

State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

DECISION

OAL DKT. NOS. EDS 918-13 and
EDS 17698-13
AGENCY DKT. NOS. 2013 19161 and
2014 20468
(CONSOLIDATED)

R.P. ON BEHALF OF J.P.,

Petitioner,

v.

MIDDLETOWN TOWNSHIP

BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Respondent.

Beth A. Callahan, Esq., for petitioner (Callahan and Fusco, attorneys)

Joanne L. Butler, Esq., for respondent (Schenck, Price, Smith and King, LLP,
attorneys)

Cheri L. Adams, Esq., for respondent (Adams, Gutierrez and Lattiboudere, LLC,
attorneys)

Record Closed: July 29, 2014

Decided: September 11, 2014

BEFORE **PATRICIA M. KERINS, ALJ:**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This is an appeal filed on behalf of J.P. by her father, R.P., for relief under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). J.P. is a fifteen-year-old girl found eligible for special education services from respondent Middletown Township Board of Education (Middletown). Diagnosed with Velo-Cardio-Facial Syndrome (VCFS), she is classified as Multiply Disabled (MD). The parties disagree whether J.P. has been provided a Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) over the course of several school years and on her appropriate placement.

On January 30, 2013, petitioner filed a due process petition with New Jersey's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and the matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for a hearing on January 22, 2013. That petition (OAL Docket # 00918-2013) requested private placement for J.P., reimbursement of expenses and compensatory education for the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school years. On November 6, 2013, petitioner filed another due process petition (OAL Docket # 17698-2013) with OSEP which was transmitted to OAL on December 11, 2013. That petition requested reimbursement for expenses, changes to the IEP for the 2013-14 school year and an Extended School Year (ESY), the inclusion of recommendations by petitioner's consultant on VCFS and compensatory education for the school years 2011-14. The matters were consolidated by Order of January 10, 2014. In late June 2014, petitioner filed another due process complaint regarding the proposed IEP for the 2014-15 school year. On July 9, 2014, petitioner's motion to consolidate that petition with these matters was denied. Hearings were held in this matter at the OAL in Mercerville, New Jersey on October 31, 2013, November 26, 2013, April 2, 2014, April 8, 2014, May 21, 2014 and July 9, 2014. As requested by the parties written summations were submitted by the parties on July 29, 2014, and the record closed on that date.

FACTUAL DISCUSSION

Background Facts

J.P. is fifteen and lives with her father, R.P., and her older brother who also is diagnosed with VCFS.¹ Her mother died in an auto accident in 2000 when J.P. was two years old. Affected with VCFS since infancy, J.P. suffered from a compromised immune system and required surgery to repair a hole in her heart. Additionally, her speech problems required plastic surgery and surgery to elongate her palate. VCFS presents “with a wide range of physical malformations” and “a large number of behavioral and developmental problems” and the most common medical issues from VCFS concern congenital heart and cleft palate anomalies, and hypernasal speech. Educational and behavioral issues are also common with the syndrome. (P-7, pages 9-10.) The condition can be progressive, affecting cognition and behavior over time.

After receiving early intervention services for occupational therapy, physical therapy and speech/language therapy, J.P. began to show weaknesses as early as the second grade in academics. Her father, R.P., consulted with Donna Cutler-Landsman (Landsman), a consultant specializing in the education of children with VCFS. She prepared a report on J.P. with recommendations (P-6), which R.P. provided to Middletown in her fifth grade. Testing shows that J.P. functions in the low average range of intelligence with an I.Q. of 80-81.

The issues in this consolidated petition begin with the 2011-12 school year, which was J.P.’s seventh grade. On June 6, 2011, an annual review meeting was held to develop an IEP for the 2011-12 school year. That IEP (R-34) was implemented and provided placement for J.P. in a general education class with support for Language Arts, Mathematics and Science/Social Studies. She also received speech and occupational therapy. That IEP was amended in March 2012 at R.P.’s request to provide for retesting and weekly summaries for R.P. (R-38)

In May 2012, an annual review meeting was held for the 2012-13 school year, J.P.’s eighth grade. The IEP for that school year (R-40) was implemented and provided J.P. with placement in a general education classroom with in class support for

¹ VCFS also is known as 22q11.2 Deletion Syndrome and DiGeorge Syndrome.

Language Arts, Mathematics and Science/Social Studies with speech and occupational therapy services. In January 2013, petitioner filed the first due process in this matter. Nevertheless, reassessment testing was conducted on J.P. during the eighth grade pursuant to a plan developed at an annual review and reevaluation plan meeting in April 2013. Those assessments included an educational assessment, psychological assessment, speech evaluation, occupational therapy evaluation and assistive technology evaluation. During the eighth grade, J.P.'s difficulties with mathematics resulted in a recommendation that she be placed in a pullout resource room for that subject.

In August 2013, an annual review IEP meeting was held for the 2013-14 school year. The proposed IEP (P-11) provided that J.P. would receive in class support for Language Arts and Social Studies with pullout resource room for Mathematics. The district further proposed smaller classes for J.P. and a specific science class. At R.P.'s request another IEP meeting was held in September 2013 and the IEP (P-73) was implemented for J.P.'s 2013-14 school year.

Middletown's Case and Witnesses

The Board presented the testimony of several witnesses and placed numerous documents in evidence in its case that it has provided FAPE to J.P. Testifying on its behalf were J.P.'s middle school case manager, Marianna Black (Black), Marian Enny (Enny), a Learning Disability Consultant at the middle school, Molly Ahern (Ahern), J.P.'s special education teacher at middle school, Michael Melando (Melando), an Assistant Principal for Middletown, and Bonnie Samuelson (Samuelson), a Learning Consultant at J.P.'s high school.

Black is a school social worker and was J.P.'s case manager from mid-sixth grade through eighth grade. While she admitted that R.P. provided her with a book on VCFS (P-7) when she became J.P.'s case manager, she only read some of it and was not very familiar with the syndrome. Black did allow that VCFS affected learning, including how a child learns. However, she did not implement any strategies specific to the syndrome in her IEPs. She prepared J.P.'s IEPs using her grades, teacher reports

and assessments. She did not recall any parental concerns over the IEPs. Black explained that J.P.'s progress on her goals and objectives was monitored by her teachers and quarterly progress reports were issued. (R-62) Her report cards showed good grades. (R-42 and 59) In seventh grade Black stated that J.P.'s teachers voiced no concerns, but that in eighth grade they did raise concerns over math.

Black, however, was questioned concerning J.P.'s failure to master goals and objectives in her IEPs, despite no concerns by her teachers and good grades on her report cards. She acknowledged that during seventh grade she only mastered two of her goals and that eight of her goals were not even introduced during that grade. While she agreed goals were to be objectively measured she could not cite any documentation showing objective measurement of J.P.'s goals. Similarly, she agreed that J.P. did not master a single goal in her eighth grade year. Nor was an ESY program designed for J.P. after eighth grade.

Middletown then presented the testimony of Enny, the learning disability teacher consultant at the middle school attended by J.P. She was qualified to testify as an expert in special education and as a Learning Disabilities Teacher Consultant. Prior to Black she was J.P.'s case manager and had performed evaluations on her. However, after an incident with R.P.'s father in 2011 after a school meeting, Black replaced her.² She did conduct another evaluation of J.P. for the eighth grade and another assessment in the spring of 2013, and for a time served as her case manager for the development of her upcoming 2013-14 IEP. She said she was aware of J.P.'s VCFS and cited her weaknesses in math and reading comprehension, as well as her continued need for speech and occupational therapy.

On cross examination, Enny agreed that goals and objectives in an IEP there should have objective criteria for mastery. As to J.P.'s goals for occupational therapy she could not cite what those objective measurements were, but felt that a teacher's opinion is an objective measurement. She did not put goals in the IEP for all academics as J.P. was in a general education setting. However, she did include some for reading

² The dispute resulted in charges being pressed by the school principal and a municipal court order barring R.P. from school property without prior notice and permission. (P-11).

and math. As to how those goals were objectively measured, she cited teacher assessments and reports which were not maintained but sent home. She was unclear as to why 80% or 70% were used as accuracy criteria. Enny also was questioned regarding the Woodcock-Johnson diagnostic test and J.P.'s NJ ASK scores. NJ ASK measures grade level curriculum annually. J.P. was not in the proficient range on that test. Her Woodcock-Johnson scores showed that the gap between J.P. and her peers was growing from her prior testing in elementary school.. She further testified that goals and objectives are written for the course of a school year and simply carried over to the next school year if they are not mastered. She found J.P. to have made progress during her middle school years despite her failure to master her goals and objectives.

Ahern also testified on behalf of respondent. She is a Special Education teacher and was in-class support at J.P.'s middle school. J.P. was her student during the 2012-13 school year. She described her teaching routine with J.P. in Language Arts and her role in preparing and sending home weekly reports to R.P. Ahern admitted that J.P. was not always removed from class for testing. She prepared goals and objectives for J.P.'s 2013-14 IEP. In J.P.'s Language Arts class, there were twenty-six students with Ahern responsible for in-class support for eight of the students. She did not prepare data from her work with J.P. In discussing J.P.'s mastery of her goals and objectives she agreed that she had not mastered any in her eighth grade. As to her Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA), J.P. was at the eighth grade instructional level but not independent at that level. She requires prompts and her reading skills are not consistent.

Melando testified briefly regarding his role in collecting and forwarding weekly progress reports to R.P. After a meeting with the district superintendent regarding compliance with the IEP, a system was put in place to make certain R.P. was receiving those reports as the district continued its limitations on R.P.'s contact with school staff as a result of the 2011 municipal court order.

The final witness for Middletown was Samuelson, a district Learning Consultant at its North High School. She has been J.P.'s case manager during her 2013-14 freshman high school year. She was familiar with J.P.'s IEP and evaluations. She was present at the September 2013 IEP meeting and cited parental concerns regarding

J.P.'s transition to high school, the size of her classes, their content and communication with school staff. Additional evaluations of J.P. were done in fall 2013 (P-74-75-76). According to Samuelson, her executive processing skills are at a low average range and she struggles with analysis, synthesis and problem solving, with a need for structure and support in mathematics. While she has strength in writing, her reading comprehension is a weak area.

As J.P.'s case manager, Samuelson does not prepare or collect data that goes into whether J.P. is meeting her goals and objectives. Her teachers are responsible for that function. She admitted that a "partially proficient" score is a subjective decision by a teacher. She found J.P. to have made progress and that her achievements are in line with her cognitive abilities. On cross examination, Samuelson admitted that J.P.'s teachers write her goals and objectives and that her father did not have input into their preparation. J.P.'s teachers also determine the percentages that go into the goals and objectives. In reviewing a goal and objective Samuelson could not provide a formula for determining how a given mastery or completion percentage would be calculated, although she did mention the use of assignment completion.

Samuelson was familiar with VCFS and admitted that is has affected J.P.'s learning. She stated she had read portions of P-7, the volume on VCFS and implemented some recommendations from petitioner's consultant's report in the fall of 2013. She opined that J.P. had made meaningful educational progress in the years between 2010 and 2013. She did admit that in reviewing J.P.'s scores on the Woodcock-Johnson test, she was further behind in her eighth grade test scores than in her fifth grade test scores.

Petitioner's Case and Witnesses

Petitioner R.P. and Landsman, a learning consultant with specialized knowledge of VCFS, testified on behalf of petitioner. R.P. testified that his concerns regarding his

daughter's education began in earnest in her middle school years. He was concerned that evaluations were not done on time and had concerns that her IEP was not being implemented properly. In an effort to learn more about VCFS and its effects on her ability to learn, he consulted with Landsman, the author of P-7, and an expert on VCFS and its relationship to a child's learning experience. Knowing the rarity of the syndrome, he provided Middletown staff with her book to aid them in crafting her educational program.

He noticed that J.P. was having difficulty with comprehension and retention in middle school and became concerned that she was just "being pushed through the system." After the incident in 2011 when he was banned from the school, he felt restricted in his ability to be a full partner in his daughter's education. As his wife, J.P.'s mother, had died when she was young, he had been her primary caretaker and educational advocate. He described being unable to attend her after school activities. He also described an incident with Middletown's prior counsel in the summer of 2013. When he and his counsel arrived for an IEP meeting, they were not allowed to have his out of state consultant, Landsman, participate by telephone due to an edict rendered by that prior counsel. When they objected, they were told to leave the room by that counsel and threatened with forcible eviction by security. (P-8).

In reviewing his daughter's school performance, he was concerned not only at the failure of the Middletown to factor in his consultant's unique expertise on J.P.'s condition and needs, but also at her continued failure to master her IEP's goals and objectives. His concern over her actual achievement and progress was heightened by the juxtaposition of her good grades versus her failure to master her goals. He felt he did not have meaningful input into the educational decisions for her since the only communication he had with the district was through the IEP process and the receipt of her progress reports. He testified he has not had input into her goals and objectives or planning for her transitions, although he admitted many of his concerns were listed in the IEP narratives. When she is at home, he described J.P. as a struggling learner, with few independent learning skills.

Finally, petitioner presented the testimony of Donna Cutler-Landsman. She was qualified as an expert in VCFS and in the education of individuals with the syndrome. She discussed the syndrome and its effect on learning and cognitive functions. The syndrome can be progressive in some individuals, with a huge risk of psychological issues, including psychosis later in life. Children with VCFS are concrete, literal learners who often experience more difficulties as they age. Environmental stressors need to be kept to a minimum in their learning experience.

Part of the educational programming for a student with VCFS should be the development of skills necessary for that person to function in the world. In her opinion, a strong transition program is necessary. Landsman testified she has worked with schools in various states in the development of goals and objectives specifically for VCFS children. She finds that it is extremely important to have objective measurements to determine how the child is progressing. Meaningful measurement should occur several times a year to ascertain progress and make any necessary changes to interventions. After observing J.P. in eighth grade, she authored a report with recommendations (P-2). She found the goals and objectives in J.P.'s IEP to be too general and not focused in areas of J.P.'s needs. Significantly she found a lack of objective criteria to measure mastery of those goals and objectives. As an example, she recommended setting a goal with a grade level and degree of mastery with documentation as to the percentage of correct results in the given area. In the area of mathematics, it is crucial for J.P. to master a skill before moving on to the next skill. As children with VCFS show deficits in the areas of number sense and number understanding, learning methods should be tailored to those deficits.

In reviewing J.P.'s Woodcock-Johnson scores, she found her to be further behind in her skills and cited the test as an objective measure of her functioning and progress. In reviewing her report cards, Landsman found a discrepancy between her grades and her assessment test scores, as well as her failure to master her goals and objectives. She found that J.P. had not made educational progress from her seventh grade on.

A review of the testimony and documentary evidence in these consolidated matters shows that J.P. suffers from a syndrome which has serious and tangible effects not just on what she is capable of learning, but on how she learns. Her condition is

rare, but a body of studies and literature (P-7) on the condition and its effects on a child's learning and educational experience exist. Despite being provided with information on the syndrome by R.P. during elementary school, a review of J.P.'s IEPs and testimony from Middletown staff shows that until the 2013-14 school year, the district did not incorporate that knowledge into her educational program. The evidence further shows that, although in the 2013-14 school year some recommendations from Landsman were incorporated into her program, the program did not fundamentally change.

A review of P-7, and the testimony and report of petitioner's expert Landsman, lead to the conclusion that J.P. needs an educational program specific to her needs as a child with VCFS. Landsman testified credibly, and as set forth in more detail in her book (P-7), that VCFS has a recognized effect on how a child with the syndrome learns, as well as effects on cognitive functions. While those effects may vary with the individual and over time, it is clear that the syndrome has a relationship to a child's educational experience. A review of J.P.'s IEPs from grades 7 to 9 leads to the conclusion that her programs were not tailored to address her specific needs as a child with VCFS. The relationship between her disability, its progress, and its effect on how and what she was learning was not factored into her IEPs for those years. Crucially, her program did not address the manner in which a child with VCFS processes information and learns, tailoring the way in which she was taught to her specific needs. I FIND that petitioner's IEPs for seventh, eighth and ninth grades were not tailored to her unique needs as a child with VCFS.

In addition to a program tailored to her needs as a child with VCFS, the evidence credibly presented by Landsman cited a need for goals and objectives measured objectively on a continuing basis with mastery of skills, particularly in mathematics, prior to the introduction of new concepts. The goals and objectives in the IEPs at issue did not meet that criteria. They were not comprehensive in nature and were not written using her unique needs as a child with VCFS as a starting point. Simply put, the analysis needed to draft her goals and objectives should have started with the effect her VCFS had not only on what she was learning but on the manner in which she learned. From that point, the goals and objectives prepared should have been data driven with

objective measurements to monitor progress and mastery on a frequent basis. While Middletown argues that teacher input and class work are appropriate tools of measurement, it has not shown how standards for her progress and mastery were set or objectively measured. Certainly, a teacher's assessment is one tool for judging a child's progress but goals and objectives in an IEP require objective measurement. I FIND that the goals and objectives in petitioner's IEPs for grades seven through nine were not specific to her needs and were not subject to objective measurement.

On the issue of whether J.P. has made educational progress in the years at issue, respondent cites her grades, certain scores on assessment tests and teacher evaluations as signs of progress. Yet those factors are at odds with her failure to master goals and objectives in the years at issue. She mastered two in seventh grade and none in eighth grade and respondent did not present evidence that she had mastered her goals and objectives in the ninth grade as she remained "partially proficient" through February 2014 in those goals and objectives. (P-84). She is not proficient in her mastery of the curriculum as measured by NJ ASK scores and her DRA shows that she is at grade level only for instructional purposes, not as an independent reader. Extensive testimony was taken on her Woodcock-Johnson scores, with the parties' experts differing on how to interpret the results. Yet even respondent's witnesses acknowledged that the test showed that the gap between J.P. and her peers was growing. Based on the above factors, and in particular the fact that J.P. has mastered only two of her IEP goals and objectives in the three years at issue, I FIND that J.P. has not made meaningful educational progress in grades seven through nine.

LEGAL DISCUSSION

A public school board of education in New Jersey is required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and state law to provide classified students with a free appropriate public education (FAPE), including special education services. Those services are provided in accordance with an IEP. 20 U.S.C.A. § 1412; N.J.S.A. 18A:46-8, -9; N.J.A.C. 6A:14-1, et seq. Although a State is not required to maximize the potential of a child with a disability, the Third Circuit has made clear that the educational benefit must be "meaningful," "achieve significant learning," and confer "more than

merely trivial benefit.” T.R. v. Kingwood Tp. Bd. Of Educ., 205 F.3d 572 (3d Cir. 2000); Ridgewood Bd. Of Educ. v. N.E. for M.E., 172 F.3d (238 (3d Cir. 1999); Polk v. Cent. Susquehanna intermediate Unit 16, 853 F.2d 171, 183-84 (3d Cir. 1988), cert. den. Sub. Nom. Cent Columbia Sch. Dist. v. Polk, 488 U.S. 1030, 109 S.Ct. 838, 102 L. Ed.2d 970 (1989). It has stressed that in the injury into whether the proposed placement will provide the student with “meaningful educational benefit,” the amount of educational benefit necessary to comply with the IDEA will vary with the potential of each student. I.H. v. State-Operated Sch. Dist. of Newark, 336 F.3d 260 (3d Cir. 2003), N.E., supra, 172 F.3d at 247.

In this matter respondent has not provided FAPE to petitioner. As set forth above, her program for the years at issue, grades seven through nine was not tailored to her unique needs as a student with VCFS and did not provide her with meaningful educational benefit. Petitioner seeks a program tailored to her unique and individual needs and has requested an out of district placement for J.P. The program to be developed for J.P. should be based upon the recommendations of Landsman as set forth in her report and recommendations. As respondent failed over the course of J.P.’s educational career to seek input from professionals with expertise in the educational needs of a child with VCFS in developing her program, the recommendations of Landsman as set forth in her report are to form the basis of J.P.’s program to be implemented in an IEP. While petitioner requests, and Landsman recommends, an out of district placement, respondent should be given the opportunity to determine if it can provide such a program within district. If it is unable to do so, J.P. shall be entitled to an out of district placement in a program which meets her needs.

Petitioner also raises the issue of whether the district committed procedural violations in the IEP process by not allowing petitioner’s expert to participate by telephone in a July 2013 IEP meeting. While the incident at issue was troubling, it is not necessary to reach the issue as the issue of FAPE has been decided as set forth above and petitioner did not raise the issue in its second due process petition filed in the fall of 2013.

In these matters, petitioner further requests an award of compensatory education. As it has been determined that petitioner was not provided with FAPE for the school years at issue an award is appropriate. Petitioner shall be awarded five hours a week compensatory education in the form of instruction or services for the school years 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14, as well as compensation for the failure to provide an ESY program for the 2012-13 school year.

ORDER

Based on the above the following is **ORDERED**:

1. J.P.'s 2014-15 IEP shall be based upon the report and recommendations of Donna Cutler-Landsman as set forth in this record.
2. If respondent is unable to provide the program ordered above in-district it shall place petitioner in an out of district program capable of implementing such IEP.
3. Petitioner is awarded compensatory education in the form of instruction and services to be computed at five hours a week for the school years 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 and compensation for an ESY program for school year 2012-13.

This decision is final pursuant to 20 U.S.C.A. § 1415(i)(1)(A) and 34 C.F.R. § 300.514 (2012) 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 (2012). 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.

September 11, 2014
DATE

PATRICIA M. KERINS, ALJ

Date Received at Agency

Date Mailed to Parties:

cmo

WITNESSES

For Petitioner:

R.P.
Donna Cutler-Landsman

For Respondent:

Marianna Black
Marian Enny
Molly Ahern
Michael Melando
Bonnie Samuelson

EXHIBITS

For Petitioner:

- P-1 Resume Donna Cutler-Landsman
- P-2 Report Donna Cutler-Landsman 2013
- P-3 IEP Changes and recommendations
- P-4 Proposed communication sheet 2013-2014 School Year and ESY
- P-5 Donna Cutler-Landsman Assessment ideas
- P-6 Report Donna Cutler-Landsman Grade 5
- P-7 Book by Donna Cutler-Landsman: Education Children with Velo Cardio-Facial Syndrome
- P-8 Emails between Beth A. Callahan, Esq. and Robert Pruchnik, Esq. relative to IEP meeting
- P-9 Classroom Contracts
- P-10 R Rated Movie form for JP
- P-11 2013-2014 IEP

For Respondent:

- R-1 Parent Invitation to Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-2 Letter from District to Parent enclosing Progress Report
- R-3 Parent Invitation to Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-4 Parent Invitation to Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-5 Parental Notice Following Reevaluation Meeting: Additional Assessment Required
- R-6 Record of Attendance Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-7 Parental Notice Following Reevaluation Meeting: Additional Assessment Required
- R-8 Record of Attendance Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-9 Consent for Child Study Team Reevaluation
- R-10 Middletown Elementary 5th Grade Report Card, 4th Marking Period
- R-11 Educational Evaluation by Marian Enny
- R-11A Test protocols
- R-12 Social Evaluation Update by Kristie Kane, MSW
- R-13 Invitation to an IEP Reevaluation Meeting
- R-14 Request for Medical Examinations Prior to IEP Meeting
- R-15 IEP Reevaluation, dated September 3, 2010 and letter attaching same
- R-16 Parent Invitation to Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-17 Consent for Child Study Team Reevaluation
- R-18 Parental Notice Following Reevaluation Meeting: Additional Assessment Required
- R-19 Record of Attendance Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-20 Letter to Dr. Kuhn from Marian Enny regarding referral for CAPD Evaluation
- R-21 Hunterdon Healthcare Psychological Evaluation by Gail Burack, Ph.D.
- R-22 Child Study Team Review of Hunterdon Healthcare Psychological Evaluation
- R-23 Letter from Matthew Stoloff, Esq. to Rita Barone, Esq. regarding suggested changes and clarifications to IEP

- R-24 Letter from Marian Enny to Parent regarding additional Audiological and Occupational Therapy evaluations
- R-25 Audiological evaluation by Sandra Fields Kuhn, Au.D., CCC and letter attaching same
- R-26 Child Study Team Review of Audiological Evaluation
- R-27 Speech and Language Evaluation by Kimberly Black, MA, CCC-SLP and letter attaching same
- R-28 Invitation to an IEP Reevaluation Meeting
- R-29 IEP Reevaluation and letter attaching same
- R-30 Invitation to an IEP Reevaluation Meeting
- R-31 Letter enclosing Speech progress report
- R-32 IEP Reevaluation and letter attaching same.
- R-33 Invitation to an IEP Review Meeting
- R-34 IEP Annual Review and letter attaching same
- R-35 Middletown 6th Grade Report Card, 4th Marking Period
- R-36 New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge Individual Student Report
- R-37 Consent to Amend an IEP without a Meeting
- R-38 IEP Amendment and letter attaching same
- R-39 Invitation to an IEP Review Meeting
- R-40 IEP Annual Review and letter attaching same
- R-41 Grade 7 Report Card, Marking Period 3
- R-42 Grade 7 Report Card, Marking Period 1-4
- R-43 Grade 7 PowerSchool Quick Lookup
- R-44 New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge Individual Student Report
- R-45 Grade 8 Report Card, Marking Period 1
- R-46 Permission to Release/Obtain Information
- R-47 Invitation to a Meeting
- R-48 Invitation to a Meeting
- R-49 IEP Annual Review
- R-50 Parental Notice Following a Reevaluation Planning Meeting
- R-51 IEP Annual Review

- R-52 Educational Evaluation, conducted by Marian Enny
- R-52A Text protocols
- R-53 Social Assessment, conducted by Marianna Black
- R-54 Therapy Evaluation, conducted by Marianna Black
- R-55 Speech and Language Evaluation, conducted by Christine Merlino, SLP
- R-56 Assistive Technology Evaluation, conducted by Adam E. Krass, M.S., ATP
- R-57 Psychological Evaluation, conducted by Christine DeRise
- R-58 Invite to an IEP meeting
- R-59 Grade 8 Report Card, Marking Periods 1-4
- R-60 Invite to an IEP meeting
- R-61 IEP, Annual Review (Following a Reevaluation)
- R-62 Progress Reports
- R-62A Index of the Progress Report
- R-63 Weekly Progress Reports
- R-64 E-mails between District Staff and Parents
- R-65 Progress Reports, for 4th Quarter
- R-66 Eligibility Determination Report, dated July 15, 2013, and letter enclosing Same
- R-67 Annual Review (Following a Reevaluation) IEP
- R-68 NJ ASK Spring 2013 Individual Student Report
- R-69 Electronic Student Record format Opt-Out for TIENET (IEP) Progress Notes
- R-70 Student Invitation to a Transition IEP Meeting Turning Age 16
- R-71 Invitation to a Meeting
- R-72 Regular Ed. Teacher Reporting Forms
- R-73 Annual Review IEP and letter enclosing same
- R-74 Parental Notice Following a Reevaluation Planning Meeting: Additional Assessment Required
- R-75 Auditory Processing Re-Evaluation by Sandra Fields Kuhn, Au.D., CCC and letter enclosing same
- R-76 Educational Assessment by Bonnie K. Samuelson, M.S. Ed., LDT/C and letter enclosing same
- R-77 Progress Report, First Reporting Period

- R-78 Educational Assessment by Bonnie K. Samuelson, M.S. Ed., LDT/C and letter enclosing same
- R-79 Individual Student Report for World History
- R-80 Individual Student Report for Physical Education
- R-81 PowerSchool Quick Lookup
- R-82 Weekly Progress Reports for Fundamentals of Science, Math, World Literature, Cinema Studies, Spanish, Physical Education, Speech Occupational Therapy, Economics, World History and Rock History
- R-83 Report Card
- R-84 Progress report, Second Reporting Period
- R-85 Educational Plan and IEP Recommendations from Donna Cutler-Landsman
- R-86 Observation from Donna Cutler-Landsman