood Speech/Language Re-Evaluation by Elizabeth Belfiore, Dated: 5/14/2025
- J-13 Laurie Zelter CV
- J-14 Norwood School-Based Occupational Therapy Re-Evaluation By Laurie Zeltzer, Dated: 5/8/2025
- J-15 Tenafly Graphs 2023-2025
- J-16 Progress Report Chart by Jennifer Bertonlini 2024-2025
- J-17 Lisa Nalven Reports
 - A. Developmental Pediatrics Consultation, Dated 4/14/2022
 - B. Developmental Pediatrics Consultation, Dated 11/01/2022
 - C. Pediatric Letter, Dated 6/7/2023
 - D. Developmental Pediatrics Consultation, Dated 5/21/2023
 - E. Developmental Pediatrics Consultation, Dated 4/30/2024
 - F. Developmental Pediatrics Consultation, Dated 7/7/2025
- J-18 Email Correspondence between Parents and Norwood 2024-2025
- J-19 Elizabeth Giampaglia Resume
- J-20 Norwood Individualized Education Program, Dated: 4/22/2025
- J-21 Norwood Individualized Education Program, Dated: 11/6/2024
- J-22 Norwood Proposed Classroom Schedule
- J-23 Norwood Functional Assessment, Dated: 5/17/2023
- J-24 Norwood Confidential Social History, Dated: 5/3/2023
- J-25 Norwood Speech/Language Evaluation, Dated: 4/25/2023
- J-26 Norwood School-Based Occupational Therapy Evaluation, Dated: 4/20/2023
- J-27 Kathy Rotter CV
- J-28 Kathy Rotter Report
- J-29 Lauren Schnell CV
- J-30 Lauren Schnell Report
- J-31 Eric Rosenblatt CV
- J-32 Description of IEA program
- J-33 Notes from IEA intake
- J-34 Correspondence between parents and IEA including acceptance letter

- J-35 IEA Intake Data, Dated: 4/8/2025
- J-36 Norwood IEP Annual Review, Dated: 10/23/2023
- J-37 Tenafly Progress Reports 2023-2024 and 2024-2025
- J-38 VB-MAPP Scoring Supplement
- J-39 Recording of IEP Meeting

Petitioners:

- P-1 Richling and Williams Article
- P-2 Ethics Code for Behavior Analysis

Respondent:

- R-1 Erika Duffy CV
- R-2 Zachary Craig CV
- R-3 Summary of Observation Prepared by Zachary Craig
- R-4 Notes Prepared by Zachary Craig
- R-5 Teacher Daily Notes to Parents 10/2023 to 7/2025
- R-6 Omitted
- R-7 Welcome Letter
- R-8 K-2 MD Curricular Guidance Document
- R-9 Omitted
- R-10 Omitted
- R-11 Fuller and Fienup Article