## Aligning New Jersey Special Education Process with the Core-Selective Evaluation Process (C-SEP)



Special Education Process: From Child-Find, Referral, Evaluation, and Eligibility To IEP Development, Annual Review and Reevaluation Companion Document to NJOSEP Code Trainings. October/November 2006 (Updated 2007)

## Process to Determine Eligibility for Special Education and Related Services

| CHILD-FIND   |   |
|--|---|
| Child-Find for Preschool   | C-SEP is a thorough and efficient method for identifying at-risk and eligible   |
| For preschool age students enrolled in early childhood programs, the child-<br>find obligations, including evaluation for eligibility for special education and<br>related services shall be the responsibility of the district of residence of the<br>parent of the student. [3.3(a)2i] | students. Its framework is built upon federal and state law, and its<br>methodology adheres to best practices guiding an evaluation process. The<br>model can be utilized for any age group. C-SEP users are mandated to adhere<br>to all applicable federal, state, and local guidance when conducting<br>individualized and targeted evaluations. |
| Child-Find for Non-Public  |   |
| For nonpublic elementary or secondary school students, the child-find obligations shall be the responsibility of the district of attendance. [3.3(a)2ii]   |   |

| PREREFERRAL   |  |
|---|--|
| Interventions in General Education  | Interventions in General Education   |
| Interventions in the general education setting shall be provided to students<br>exhibiting academic difficulties and shall be utilized, as appropriate, prior to<br>referring a student for an evaluation of eligibility for special education and<br>related services. [3.3(b)]<br>Within Abbott districts, the system of assessment and interventions within<br>general education programs according to N.J.A.C. 6A:10A-3.1 shall be<br>implemented for all students who have reading as their primary area of<br>difficulty. [3.3(b)1] | Federal and state law requires that children be provided with a Free and<br>Appropriate Education. This includes receiving support or services required<br>to ensure that the student succeeds in the curriculum and in a least<br>restrictive environment. Within this context, students struggling<br>academically or behaviorally should be provided with intervention prior to<br>their being referred for consideration and testing for special education<br>eligibility. C-SEP users should strictly adhere to federal, state, and district<br>standards pertaining to the monitoring of student progress, the offering of<br>initial support and, when applicable, the referral for special education |
| The staff of the general education program shall maintain written documentation, including data setting forth the type of interventions utilized, the frequency and duration of each intervention, and the effectiveness of each intervention. [3.3(c)]   | evaluation.<br>C-SEP is data driven and incorporates the widest possible data using multiple<br>sources to monitor and manage student performance. The model requires its<br>users maintain written documentation, including data setting forth the type<br>of interventions utilized, the frequency and duration of each intervention,<br>and the effectiveness of each intervention. Such data should include, at<br>minimum, student grades, benchmarks, interventions and their outcomes,  |

| work samples, and other data sources. This data should be collected, merged    |
|--|
| and interpreted together, and documentation of its used should occur;          |
| specifying data sources, their value in the process, and their interpretation. |
|  |

| REFERRAL   |   |
|--|---|
| Written request for initial evaluation submitted to the child study team   | Written request for initial evaluation submitted to the child study team  |
| When it is determined through analysis of relevant documentation and data concerning each intervention utilized that interventions in the general education program have not adequately addressed the educational difficulties, and it is believed that the student may have a disability, the student shall be referred for an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education programs and services. [3.3(c)1] | C-SEP can be used to collect, organize and interpret intervention data<br>acquired on a student. In this instance, the process would include collecting<br>and merging all available data. This includes data concerning the<br>intervention and its outcome as well as additional information collected from<br>teachers, academic and behavioral performance (e.g., grades, benchmarks,<br>discipline reports). Once collected, it should be merged to identify a pattern<br>of strengths and weaknesses. These should then be leveraged to determine<br>why the intervention attempted hitherto has not produced the desired<br>results. If it is determined that the child may have a disability, then this<br>finding should be documented and the child referred for an evaluation. |
| A direct referral to the child study team may be made when it can be documented that the nature of the student's educational problem(s) is such that evaluation to determine eligibility for special education services is warranted without delay. [3.3(d)]   | C-SEP users should adhere to all applicable federal and state law.  |
| Referrals may be submitted by instructional, administrative and other<br>professional staff of the local school district, parents and state agencies,<br>including the New Jersey Department of Education, concerned with the<br>welfare of students. [3.3(a)3ii]  | C-SEP users should adhere to all applicable federal and state law.  |

| TRANSITION FROM EARLY INTERVENTION  |  |
|---|--|
| Transition from Early Intervention To Preschool<br>3.3(e)1  | Transition from Early Intervention To Preschool  |
| To facilitate the transition from early intervention to preschool, a child<br>study team member of the district board of education shall participate in<br>the preschool transition planning conference arranged by the designated<br>service coordinator from the early intervention system. The district<br>representative at the transition planning conference shall:<br>Review the Part C Early Intervention system Individualized Family<br>Service Plan;<br>Provide parents with written district registration requirements; | C-SEP users should adhere to all applicable federal and state law, regardless<br>of the age of the student. This includes following protocol for notifying<br>parents. |
| Provide parents written information on available district programs for preschoolers, including options available for placement in general education classrooms; and   |  |
| Provide the parent a form to utilize to request that the district board of education invite the Part C service coordinator from the Early Intervention System to the initial IEP meeting for a child after a determination of eligibility.  |  |

| IDENTIFICATION  |  |
|---|--|
| Deciding Whether to Evaluate  | Deciding Whether to Evaluate   |
| Notice of Meeting   | Notice of Meeting  |
| Parent (and adult student) is provided notice of a meeting to determine<br>need for evaluation. The notice includes a copy of the procedural<br>safeguards statement, Parental Rights in Special Education (PRISE). | In addition to the legal requirements, C-SEP recognizes the value of having parents attend meetings concerning their child's academic, social and behavioral wellbeing. Regardless of the methodology used to conduct evaluations, all guidelines and protocol must be followed. Consequently, the notice of meeting provided to parents should likewise include a copy of the procedural safeguards statement (in a language that the parent can understand), and Parental Rights in Special Education (PRISE). |

| Meeting   | Meeting  |
|---|--|
| Convened within 20 calendar days of receipt of written request by the district to determine whether an evaluation is warranted.   | All evaluators and team members should consult the state legal framework<br>and ensure it timelines are strictly adhered to. New Jersey requires a<br>meeting be help within 20 calendar days following receipt of written request.  |
| PARTICIPATION THROUGH ALTERNATIVE MEANS 2.3(k)4   | PARTICIPATION THROUGH ALTERNATIVE MEANS  |
| Meetings shall be scheduled at a mutually agreed upon time and place. If a mutually agreeable time and place cannot be determined, the parent(s) shall be provided the opportunity to participate in the meeting through alternative means, such as videoconferencing and conference calls. | Parents are vital to the conduct of an individualized assessment. Therefore,<br>C-SEP believes that every effort should be made to acquire their cooperation<br>and input. New Jersey states that meetings "shall be scheduled at a mutually<br>agreed upon time and place. If a mutually agreeable time and place cannot<br>be determined, the parent(s) shall be provided the opportunity to participate<br>in the meeting through alternative means, such as videoconferencing and<br>conference calls." In so doing, the student is guaranteed the representation<br>s/he deserves and the evaluator and other team members can acquire the<br>insight and experience that they have concerning the child being evaluated.   |
| PARTICIPANTS<br>3.3(e); 3.3(e)3 S - 5; S- 9 to 11   | PARTICIPANTS   |
| <ul> <li>Parent</li> <li>Child study team</li> <li>General education teacher</li> <li>Speech language specialist (when required)</li> </ul>   | Collaboration is fundamental to the conduct of a comprehensive and<br>individualized assessment that is capable of identifying a child's strengths<br>and weaknesses, from whereupon sound conclusions can be deduced and, a<br>determination made. Within this frame, parental involvement and<br>participation of other stakeholders is important to a child's success.<br>Team members should fully participate in the discussion of data and services<br>required, with individuals sharing their expertise and knowledge within the<br>context of what data was collected, how they interpret it, and what it<br>implies. When inconsistencies arise in the data or interpretations of the data,<br>these should be thoroughly discussed and clarified. Related service<br>providers are beneficial and should be incorporated into teams as required,<br>and they should contribute to data reviews and discussions so that informed |
|   | and legally defensible decisions are made.<br>All evaluators and team members should consult the state legal framework<br>and ensure those required to attend meetings are notified of the dates and<br>times. At minimum, New Jersey requires the parent; a general education   |

|   | teacher; and a child study team member be present. However, meetings may<br>likewise include additional individuals (e.g., a speech language specialist)<br>depending on the individual needs/concerns of the student.   |
|---|--|
| REVIEW DATA<br>3.4(a)1 S13  | REVIEW DATA  |
| Review existing evaluation data on the student including evaluations and<br>information provided by the parents, current classroom-based<br>assessments and observations and observations of teachers and related<br>services providers, and consider the need for any health appraisal or<br>specialized medical evaluation. | A review of existing data must occur during all assessments, whether an initial evaluation or a reevaluation. C-SEP adheres to this mandate. At minimum, it should include:  1. Information provided by the parent(s) of the child, 2. Current performance (grades, state assessments) 3. The student's response to research-based intervention 4. The student's education records, 5. Observations by teachers and related services providers. 6. Health and Medical evaluations or appraisals. As part of the pre-referral data collected from school records (e.g., attendance, discipline), a child's previous or existing experience with interventions, accommodations, supports or modifications that may have been provided in the past should likewise be documented and considered. Such considerations should also include a student's involvement with Rtl, its purpose, focus, methodology, duration and outcome. This data, like others, should be merged and considered with alternative sources. Once the data has been collected, merged and analyzed by the Team, a decision should be made whether additional data is required to make a sound decision on whether the child is suspected of having a disability (initial referral) or continues to have a disability (reevaluation). When a disability is suspected, the educational needs of the student should also be considered and documented. The team is encouraged to review federal and state law to determine which disability categories should be considered at the eligibility meeting. After reviewing the data and the eligibility criteria established at the federal and state levels, a Team must consider whether additional data needs to be collected prior to making a determination of whether the child continues to |

|  | be or is suspected of having a disability and is in need of services. The data<br>collected and analyzed should be documented along with the decision made<br>based upon the data (and any need for additional) should be included in the<br>student's education record according to federal and state guidance.   |
|--|--|
| When an evaluation is not warranted:         | When an evaluation is not warranted:   |
| Determine other appropriate action. [3.3(e)] | Within the C-SEP framework, the existing data should be carefully considered<br>with other data available. The combination should clearly indicate a<br>student's strengths and weaknesses, and be sufficient to make a legally<br>defensible decision whether the child requires further evaluation. If not, the<br>parent should be provided with written notification that states that the child<br>does not require further evaluation and explain the reasoning for this<br>decision.<br>C-SEP requires that the data available be used to determine which  |
|  | accommodation or supports are required to help the student excel in the curriculum. When an evaluation is conducted, an eligibility committee is required to provide information about a child's educational needs to the committee and the student's teachers, even if the student is not found eligible for services. Teachers should use this information to individualize and improve instructional planning and delivery.   |
|  | Evaluations are prompted because a child is struggling. For this reason, all<br>evaluations should be leveraged to their fullest extent to ensure a child<br>obtains what they need to succeed. For this reason, in instances where a<br>child is not found eligible, the information gleaned from the evaluation<br>should be used to provide teachers and other stakeholders with insight into<br>which supports the child needs. Stakeholders should work together to<br>identify instructional strategies and supports that can be provided in the<br>general education setting and share any additional information or resources. |

| WRITTEN NOTICE S4  | WRITTEN NOTICE  |
|--|---|
| <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, the parent provided with:</li> <li>Notification that the child does not require testing;</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement; and</li> <li>Copies of the special education rules (N.J.A.C. 6A:14) and the due process hearing rules (N.J.A.C. 1:6A)</li> </ul> | In cases where a team decides that an evaluation is not warranted or that it<br>is unnecessary because there is no suspicion of the child having a disability,<br>the parent must be notified of this decision. New Jersey sets a 15 calendar<br>day notice prior to the scheduled meeting. Federal and state law equally<br>require that a copy of procedural safeguards be provided in a language that<br>the parent understands; and the state further requires that a parent should<br>be provided copies of New Jerseys special education rules and due process<br>hearing rules.  |
| Disagreement<br>2.3(h)3ii  | Disagreements   |
| The parent may disagree with the determination by requesting mediation or a due process hearing.   | Parents are entitled to challenge a decision not to conduct an evaluation,<br>and may do so in the state of New Jersey through mediation or a due process<br>hearing. All stakeholders should adhere to federal and state standards.<br>Eligibility decisions within the C-SEP framework are to be deduced from<br>multiple sources of data that has been collected using diverse methods of<br>data collection. The data should be collected, merged and analyzed in order<br>to identify eligibility, to eliminate exclusionary factors, and to determine the<br>extent of the need and the supports and accommodations that a student<br>requires. Eligibility criteria as spelled out in federal and state protocol should<br>be consulted when making decisions. All decisions made should be evidence-<br>based and legally defensible. |
| When an evaluation is warranted:   | When an evaluation is warranted:  |
| The student shall be considered identified as potentially a student with a disability.<br>A case manager shall be assigned.  | In cases where a team decides that an evaluation is warranted or that it is<br>necessary because there is a suspicion of the child having a disability, the<br>student shall be consider and evaluated. At this point, a case manager should<br>be assigned and an evaluation be conducted according to federal, state, and<br>local laws and regulations.  |

| EVALL   | IATION  |
|---|---|
| The screening ( <u>i.e., testing</u> ) of a student by a teacher or specialist to determine appropriate instructional strategies for curriculum implementation shall not be considered to be an evaluation for eligibility for special education and related services. [3.4(d)] | Both federal and New Jersey state law do not consider student being<br>screened by a teacher or specialist to determine appropriate instructional<br>strategies for curriculum implementation to be an evaluation for eligibility<br>for special education and related services.  |
| Deciding the evaluation   | Deciding the evaluation   |
| Participants<br>3.3(e) S-5; S-9 to 11   | Participants  |
| <ul> <li>Parent</li> <li>Child study team</li> <li>General education teacher</li> <li>Speech language specialist (when required)</li> </ul>   | Collaboration is fundamental to the conduct of a comprehensive and<br>individualized assessment that is capable of identifying a child's strengths<br>and weaknesses, from whereupon sound conclusions can be deduced and, a<br>determination made. Within this frame, parental involvement and<br>participation of other stakeholders is important to a child's success.<br>All evaluators and team members should consult the state legal framework<br>and ensure those required to attend meetings are notified of the dates and<br>times. At minimum, New Jersey requires the parent; a general education<br>teacher; and the child study team be present. However, meetings may<br>likewise include additional individuals (e.g., a speech language specialist)<br>depending on the individual needs/concerns of the student.<br>The team is encouraged to review federal and state law to determine which<br>disability categories should be considered at the eligibility meeting. After<br>reviewing the data and the eligibility criteria established at the federal and<br>state levels, a team must consider whether additional data needs to be<br>collected prior to making a determination of whether the child continues to<br>be or is suspected of having a disability and is in need of services. The data<br>collected and analyzed should be documented along with the decision made<br>based upon the data (and any need for additional) should be included in the<br>student's education record according to federal and state guidance.<br>Team members should fully participate in the discussion of data and services<br>required, with individuals sharing their expertise and knowledge within the<br>context of what data was collected, how they interpret it, and what it |

|   | these should be thoroughly discussed and clarified. Related service<br>providers are beneficial and should be incorporated into teams as required,<br>and they should contribute to data reviews and discussions so that informed<br>and legally defensible decisions are made.  |
|---|--|
| Determinations<br>S-13; S-16 3.4(a)3  | Determinations   |
| Nature and scope of the evaluation<br>Which child study team members and/or specialist(s) shall <u>conduct each</u><br><u>assessment that is part of the evaluation</u> | The meeting should determine the nature and scope of the evaluation.<br>Federal and state law, in addition with C-SEP best practices, require that a<br>variety of assessment tools and strategies be used to gather functional,<br>developmental, and academic information and ensure that no single<br>measure or assessment is the sole criterion for determining whether a child<br>is a child with a disability. The initial data analyzed previously (e.g., grades,<br>interventions and their outcomes) should be used to Under the C-SEP<br>framework to determine which additional data is needed to evaluate the<br>child and make a determination as to their eligibility.<br>When determining which disability categories should be considered, team<br>members should review federal and state law. Both federal and state<br>regulations offer some criteria for determining eligibility in each category. In<br>addition, certain requirements apply to all disability categories, such as<br>determining educational impact, educational needs, and academic and<br>behavioral information from an observation. An eligibility team should<br>consider each of the criteria for the suspected disability areas such as a<br>medical evaluation or use of a specific disability areas such as a<br>medical assessment components for specific disability areas such as a<br>medical evaluation or use of a specific assessment tool or test. Team<br>members should be made aware of applicable standards and adhere to the<br>regulations whether federal, state and/or local.<br>Once agreement is reached on what data is required, team members and/or<br>specialists should conduct their assessment using approved and reliable<br>methods, while vigorously following applicable laws and standards. |

| Written Notice   | Written Notice  |
|--|---|
| <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the determination(s) and proposed action(s): <ul> <li>The evaluation is warranted;</li> <li>The student is considered identified as potentially a student with a disability;</li> <li>The nature and scope of evaluation;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | In cases where a team decides that an evaluation is warranted or that it is<br>necessary because there is a suspicion of the child having a disability, the<br>parent must be notified of this decision. New Jersey sets a 15 calendar day<br>notice prior to the scheduled meeting.<br>The notification should inform the parent that an evaluation is warranted;<br>the student has been identified as potentially having a disability; and an<br>explanation of the nature and scope of the evaluation that is to be<br>conducted.   |
| A request for written consent from the parent. When the student is an adult<br>student, consent is obtained from the adult student;  | <ul> <li>According to federal and state law, parents must provide informed consent before a child can be evaluated for a specific learning disability. Informed consent means that the parent has been provided all of the information pertaining to the evaluation and how it is to be conducted (e.g., what data will be collected; how data will be collected). Information should be provided in the parent's native language, or through other modes of communication that they understand. In general, seven items must be included in the prior written notice. Subsequent to collecting, analyzing and interpreting the existing data, it should be possible to: <ol> <li>Explain to the parent which action the school is taking (refusing to evaluate or proceeding with an evaluation)</li> <li>Interpret and reference the data examined to explain the decision.</li> <li>Outline other options the team has considered and why these options were rejected.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Describe the evaluation procedures, the assessment process, and data used to make the decision.</li> <li>Identify and articulate other additional factors that are relevant to the decision</li> <li>Outline the rights and protections that a child with a disability has in Virginia.</li> <li>Make the parent aware of available resources that can help explain the applicable federal and state regulations.</li> </ul> |
| A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement; and<br>Copies of the special education rules (N.J.A.C. 6A:14) and the due process   | Federal and state law equally require that a copy of procedural safeguards<br>be provided in a language that the parent understands; and the state further<br>requires that a parent should be provided copies of New Jerseys special   |

| hearing rules (N.J.A.C. 1:6A)   | education rules and due process hearing rules.   |
|---|--|
| Parent must be given the opportunity to consider the proposed initial evaluation for up to 15 calendar days before providing consent. The parent may provide consent sooner.  | According to New Jersey state law, parents have 15 calendar days to consider the proposal and provide consent to continue with the evaluation.   |
| If the parent has not provided consent within 15 calendar days, and the district and parent have not agreed to other action, the district may request a due process hearing according to 2.3(c). If the district chooses not to file for a due process hearing to obtain consent for an initial evaluation, the district is not in violation of its child find obligation or its obligation to evaluate the student.  | Should parental consent not be granted, the district can either accept the decision not to conduct the evaluation or request a due process hearing. In either case, evaluators should consult federal and state law and strictly adhere to its timelines and regulations.  |
| Timelines   | Timelines  |
| When consent for initial evaluation is granted, the evaluation shall be conducted without delay [2.3(d)].   | Once consent has been obtained, the evaluation can begin without delay.<br>Teams should be cognizant of the timelines they have and operate within<br>this timeframe.  |
| 90 day clock begins   | 90 day clock begins  |
| After consent for initial evaluation has been received, the evaluation, determination of eligibility for services, and, if eligible, the development and implementation of the IEP are completed within 90 calendar days.   | The team has 90 days after consent has been received to conduct the evaluation, determine eligibility and the services required, and implement the IEP.  |
| If the parent repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation, the time period above shall not apply. [3.4(e)1]   | New Jersey state law notes that if a parent repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation, the time period above shall not apply.  |
| If a child enrolls in the school of a district board of education after an initial evaluation was undertaken by another district board of education, but before it was completed, and the new district is making progress so as to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the district and parent agree to a specified modified timeframe for completing the evaluation, the agreed-upon timeframe for completing the evaluation shall be applied. [3.4(e)2] | In instances where a child relocates to another district while an evaluation process is underway, the districts should coordinate and the parent and districts should agree to a modified timeframe whereby the evaluation of the student can be completed. Consult state law and district protocols for additional details. |

| Assessments are conducted | Assessments are conducted   |
|---------------------------|---|
|                           | Federal and New Jersey state law requires a variety of assessment tools be<br>used during an evaluation. A variety of tools are available to Teams, including<br>but not limited to, standardized formal assessments, curriculum-based<br>measures, questionnaires, and state-approved benchmark testing. These can<br>be used to gather functional, developmental and/or academic information<br>on the child being assessed. Federal and state law, and C-SEP best practices<br>require that instruments utilized meet technical standards and be<br>administered by qualified professionals. This includes, but is not limited to,<br>being appropriate for the age, culture, and linguistic capacity of the child<br>being evaluated. In full agreement with New Jersey regulations, C-SEP<br>advocates that both formal and informal be utilized to acquire the precise<br>data required to make informed, legally defensible decisions. |
|                           | Federal and state regulations require assessments and their tools be<br>implemented in a manner that is nondiscriminatory (racial, cultural) and<br>administered in the student's native language. Overall, the tools utilized and<br>their methodology should yield the most accurate information on a child's<br>capability (functionally, developmentally, and academically). Finally, these<br>tools should be used for their intended purpose and administered according<br>to their standards and norms.  |
|                           | Norm referenced tests, like other data sources, should never be solely used<br>for decision-making. Contrary, they should be combined with other sources<br>of data as they are snapshots of a child's performance in a particular domain<br>and instance. Moreover, some norm referenced tests and their scores are<br>more reliable than others. Consequently, assessments must be carefully<br>considered and determined appropriate in a given context.   |
|                           | These tests should be administered according to the test publisher's guidelines and their scores cautiously calculated in the same manner. Users should equally select which scores that provide the most appropriate data. See individual test publisher guidance, consult peer-reviewed publications, and state regulations.  |
|                           | Test scores should be analyzed and documented in the context of inevitable error that is inherent to standardized tests. As a consequence, C-SEP and New Jersey state law encourage Team members to use standard scores with  |

their confidence intervals. This data should be considered and presented in a manner that reflects which results were obtained, why this data was used, and its significance in relation to student performance.

State law and C-SEP recommend using the most recent version of the assessment selected to ensure that the instrument and the data it provides is current. Simultaneously, and as mentioned above, only individuals qualified to administer the assessment should do so. In instances were expected standards are not followed (e.g., the publisher guidance for administration), deviations should be accurately documented and their potential implications on the findings noted.

| Instruments                |                                    |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Standardized Tests         | Norm-Referenced Tests              |
| Criterion-Referenced Tests | Curriculum-Based Measurement       |
| Informal Assessment        | Structured Inventory or Checklists |
| Dynamic Assessment         | Rating Scales                      |
| Questionnaires/ Interviews | Formal Observations                |
| Informal Observations      | Parental Input                     |
| Data from External Sources | Work Samples                       |

C-SEP encourages the collection and consideration of multiple sources of data. The data collected, and the instruments used, should provide the most reliable and targeted information required to assess a student's pattern of strengths and weaknesses. This is especially applicable when additional source of data has been determined necessary by the team. At this point, the evaluator is encouraged to concentrate their attention on obtaining the data required to address outstanding issues or concerns.

In terms of tools and instruments deemed appropriate, C-SEP adheres to New Jersey regulations and recognizes the unique importance of the various types of data. C-SEP equally encourages a blending of these.

Those instruments listed in the above table are not exhaustive. Regardless of the data source, it should be reliable, documented, and acquired in a manner

| and approp<br>instructions<br>and administ<br>factors such<br>for nonstant<br>assessment<br>cultural or l | ucation regulations require that the evaluators be knowledgeable<br>oriately trained to administer assessments in accordance with the<br>s provided by the producer of the assessments. When selecting<br>istering assessment components, evaluators should consider<br>h as: selection of tools, possible racial or cultural bias, the need<br>ndard administration based on student needs, features of the<br>t or observation environment, and the impact of a student's<br>linguistic differences (Virginia Department of Education, 2021:<br>standards are fully embraced by C-SEP and should be strictly<br>by |
|---|--|

| ELIGIBILITY  |   |
|--|---|
| When the assessments are completed, a written report of the results of<br>each assessment is prepared. A copy of the evaluation report(s) and<br>documentation and information that will be used for a determination of<br>eligibility shall be given to the parent not less than 10 calendar days prior to<br>the meeting. [3.5(a)] | The data collected by evaluators will have to first be individually processed<br>as it is acquired. However, this process can be subjective. For this reason, the<br>IEP Team should work together to collectively (re)interpret data that has<br>been acquired, regardless of its origin (e.g., formal or informal). This process<br>will ensure that all Team members have access to the data and, thereby, can<br>better determine as a collective which strengths and weaknesses a student<br>has. Moreover, collective knowledge and consultation will improve the<br>reliability of the eligibility status the Team determines.<br>As data and their findings are presented, these should be introduced in a<br>manner that is easily understood by the average individual. Since the Team<br>consists of a variety of stakeholders (e.g., parent; teacher) with diverging<br>expertise and knowledge, participants must be prepared to explain their<br>methodology and findings to others. This requirement ensures that Team<br>members have the knowledge necessary to make informed and responsible<br>decisions.<br>The objective of the Team is to analyze and merge the multiple sources of<br>data and its findings, whereby consistency is found that reflect a student's |
|  | strengths and weaknesses. Collectively, the group can identify patterns and use the data to draw conclusions about a student's true performance, and  |

| whether the data indicates the existence of a disability and the requirement<br>of services. After all, a student can suffer from more than one disability area<br>(Virginia Department of Education, 2021: 26-27).  |
|--|
| Federal and state law requires students undergo a comprehensive and full<br>evaluation. They should equally be assessed in all areas of concern and all<br>exclusionary factors should equally be considered. As part of this process,<br>the Team should equally consider other factors that may explain or<br>contribute to the difficulties a child is experiencing. For instance, family<br>changes such as a divorce or health issues, among other factors, may<br>contribute to learning difficulties. See, for instance, Virginia Department of<br>Education (2021: 17-19). Equally important, the Team should consider<br>factors that may explain certain findings. |
| Federal and state regulations demand that no single source of data be used<br>to determine eligibility (Department of Education, 2021; 2018). C-SEP<br>encourages the collection of multiple sources of data using diverse methods.<br>This information should then be merged and considered collectively. This<br>process corresponds with Virginia Department of Education (2021: 20).   |
| Scores and standards used during assessment should be carefully selected<br>and considered. According to best practice, when students are aligned with<br>the normative population of a particular assessment, standard scores are<br>considered the most robust for comparison and as a component in decision-<br>making. Additionally, standard scores for students who do not fit the<br>normative population of the assessment should be interpreted with caution<br>and considered as a nonstandard administration. Individual evaluators and<br>groups are cautioned against using age and grade equivalent scores to<br>compare students or for decision-making.      |
| When the assessments are completed, a written report (or IEP) of the results<br>of each assessment is prepared. A copy of the evaluation report(s) and<br>documentation and information that will be used for a determination of<br>eligibility shall be given to the parent not less than 10 calendar days prior to<br>the meeting. [3.5(a)]  |

| NOTICE OF A MEETING  | NOTICE OF A MEETING  |
|--|--|
| Parent is provided notice of meeting to determine student eligibility for special education and related services, and if eligible develop an IEP.<br><u>Meetings to determine eligibility and develop an IEP shall, if feasible, be combined as long as the requirements for notice of a meeting are met.</u><br>[2.3(k)]  | Parents should be notified of the meeting to determine student eligibility.<br>Their collaboration is fundamental to the conduct of a comprehensive and<br>individualized assessment that is capable of identifying a child's strengths<br>and weaknesses, from whereupon sound conclusions can be deduced and, a<br>determination made. Within this frame, parental involvement and<br>participation is important to a child's success. Parental consent and<br>participation should be acquired and managed according to applicable<br>federal and state regulations. To determine who qualifies as a parent in<br>terms of evaluations, see consult the federal (34 CFR 99.4 and 34 CFR<br>300.30) and state laws.<br>New Jersey state law allows, when possible, a combining of the eligibility and<br>IEP writing into one meeting. |
| PARTICIPANTS<br>2.3(k)1 S- 5   | PARTICIPANTS   |
| Eligibility is determined collaboratively by:         • Parent       • A teacher         • Child (where appropriate)       • Case manager         • A child study member       • Other appropriate individuals at the discretion of the parent or school district; and         For an initial eligibility meeting, certified school personnel referring the student as potentially a student with a disability, or the school principal or designee if they choose to participate. | Team members should fully participate in the discussion of data and services<br>required, with individuals sharing their expertise and knowledge within the<br>context of what data was collected, how they interpret it, and what it<br>implies. When inconsistencies arise in the data or interpretations of the data,<br>these should be thoroughly discussed and clarified. Related service<br>providers are beneficial and should be incorporated into teams as required,<br>and they should contribute to data reviews and discussions so that informed<br>and legally defensible decisions are made.<br>Eligibility is determined collaboratively by:<br>According to state law, at minimum, the following should be present at the<br>eligibility and/or IEP meeting:  |
|  | <ul> <li>Parent</li> <li>Child (where appropriate)</li> <li>A child study member</li> <li>Other appropriate individuals at the discretion of the parent or school district; and</li> </ul>   |

|   | For an initial eligibility meeting, certified school personnel referring the student as potentially a student with a disability, or the school principal or designee if they choose to participate.   |
|---|---|
| Making the determination of eligibility:  | Making an eligibility determination:  |
| Making the determination of eligibility: A student shall not be determined eligible if the determinant factor is due to a lack of instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction, or math, or due to limited English proficiency. [3.5(b)] | Making an eligibility determination:C-SEP users should thoroughly document their consideration and ruling out<br>of exclusionary factors as the primary factors of a student's lack of<br>educational achievement as required by federal and state guidance. Among<br>these factors, the lack of appropriate instruction in reading and math, as well<br>as limited English proficiency must be considered. In instances where an<br>exclusionary factor could explain a child's lack of educational achievement,<br>this student may not be found eligible. Team members should collect, merge<br>and analyze multiple sources of data and rule exclusionary factors out<br>independently. C-SEP users may select to leverage the Exclusionary Factors<br>worksheet to ensure that each factor is carefully considered and ruled out.Educational Identification and Medical Diagnosis<br>Careful consideration must be given to the health and wellbeing of a student<br>during an evaluation. This includes taking into account any medical<br>conditions, use of medication, and diagnoses made by licensed healthcare<br>providers and noted in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental<br>Disorders 5 <sup>th</sup> Edition (DSM 5). Such diagnosis cannot individually be utilized<br>to make an eligibility determination, but they should be merged and<br>interpreted within multiple sources of data. Evaluators will also have to<br>cautiously weigh the impact of these conditions on the behavioral or<br>educational performance of the child.The medical information must be considered against the identification<br>criteria offered under IDEA and New Jersey. Only students that meet the<br>criteria can be considered eligible. |
|   | Evaluators should keep in mind that a student might meet the criteria for<br>educational identification as a child with a disability under one of the federal<br>disability categories without having a medical diagnosis. It is also equally<br>possible for a student to have a medical diagnosis but not meet the eligibility<br>criteria as a child with a disability.  |

|   | Eliminating Disadvantages to Reduce Disproportionality in Referrals<br>Evaluators are charged with carefully considering and ruling out exclusionary<br>factors as the primary cause of a child's educational challenges. Among other<br>exclusionary factors identified in IDEA, an eligibility committee must consider<br>environmental, cultural, and economic influences prior to determining if a<br>child has a disability. C-SEP provides a checklist for exclusionary factors,<br>which can be singularly used or combined with other resources.<br>Documentation of this process is essential and should be included in the<br>student records and the IEP.<br>C-SEP recommends that evaluators and Team Members be careful to take<br>cultural, racial, and economic factors into consideration when interacting<br>with students and conducting assessments to eliminate potential bias in the<br>process.<br>Evaluators are expected to track and report race, ethnicity, and disability<br>that are then reported to the state. Check your state and local policy for<br>protocol. Schools and districts are expected to have polities and procedures<br>in place to reduce disproportionality and inappropriate identification.<br>Evaluators and Team members should familiarize themselves with these and<br>adhere to them. |
|---|--|
| <ul> <li>A student shall be determined eligible and classified "eligible for special education and related services" when:</li> <li>The student has one or more of the disabilities defined in 6A:14-3.5(c)1-14;</li> <li>The disability adversely affects the student's educational performance; and</li> <li>The student is in need of special education and related services.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>IDEA establishes guidelines for which conditions must be met to find a child eligible for special education services. At the same time, individual states have the capacity to set standards and norms within the federal legal framework. The decision must be made by a group of qualified individuals, including the parent(s), who have considered multiple sources of data and determine if the child has a disability.</li> <li>A student shall be determined eligible and be classified "eligible for special education and related services" when: <ul> <li>The student has one or more of the disabilities defined in 6A:14-3.5(c)1-14;</li> <li>The disability adversely affects the student's educational performance; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |

| Each team member shall certify in writing whether his or her report is in accordance with the conclusion (determination) of eligibility of the student. If his or her report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team member must submit a separate statement presenting his or her conclusions. | <ul> <li>The student is in need of special education and related services.</li> <li>Within the C-SEP framework, the existing data should be carefully considered with other data available. The combination should clearly indicate a student's strengths and weaknesses, and be sufficient to make a legally defensible decision whether the child does not warrant further evaluation or they are suspected of having a disability and require additional testing.</li> <li>All team members must certify in writing whether the IEP is in accordance with the conclusion (determination) of eligibility of the student. If the report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team member must submit a separate statement presenting alternative conclusions. Team members should consult federal and state protocol for additional information.</li> </ul> |
|--|---|
| When the student is not eligible:  | When the student is not eligible:   |
| WRITTEN NOTICE   | WRITTEN NOTICE  |
| <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the determination that the student is ineligible for special education and related services; and</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul>                                      | <ul> <li>Written notice must be given to the parents within 15 calendar days of the eligibility meeting:</li> <li>Written notice of the determination that the student is ineligible for special education and related services; and</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul>   |
| DISAGREEMENT   | DISAGREEMENT  |
| The parent may disagree with the determination by requesting mediation or a due process hearing or an independent education evaluation.  | When collectively analyzing the data, the eligibility members should try to<br>reach a consensus within existing federal and state regulations. Within the<br>group, interpretation of the data should be a collective endeavor and<br>decisions should be based on shared understanding of multiple sources of<br>data. In instances where an individual member's conclusion does not<br>correspond with the collective, this dissention should be thoroughly<br>documented and included in documentation of the evaluation and the<br>student's records.<br>Parents are entitled to challenge a decision not to conduct an evaluation,<br>and may do so in the state of New Jersey through mediation or a due process<br>hearing. All stakeholders should adhere to federal and state standards.  |

|  | Eligibility decisions within the C-SEP framework are to be deduced from<br>multiple sources of data that has been collected using diverse methods of<br>data collection. The data should be collected, merged and analyzed in order<br>to identify eligibility, to eliminate exclusionary factors, and to determine the<br>extent of the need and the supports and accommodations that a student<br>requires. Eligibility criteria as spelled out in federal and state protocol should<br>be consulted when making decisions. All decisions made should be evidence-<br>based and legally defensible.  |
|--|--|
| INDEPENDENT EVALUATION<br>2.5(c)1-8 S-17   | INDEPENDENT EVALUATION   |
| If a parent seeks an independent evaluation in one or more areas not<br>assessed as part of an initial evaluation or reevaluation, the school district<br>shall first have the opportunity to conduct the requested evaluation<br>(assessment).<br>The school district shall determine within ten (10) days of receipt of the<br>request for an independent evaluation whether to conduct the evaluation(s)<br>(assessments), and notify the parent of its determination. If the school<br>district determines that it will conduct the evaluation(s) (assessments) first,<br>the school district will obtain consent. If the parent will not provide<br>consent, the district should inform the parent that the parent may still<br>obtain an independent evaluation but not at public expense. | While beyond the scope of the C-SEP framework, users should be aware that<br>in certain cases, New Jersey allows parents to seek an independent<br>evaluation in one or more areas not assessed as part of an initial evaluation<br>or reevaluation. However, the school district must first be given the<br>opportunity to conduct the requested evaluation (assessment) prior to<br>attaining external evaluation.<br>The school district shall determine within ten (10) days of receipt of the<br>request for an independent evaluation whether to conduct the evaluation(s)<br>(assessments), and notify the parent of its determination. If the school<br>district determines that it will conduct the evaluation(s) (assessments) first,<br>the school district must obtain parental consent. If the parent will not<br>provide consent, the district should inform the parent that the parent may<br>still obtain an independent evaluation but not at public expense. |
| When the student is eligible, develop the Individualized Education<br>Program (IEP):   | If the student is deemed eligible, an Individualized Education Program (IEP)<br>must be developed.<br>Thorough documentation of the assessment is essential. This includes<br>explaining which data was collected, how it was interpreted and which<br>decisions were made based on the data. This information should be detailed<br>in the reports and included in a student's educational records. According to<br>best practice, reports should include a summary of the assessment activities,<br>descriptions of the student's performance, observation notes, data and<br>norm-referenced scores, a summary of strengths and weaknesses, and<br>recommendations for those working with the student. Evaluators may   |

| instructions. Consult federal and state regulations for more information. |  | provide recommendations. When students differ from the norming<br>population or participate using a non-standard administration, professionals<br>are encouraged to reference the administration manual for specific<br>instructions. Consult federal and state regulations for more information |
|---|--|--|
|---|--|--|

| INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM   |   |
|--|---|
| PARTICIPANTS<br>2.3(k)2 S- 5; S-9 to 11  | PARTICIPANTS  |
| <ul> <li>An IEP is developed at a meeting by the IEP team which shall include the following participants:</li> <li>The parent;</li> <li>Not less than one general education teacher of the student, if the student is or may be participating in the general education classroom;</li> <li>If the student has no general education teacher, a general</li> </ul>   | Collaboration is fundamental to the conduct of a comprehensive and<br>individualized assessment that is capable of identifying a child's strengths<br>and weaknesses, from whereupon sound conclusions can be deduced and, a<br>determination made. Within this frame, parental involvement and<br>participation of other stakeholders is important to a child's success.<br>Team members should fully participate in the discussion of data and services   |
| <ul> <li>Not less than one special education teacher of the student, or where appropriate, not less than one special education teacher or special education provider; If there is no special education teacher or special education provider, a special education teacher or provider who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;</li> </ul>   | required, with individuals sharing their expertise and knowledge within the<br>context of what data was collected, how they interpret it, and what it<br>implies. When inconsistencies arise in the data or interpretations of the data,<br>these should be thoroughly discussed and clarified. Related service<br>providers are beneficial and should be incorporated into teams as required,<br>and they should contribute to data reviews and discussions so that informed<br>and legally defensible decisions are made. |
| <ul> <li>At least one child study team member who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results;</li> <li>The case manager;</li> <li>A representative of the district board of education who:</li> </ul>  | All IEP team members should review the data to help determine which<br>services are necessary. According to C-SEP best practices, after reviewing the<br>data, an IEP Team is responsible for:  |
| <ul> <li>Is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities;</li> <li>Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum;</li> <li>Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the district board of education; and</li> <li>Shall be the child study team member or other appropriate personnel including the special education administrator or</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Determining if a child requires services</li> <li>Identify which type of services are required</li> <li>Establishing IEP goals and monitoring mechanisms</li> <li>Determine the quantity and duration of services</li> <li>Adhering to state established, grade level Standards of Learning (SOL)</li> <li>IEP documentation should include, at minimum: <ul> <li>A review of all data collected (existing and new)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |

| principal;  | Consideration of external sources of data  |
|---|--|
|   |  |
| <ul> <li>principal;</li> <li>At the discretion of the parent or school district, other individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student, including related services personnel as appropriate;</li> <li>The student where appropriate;</li> <li>At the request of the parent, the Part C Service Coordinator for a student transitioning from Part C to Part B; and</li> <li>If a purpose of the meeting is to consider transition services, the student with disabilities and a representative of any other agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services shall be invited to attend the IEP meeting.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Consideration of external sources of data</li> <li>Identification of services needed (type, amount, goals)</li> <li>Careful consideration must be made when evaluating students and sufficient data must be collected to make legally defensible decisions. Single types of data, such as grades, alone, are insufficient to demonstrate the child has a strength or a weakness, or has a disability. Eligibility committees should be familiar with identification practices and criteria surrounding the area of disability and giftedness. Within this context, they should examine relevant data and carefully interpret it to make sound decisions concerning giftedness, characteristics of disabilities, and twice gifted.</li> <li>An Individualized Education Program (IEP) is developed at a meeting by the IEP team which shall include the following participants:         <ul> <li>The parent;</li> <li>Not less than one general education teacher of the student, if the student is or may be participating in the general education classroom;</li> <li>If the student has no general education teacher, a general education teacher who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;</li> <li>Not less than one special education teacher or provider; If there is no special education teacher or provider who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;</li> <li>At least one child study team member who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results;</li> <li>The case manager;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|   |  |
|   | <ul> <li>A representative of the district board of education who:</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul> <li>Is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specially<br/>designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students with<br/>disabilities;</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul> <li>Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum;</li> <li>Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the district board of education; and</li> </ul>   |

|   | <ul> <li>Shall be the child study team member or other appropriate personnel including the special education administrator or principal;</li> <li>At the discretion of the parent or school district, other individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student, including related services personnel as appropriate;</li> <li>The student where appropriate;</li> <li>At the request of the parent, the Part C Service Coordinator for a student transitioning from Part C to Part B; and</li> <li>If a purpose of the meeting is to consider transition services, the student with disabilities and a representative of any other agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services shall be invited to attend the IEP meeting.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|
| AUDIO-TAPING  | AUDIO-TAPING   |
| Participants at the IEP meeting shall be allowed to use an audio-tape recorder during the meeting <u>provided notification is given to the other</u> participants prior to the start of the meeting that such a device is being <u>utilized</u> .   | Participants at the IEP meeting in New Jersey may record the meeting.<br>However, other participants must be notified prior to the start of the<br>meeting that the meeting will be recorded.  |
| EXCUSAL FROM AN IEP TEAM MEETING<br>2.3(k)9, 10   | EXCUSAL FROM AN IEP TEAM MEETING   |
| For a <b>required</b> member of the IEP team whose area of the curriculum or<br>related services <b>is not being modified or discussed</b> , such IEP team member<br>may be excused from participation in the meeting, in whole or in part,<br>provided the parent and district board of education agree that the IEP team<br>member need not attend the meeting and the parent consents to such<br>excusal in writing. | In New Jersey, IEP team member may be excused from participation in the meeting if their area of the curriculum or related services <b>is not being modified or discussed</b> , in whole or in part, provided the parent and district board of education agree that the IEP team member need not attend the meeting and the parent consents to such excusal in writing.  |
| For a required member of the IEP team whose area of the curriculum or<br>related services is being modified or discussed, such IEP team member may<br>be excused from participation in the meeting, in whole or in part, provided<br>the parent and district board of education agree that the IEP team member<br>need not attend the meeting, the team member provides written input to                                | For a required member of the IEP team whose area of the curriculum or<br>related services is being modified or discussed, this member may be excused<br>from participation in the meeting, in whole or in part, provided the parent<br>and district board of education agree that the IEP team member need not<br>attend the meeting, the team member provides written input to the parent<br>and the IEP team, and the parent consents to excusal in writing. The written   |

| the parent and the IEP team, and the parent consents to excusal in writing.<br>The written input shall be provided to the parent with notice of the IEP<br>meeting date.  | input shall be provided to the parent with notice of the IEP meeting date.<br>Nevertheless, C-SEP would encourage that all IEP team members be involved<br>so that data can be shared, explained, and discussed as a collective. In this<br>manner, we believe that a child receives the most thorough evaluation and<br>decision.   |
|---|--|
| WRITTEN NOTES or COPY OF IEP<br>3.7(I)  | WRITTEN NOTES or COPY OF IEP   |
| Either a copy of the IEP or written notes setting forth agreements with respect to the IEP as determined by the IEP team shall be provided to the parents at the conclusion of the meeting.   | At the conclusion of the meeting, the parent should be provided with a copy<br>of the IEP or written notes setting forth agreements with respect to the IEP<br>as determined by the IEP team. The IEP or IEP notes should be written in a<br>clear manner in a language that the parent understands.   |
| WRITTEN NOTICE  | WRITTEN NOTICE   |
| <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent provided:</li> <li>Written notice of the determination(s) and proposed actions including: <ul> <li>Eligibility;</li> <li>Proposed individualized education program;</li> <li>Proposed educational placement;</li> <li>A request for written consent from the parent; and</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the IEP meeting, New Jersey law states that a parent should be provided with: <ul> <li>Written notice of the determination(s) and proposed actions including:</li> <li>Eligibility;</li> <li>Proposed individualized education program;</li> <li>Proposed educational placement;</li> <li>A request for written consent from the parent; and</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul> </li> <li>This documentation should be provided in a language and manner that the parent understands.</li> </ul> |
| CONSIDERATION   | CONSIDERATION  |
| The parent may consider the determination of eligibility and the proposed program for up to 15 calendar days.<br>After 15 calendar days the student is considered "Eligible for Special   | The state of New Jersey allows a parent 15 calendar days to consider the determination of eligibility and the proposed program according to New Jersey law.  |
| Education and Related Services," if the parent did not disagree by requesting mediation or a due process hearing.   | After 15 calendar days, the student is considered "Eligible for Special Education and Related Services," if the parent does not disagree by  |

|  | requesting mediation or a due process hearing.  |
|--|---|
| OBTAINING CONSENT<br>2.3(c)  | OBTAINING CONSENT   |
| When a parent refuses to provide consent for implementation of the initial<br>IEP, no IEP shall be finalized and the district board of education may not<br>seek to compel consent through a due process hearing.<br>If a parent refuses special education and related services on behalf of a   | According to federal and state law, if a parent refuses to provide consent for implementation of the initial IEP, the IEP shall not be finalized and the district board of education may not seek to compel consent through a due process hearing.  |
| student, the district board of education shall not be determined to have<br>denied the student a free, appropriate public education, nor shall it be<br>determined in violation of its child-find obligation solely because it failed to<br>provide special education and related services.  | If a parent refuses special education and related services on behalf of a student, the district board of education shall not be determined to have denied the student a free, appropriate public education, nor shall it be determined in violation of its child-find obligation solely because it failed to provide special education and related services.  |
| NOTE:  | NOTE:   |
| A public agency may not use a parent's refusal to consent to one service or<br>activityto deny the parent or child any other service, benefit, or<br>activity34 CFR §300.300(d)(3)   | According to federal law (34 CFR §300.300(d)(3)), a public agency may not<br>use a parent's refusal to consent to one service or activityto deny the<br>parent or child any other service, benefit, or activity   |
| If the parent and the district agree to certain provisions of the proposed<br>program, the parent may sign consent to implement the agreed upon IEP<br>provisions. The parent has the option to request a due process hearing<br>regarding those provisions of the IEP that are in dispute.  | However, in instances where the parent and the district agree to certain<br>provisions of the proposed program, the parent may provide written consent<br>to implement the agreed upon IEP provisions. The parent has the option to<br>request a due process hearing regarding those provisions of the IEP that are<br>in dispute.  |
| When parental consent is granted, the IEP is implemented as soon as possible following the IEP meeting and within 90 calendar day timeline.  | Once parental consent is obtained, the IEP should be implemented as soon<br>as possible following the IEP meeting and within the 90 calendar day<br>timeline.   |
| The district board of education shall provide the parent with the<br>opportunity to observe the proposed educational placement, including the<br>general education setting, special class programs and out-of-district<br>placements in a program operated by another district board of education<br>or a private school placement, prior to implementation of the IEP. [4.1(k)] | According to New Jersey law, the district board of education must provide<br>the parent with the opportunity to observe the proposed educational<br>placement, including the general education setting, special class programs<br>and out-of-district placements in a program operated by another district<br>board of education or a private school placement, prior to implementation of<br>the IEP. [4.1(k)] |

| The district shall maintain documentation that the student's teacher(s)<br>and provider(s), as applicable, have been informed of their specific<br>responsibilities related to implementing the student's IEP. [3.7(a)3] | All relevant stakeholders should be clearly aware of their role and responsibilities concerning implementation of a student's IEP. For this reason, New Jersey requires that a district maintain documentation that the student's teacher(s) and provider(s), as applicable, have been informed of their specific responsibilities related to implementing the student's IEP. [3.7(a)3] Data should be regularly collected on students receiving services and/or support, which will be both valuable and required for the annual review process. |
|--|---|

| ANNUAL REVIEW  |   |
|--|---|
| NOTICE OF A MEETING  | NOTICE OF A MEETING   |
| Parent is provided notice of meeting to review and revise IEP. The notice includes a copy of PRISE                     | The parent should be provided with notice of the annual review meeting according to federal and state guidelines. The notification should include a copy of the PRISE.  |
| Annually, or more often if necessary, the IEP team shall meet to review<br>and revise the IEP and determine placement. | <ul> <li>New Jersey law requires that cases be reviewed, at minimum, once per year to review and revise the IEP and determine placement. Data should be regularly collected on students receiving services and/or support. The findings should be recurrently reviewed to monitor student progress and make service and support adjustments. Idea specifies that an IEP include impact and needs statements that equally include goals.</li> <li>In particular, the goals and objectives set by an IEP should: <ul> <li>Identify current skills levels.</li> <li>Develop appropriate, realistic learning objectives.</li> <li>Create individualized education programs.</li> <li>Monitor and measure progress over time.</li> <li>Maintain clear records for the IEP Team and educators.</li> <li>Reporting should occur regularly, and occur as often as including progress report cards and interims (see Virginia Department of Education, 2014).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|   | The IEP should equally document the data collected and the methods<br>utilized, how the data was utilized, and the findings extrapolated from its<br>review. The IEP should equally document the decision made and include<br>specific data in the PWN highlighting data and other options considered.<br>From the above, a determination must be made and documented pertaining<br>to the amounts and types of services should be provided.   |
|---|--|
| PARTICIPANTS  | PARTICIPANTS   |
| 2.3(k)2 S - 5; S - 9 to 11  |  |
| <ul> <li>Annual review participants include:</li> <li>The parent;</li> <li>Not less than one general education teacher, if the student is or may be participating in the general education classroom;</li> <li>If the student has no general education teacher, a general education teacher who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;</li> <li>Not less than one special education teacher, or where appropriate, at least one special education teacher or special education provider;</li> <li>If there is no special education teacher or special education provider, a special education teacher or provider who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;</li> <li>At least one child study team member who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results;</li> </ul> | Collaboration is fundamental to the conduct of a comprehensive and<br>individualized assessment that is capable of identifying a child's strengths<br>and weaknesses, from whereupon sound conclusions can be deduced and, a<br>determination made. Within this frame, parental involvement and<br>participation of other stakeholders is important to a child's success.<br>Team members should fully participate in the discussion of data and services<br>required, with individuals sharing their expertise and knowledge within the<br>context of what data was collected, how they interpret it, and what it<br>implies. When inconsistencies arise in the data or interpretations of the data,<br>these should be thoroughly discussed and clarified. Related service<br>providers are beneficial and should be incorporated into teams as required,<br>and they should contribute to data reviews and discussions so that informed<br>and legally defensible decisions are made. |
| <ul> <li>The case manager;</li> <li>A representative of the district board of education who: <ul> <li>Is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities;</li> <li>Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum;</li> <li>Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the district board of education; and</li> <li>Shall be the child study team member or other appropriate personnel including the special education administrator or principal;</li> </ul> </li> <li>At the discretion of the parent or school district, other individuals</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>According to New Jersey, annual review participants should include:</li> <li>The parent;</li> <li>Not less than one general education teacher, if the student is or may be participating in the general education classroom;</li> <li>If the student has no general education teacher, a general education teacher who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;</li> <li>Not less than one special education teacher, or where appropriate, at least one special education teacher or special education provider;</li> <li>If there is no special education teacher or special education provider, a special education teacher or provider who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;</li> </ul>  |
| who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student,  | <ul> <li>At least one child study team member who can interpret the</li> </ul>   |

| including related services personnel as appropriate;   | instructional implications of evaluation results;  |
|--|--|
| The student where appropriate; and   | • The case manager;  |
|  | • A representative of the district board of education who:   |
| If a purpose of the meeting is to consider transition services, the student<br>with educational disabilities and a representative of any other agency that is<br>likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services shall  | <ul> <li>Is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specially<br/>designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students<br/>with disabilities;</li> </ul>   |
| be invited to attend the IEP meeting.  | <ul> <li>Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum;</li> </ul>   |
|  | <ul> <li>Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the<br/>district board of education; and</li> </ul>   |
|  | <ul> <li>Shall be the child study team member or other appropriate<br/>personnel including the special education administrator or<br/>principal;</li> </ul>  |
|  | <ul> <li>At the discretion of the parent or school district, other individuals<br/>who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student,<br/>including related services personnel as appropriate;</li> </ul>  |
|  | The student where appropriate; and   |
|  | If a purpose of the meeting is to consider transition services, the student<br>with educational disabilities and a representative of any other agency that is<br>likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services shall be<br>invited to attend the IEP meeting.   |
| REVIEW OF DATA   | REVIEW OF DATA   |
| <ul> <li>The IEP team shall review:</li> <li>Any lack of expected progress toward the annual goals and in the general curriculum, where appropriate;</li> <li>The results of any reevaluation;</li> <li>Information about the student including information provided by the parents, current classroom based assessments and observations, and the observations of teachers and related service</li> </ul> | C-SEP encourages evaluators to collect, merge and process data in a manner<br>that provides a clear understanding of a child's strengths and weaknesses.<br>From this information, eligibility decisions can be made and specific<br>recommendations for accommodations and/or services can be determined.<br>All members should contribute to data collection and participation in group<br>data analysis to ensure their expertise is shared and informed decisions can<br>be made. C-SEP highly encourage that all recommendations of services be<br>made in writing and presented with the other data to all stakeholders. |
| providers;   |  |
| <ul> <li>The student's anticipated needs; or</li> <li>Other relevant matters</li> </ul>  | Among the data that should be considered, the IEP team should review:  |
| <ul> <li>Other relevant matters.</li> <li>For those students in a separate setting, the IEP team shall, on an annual</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Any lack of expected progress toward the annual goals and in the<br/>general curriculum, where appropriate;</li> </ul>  |
| To those students in a separate setting, the ren team shall, on all allitual   | The results of any reevaluation;   |

| basis, consider activities necessary to transition the student to a less<br>restrictive placement [3.7(k)]   | <ul> <li>Information about the student including information provided by the parents, current classroom based assessments and observations, and the observations of teachers and related service providers;</li> <li>The student's anticipated needs; or</li> <li>Other relevant matters.</li> <li>If a students is in a separate setting, the IEP team must annually consider what is necessary to transition the student to a less restrictive placement [3.7(k)]</li> </ul> |
|--|--|
| WRITTEN NOTICE   | WRITTEN NOTICE   |
| <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent is provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the proposed actions:</li> <li>The proposed individualized education program; and</li> <li>The proposed educational placement;</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>State law requires that the parent be notified within 15 calendar days of the annual review meeting. They should also be provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the proposed actions:</li> <li>The proposed individualized education program; and</li> <li>The proposed educational placement;</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul>  |
| CONSIDERATION  | CONSIDERATION  |
| Parent is provided 15 calendar days to consider implementation of the revised IEP. The parent may agree in writing to implement the IEP sooner.  | In New Jersey, a parent has 15 calendar days to consider whether they consent to implementation of the revised IEP program. However, they may consent sooner.  |
| IMPLEMENTATION<br>2.3(h)3  | IMPLEMENTATION   |
| The IEP may be implemented after 15 calendar days, if the parent did not disagree by requesting mediation or a due process hearing.  | According to New Jersey law, the IEP may be implemented after 15 calendar days, if the parent did not disagree by requesting mediation or a due process hearing.   |
| AMDENDING  | AMDENDING  |
| 3.7(d)1-4  |  |
| <ul> <li>The IEP may be amended without a meeting of the IEP team when:</li> <li>The parent makes a written request to the district board of education for a specific amendment to a provision or provisions of</li> </ul>   | According to New Jersey law, an IEP can be amended without a meeting of<br>the IEP team when:<br>• The parent makes a written request to the district board of   |

| the IEP and the district agrees, provides written notice and obtains           | education for a specific amendment to a provision or provisions of             |
|--|--|
| parental consent in writing;   | the IEP and the district agrees, provides written notice and obtains           |
| • The school district provides the parent a written proposal to                | parental consent in writing;   |
| amend a provision or provisions of the IEP and, within 15 days                 | • The school district provides the parent a written proposal to amend          |
| from the date the written proposal is provided to the parent, the              | a provision or provisions of the IEP and, within 15 days from the              |
| parent consents in writing to the proposed amendment;                          | date the written proposal is provided to the parent, the parent                |
|  | consents in writing to the proposed amendment;                                 |
| All amendments shall be incorporated in an amended IEP or an addendum          |  |
| to the IEP, and a copy of the amended IEP or addendum shall be provided to     | All amendments must be incorporated in a newly developed IEP or through        |
| the parent within 15 days of receipt of parent consent by the school district. | an addendum to the existing IEP. A copy of the amended IEP or addendum         |
| All members of the IEP team that participated in the development of the IEP    | must then be provided to the parent within 15 days of receipt of parental      |
| that was amended must be informed in writing of the change(s) to the IEP.      | consent by the school district. All members of the IEP team that participated  |
| In addition, all teachers and providers whose duties are altered by an         | in the development of the amended IEP must be informed in writing of the       |
| amendment of an IEP must be informed of their new responsibilities for         | change(s) to the IEP. In addition, all teachers and providers whose duties are |
| implementation of the IEP; and   | altered by an amendment of an IEP must be informed of their new                |
|  | responsibilities for implementation of the IEP; and                            |
| If an IEP is amended, such amendment shall not affect the requirement that     |  |
| the IEP team review the IEP at a meeting annually, or more often if            | If an IEP is amended, the amendment does not affect the requirement that       |
| necessary.   | the IEP team must review the IEP at an annual meeting, or more often if        |
|  | necessary.   |
|  |  |

| REEVALUATION   |   |
|--|---|
| Within three years of previous classification, a multi-disciplinary reevaluation shall be completed to determine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability.  | Within three years of previous classification, a multi-disciplinary reevaluation<br>must be conducted to determine whether the student continues to be a<br>student with a disability. The reevaluation should maintain the standards and<br>protocols of an evaluation process (as briefly referenced above) and dictated<br>in federal, state, and local regulations.   |
| Reevaluation shall be conducted sooner if conditions warrant or if the student's parent or teacher requests the reevaluation. However, a reevaluation shall not be conducted prior to the expiration of one year from the date the parent is provided written notice of the determination with respect to eligibility in the most recent evaluation or reevaluation, unless the parent and the district both agree that a reevaluation prior to the expiration of one year as set forth above is warranted. [3.8(a)] | A reevaluation may occur sooner if conditions warrant or if the student's parent or teacher requests a reevaluation. However, a reevaluation shall not be conducted prior to the expiration of one year from the date the parent is provided written notice of the determination with respect to eligibility in the most recent evaluation or reevaluation, unless the parent and the district both agree that a reevaluation prior to the expiration of one year as set forth above is warranted. [3.8(a)] |

| If a parent provides written consent and the district board of education<br>agrees that a reevaluation is unnecessary, the reevaluation may be waived.<br>If are evaluation is waived, the date of the parent's written consent shall<br>constitute the date upon which the next three year period for conducting a<br>reevaluation shall commence. [3.8(a)1]  | If a parent provides written consent and the district board of education<br>agrees that a reevaluation is unnecessary, the reevaluation may be waived. If<br>are evaluation is waived, the date of the parent's written consent shall<br>constitute the date upon which the next three year period for conducting a<br>reevaluation shall commence. [3.8(a)1]  |
|--|--|
| Reevaluation shall be conducted when a change in eligibility is being considered, except when a student graduates or reaches age 21. [3.8(d)]  | Reevaluation shall be conducted when a change in eligibility is being considered, except when a student graduates or reaches age 21. [3.8(d)]  |
| When a reevaluation is conducted sooner than three years from the previous evaluation, the reevaluation shall be completed in accordance with the timeframes in subsection 3.8(e).   | When a reevaluation is conducted sooner than three years from the previous evaluation, the reevaluation shall be completed in accordance with the timeframes in subsection 3.8(e).   |
| Unless the parent and the district board of education agree to waive a reevaluation, all requirements for performing a reevaluation shall, as applicable, be completed within 60 days of the date the parent provides consent for the assessments to be conducted as part of the reevaluation or by the expiration of the three year timeframe from completion of the prior evaluation or reevaluation, whichever occurs sooner.[3.8(e)] | Unless the parent and the district board of education agree to waive a reevaluation, all requirements for performing a reevaluation shall, as applicable, be completed within 60 days of the date the parent provides consent for the assessments to be conducted as part of the reevaluation or by the expiration of the three year timeframe from completion of the prior evaluation or reevaluation, whichever occurs sooner.[3.8(e)] |
| NOTICE OF A MEETING  | NOTICE OF A MEETING  |
| Parent is provided notice of meeting to review data and determine nature<br>and scope of the reevaluation. The notice includes the short procedural<br>safeguards statement.   | Parent is provided notice of the reevaluation meeting to review data and determine nature and scope of the reevaluation. The notice should includes the short procedural safeguards statement.   |
| PARTICIPANTS<br>2.3(k)2 S-5; S-9 to 11   | PARTICIPANTS   |
| <ul> <li>Data shall be reviewed by and the nature and scope of the reevaluation shall be determined by the IEP team which shall include the following participants:</li> <li>The parent</li> <li>At least one child study team member who can interpret the instructional implications of the evaluation results;</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>IEP team participants include:</li> <li>The parent</li> <li>At least one child study team member who can interpret the instructional implications of the evaluation results;</li> <li>Not less than one general education teacher, if the student is or more be participating in the general education elastroam.</li> </ul>  |
| <ul> <li>Not less than one general education teacher, if the student is or</li> </ul>  | <ul><li>may be participating in the general education classroom;</li><li>If the student has no general education teacher, a general</li></ul>  |

| may be participating in the general education classroom;   | education teacher who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;  |
|--|--|
| <ul> <li>If the student has no general education teacher, a general<br/>education teacher who is knowledgeable about the district's</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Not less than one special education teacher, or where appropriate,</li> </ul>                               |
| programs;  | at least one special education provider;   |
| <ul> <li>Not less than one special education teacher, or where appropriate,</li> </ul>   | If there is no special education teacher or special education  |
| at least one special education provider;   | provider, a special education teacher or special education   |
| If there is no special education teacher or special education  | provider who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;   |
| provider, a special education teacher or special education   | The case manager;  |
| provider who is knowledgeable about the district's programs;   | A representative of the district board of education who:   |
| The case manager;  | Is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specially  |
| <ul> <li>A representative of the district board of education who:</li> </ul>   | designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students  |
| Is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specially  | with disabilities;   |
| designed instruction to meet the unique needs of students<br>with disabilities;  | Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum;   |
| <ul> <li>Is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum;</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the<br/>district board of education; and</li> </ul> |
| <ul> <li>Is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Shall be the child study team member or other appropriate</li> </ul>  |
| district board of education; and   | personnel including the special education administrator or   |
| <ul> <li>Shall be the child study team member or other appropriate</li> </ul>  | principal;   |
| personnel including the special education administrator or   | At the discretion of the parent or school district, other individuals  |
| principal;   | who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student,   |
| At the discretion of the parent or school district, other individuals  | including related services personnel as appropriate; and   |
| who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the student,   | The student, where appropriate   |
| including related services personnel as appropriate; and   |  |
| The student, where appropriate   | The team's task is to review the nature and scope of the reevaluation and make a determination.                      |
|  |  |
| MEETING  | MEETING  |
| The IEP team shall determine the nature and scope of the reevaluation  | The IEP team shall determine the nature and scope of the reevaluation  |
| according to the following:  | according to the following:  |
|  |  |
| REVIEW OF DATA   | REVIEW OF DATA   |
| The IEP team shall review existing data and shall identify what additional   | The IEP team shall review existing data and shall identify what additional   |
| data, if any are needed to determine:  | data, if any are needed to determine:  |
| <ul> <li>Whether the student continues to have a disability;</li> </ul>  | Whether the student continues to have a disability;  |
| <ul> <li>The present levels of academic achievement and functional</li> </ul>  | The present levels of academic achievement and functional  |

| <ul> <li>performance and educational and related developmental needs of the student;</li> <li>Whether the student needs special education and related services, and the academic, developmental, functional and behavioral needs of the student and how they should be appropriately be addressed in the students' IEP; and</li> <li>Whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed to enable the student with a disability to meet annual goals set in the IEP and to participate, as appropriate, in the general education curriculum.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>performance and educational and related developmental needs of the student;</li> <li>Whether the student needs special education and related services, and the academic, developmental, functional and behavioral needs of the student and how they should be appropriately be addressed in the students' IEP; and</li> <li>Whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services are needed to enable the student with a disability to meet annual goals set in the IEP and to participate, as appropriate, in the general education curriculum.</li> </ul> |
|--|--|
| When the IEP team determines that no additional data are needed:   | When the IEP team determines that no additional data are needed:   |
| CERTIFICATION<br>3.4(f)5   | CERTIFICATION  |
| Each team member shall certify in writing whether his or her report is in accordance with the conclusion of eligibility of the student. If his or her report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team member must submit a separate statement presenting his or her conclusions.   | Each team member shall certify in writing whether his or her report is in accordance with the conclusion of eligibility of the student. If his or her report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team member must submit a separate statement presenting his or her conclusions.   |
| WRITTEN NOTICE   | WRITTEN NOTICE   |
| <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, the parent is provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the determinations:</li> <li>Additional data are not warranted;</li> <li>Continued eligibility or ineligibility (de-classification);</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement; and</li> <li>A statement regarding the right of the parent to request an assessment to determine if the student continues to be a student with a disability.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, the parent must be notified. They must equally be provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the determinations:</li> <li>Additional data are not warranted;</li> <li>Continued eligibility or ineligibility (de-classification);</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement; and</li> <li>A statement regarding the right of the parent to request an assessment to determine if the student continues to be a student with a disability.</li> </ul>  |
| When the IEP team determines that additional data are needed:  | When the IEP team determines that additional data are needed:  |
| WRITTEN NOTICE   | WRITTEN NOTICE   |
| Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent (and adult student, when applicable) provided with:   | Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent (and adult student, when applicable) provided with:   |

| <ul> <li>Written notice of the determinations and proposed actions:</li> <li>Additional data are warranted to determine if the student continues to be a student with a disability;</li> <li>The nature and scope of the proposed reevaluation including which child study team members and/or specialists shall administer tests and other assessment procedures;</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement; and</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Written notice of the determinations and proposed actions:</li> <li>Additional data are warranted to determine if the student continues to be a student with a disability;</li> <li>The nature and scope of the proposed reevaluation including which child study team members and/or specialists shall administer tests and other assessment procedures;</li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement; and</li> </ul> |
|---|---|
| A request for written consent from the parent. When the student is an adult student, consent is obtained form the adult student.  | A request for written consent from the parent. When the student is an adult student, consent is obtained form the adult student.  |
| CONSIDERATION   | CONSIDERATION   |
| The parent may consider the proposed reevaluation for up to 15 calendar days.   | The parent may consider the proposed reevaluation for up to 15 calendar days.   |
| OBTAINING CONSENT   | OBTAINING CONSENT   |
| If the parent refuses to provide consent within 15 calendar days, and the district and parent have not agreed to other action, the district may request a due process hearing according to 2.3(b).  | If the parent refuses to provide consent within 15 calendar days, and the district and parent have not agreed to other action, the district may request a due process hearing according to 2.3(b).  |
| If the parent failed to respond to the request for consent for reevaluation,<br>the district board of education can proceed with the reevaluation, if it can<br>demonstrate that it had taken reasonable measures to obtain such consent,<br>such as keeping detailed records of telephone calls made or attempted or<br>maintaining copies of correspondence sent to the parents and any<br>responses received.                                | If the parent failed to respond to the request for consent for reevaluation,<br>the district board of education can proceed with the reevaluation, if it can<br>demonstrate that it had taken reasonable measures to obtain such consent,<br>such as keeping detailed records of telephone calls made or attempted or<br>maintaining copies of correspondence sent to the parents and any responses<br>received.                                |
| Assessments are conducted   | Assessments are conducted   |
| When the assessments are completed, written report(s) are prepared. A copy of the evaluation report(s) and documentation of the eligibility shall be given to the parent at least 10 days prior to the meeting. [3.8(f)1]   | When the assessments are completed, written report(s) must be prepared.<br>A copy of the evaluation report(s) and documentation of the eligibility shall<br>be given to the parent at least 10 days prior to the meeting. [3.8(f)1] See<br>above for more details on IEP reports and their contents.  |

| NOTICE OF A MEETING   | NOTICE OF A MEETING  |
|---|--|
| The parent is provided notice of meeting to determine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability, and if eligible, to review and revise the student's IEP.   | The parent must be provided with notice of meeting to determine whether<br>the student continues to be a student with a disability, and if eligible, to<br>review and revise the student's IEP.  |
| MEETING   | MEETING  |
| IEP team meets to determine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability, and if eligible, to review and revise the student's IEP.   | IEP team meets to determine whether the student continues to be a student with a disability, and if eligible, to review and revise the student's IEP.  |
| CERTIFICATION<br>3.4(f)5  | CERTIFICATION<br>3.4(f)5   |
| Each team member shall certify in writing whether his or her report is in<br>accordance with the conclusion of eligibility of the student. If his or her<br>report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team member must<br>submit a separate statement presenting his or her conclusions. | Each team member must certify in writing whether his or her report is in<br>accordance with the conclusion of eligibility of the student. If his or her<br>report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team member must<br>submit a separate statement presenting his or her conclusions. |
| When student is no longer eligible for special education and related services.  | When student is no longer eligible for special education and related services.   |
| WRITTEN NOTICE  | WRITTEN NOTICE   |
| Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent is provided with:<br>Written notice of the determination that the student is no longer<br>eligible for special education and related services; and   | Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent is provided with:<br>Written notice of the determination that the student is no longer eligible<br>for special education and related services; and  |
| A copy of the <b>short procedural safeguards statement</b> ;  | A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement;   |
| CONSIDERATION   | CONSIDERATION  |
| The parent may consider the results of the reevaluation and determination that the student is no longer eligible for up to 15 calendar days.  | The parent may consider the results of the reevaluation and determination that the student is no longer eligible for up to 15 calendar days.   |
| The parent may disagree with the reevaluation and the determination that the student is no longer eligible by requesting mediation or a due process   | The parent may disagree with the reevaluation and the determination that the student is no longer eligible by requesting mediation or a due process  |

| hearing or by requesting an independent education evaluation.  | hearing or by requesting an independent education evaluation.   |
|--|---|
| When student continues to be eligible for special education and related services:  | When student continues to be eligible for special education and related services:   |
| WRITTEN NOTICE   | WRITTEN NOTICE  |
| <ul> <li>Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent is provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the determinations and proposed actions: <ul> <li>Continued eligibility for special education and related services;</li> <li>Proposed individual education program;</li> <li>Proposed educational placement;</li> </ul> </li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>The parent must be notified if the student continues to be eligible. Within 15 calendar days of the meeting, parent is provided with:</li> <li>Written notice of the determinations and proposed actions: <ul> <li>Continued eligibility for special education and related services;</li> <li>Proposed individual education program;</li> <li>Proposed educational placement;</li> </ul> </li> <li>A copy of the short procedural safeguards statement.</li> </ul> |
| CONSIDERATION  | CONSIDERATION   |
| The parent may consider the results of the reevaluation and proposed IEP for up to 15 calendar days.   | The parent may consider the results of the reevaluation and proposed IEP for up to 15 calendar days.  |
| The proposed IEP may be implemented after 15 days, unless the parent disagrees with the reevaluation and/or proposed IEP by requesting mediation or a due process hearing. The parent may disagree with the reevaluation by requesting an independent education evaluation.  | The proposed IEP may be implemented after 15 days, unless the parent disagrees with the reevaluation and/or proposed IEP by requesting mediation or a due process hearing. The parent may disagree with the reevaluation by requesting an independent education evaluation.   |

| Evaluation S-13  |   |
|--|---|
| To determine the nature and scope of the evaluation, team members:   | To determine the nature and scope of the evaluation, team members:  |
| Review existing data on the student including, evaluations and information provided by the parents, current classroom-based assessments and observations, and the observations of teachers and related services providers; | A review of existing data must occur during all assessments, whether an initial evaluation or a reevaluation. C-SEP adheres to this mandate. The data collected and analyzed should be documented according to state law.<br>Among the data collected and reviewed by the team, C-SEP suggests, at  |
| Consider the need for any health appraisal or specialized medical evaluation;  | <ul> <li>minimum:</li> <li>1. Information provided by the parent(s) of the child,</li> <li>2. Current performance (grades, state assessments)</li> <li>3. The student's response to research-based intervention</li> </ul>  |
| The school nurse shall review and summarize available health and medical information;  | <ol> <li>The student's education records,</li> <li>Observations by teachers and related services providers.</li> <li>Health and wellbeing considerations.</li> </ol>  |
| Consider the need for additional data, if any, to determine:   | Once the data has been collected, merged and analyzed by the team, a decision should be made whether additional data is required to make a  |
| Whether the student has a disability;  | sound decision on whether the child is suspected of having a disability<br>(initial referral) or continues to have a disability (reevaluation). When a  |
| The present levels of academic and functional achievement and related developmental needs, and educational needs of the student;   | disability is suspected, the educational needs of the student should also be<br>considered and documented.  |
| Whether the student needs special education and related services; and Determine which child study team members and/or specialists shall conduct <u>each assessment that is part of</u> the evaluation.                     | When further data is required, the team must appoint individuals to collect<br>and document this data. According to the C-SEP model, as much data as<br>possible which shows a pattern of strengths and weaknesses (while also<br>paying special attention to the area(s) of suspected concern) be collected<br>by the team. Once acquired, the team should meet again to combine the |
|  | data and discuss the findings as a collective.<br>C-SEP advocates the collection of multiple sources of data using numerous<br>methods as required by federal and state law. This data should be collected  |
|  | as a team (e.g., teacher, nurse, evaluator), with individuals contributing<br>according to their position and expertise. Parents should provide<br>information on the family, culture, the child's social and behavioral status,<br>their educational and health history, and so forth. This information can be   |
|  | collected via interviews, forms, face-to-face meetings, or a combination of<br>these. By comparison, teachers can contribute information including<br>observations, grades, work samples, formal and informal testing, as well as   |

|   | <ul> <li>insight into behavior, motivation and attendance. Data can be collected from teachers using questionnaires, interviews, or during meetings, in addition to the materials that they can provide as a result of their contact with the student (e.g., work samples). All data should be carefully collected, organized, merged, documented, interpreted and considered as a whole.</li> <li>Within the C-SEP framework, the Present Level of Academic Performance is determined using the findings. This information should be integrated into the Impact and Needs Statement. This statement is complex and detailed, as it will specify the present level of academic and functional performance; which, if any, disabilities have been identified; how these specifically impact on learning; which services and/or supports are required; and what are the objectives and goals for this student and how will progress be monitored. For more information on documenting impact, see Virginia Department of Education (2021: 21).</li> <li>IDEA establishes guidelines for which conditions must be met to find a child eligible for special education services. At the same time, individual states have the capacity to set standards and norms within the federal legal framework. The decision must be made by a group of qualified individuals, including the parent(s), who have considered multiple sources of data and determine if the child has a disability. In order to determine that a child has a disability area. This includes documentation of: <ul> <li>The presence of an impairment,</li> <li>Adverse impact on educational performance,</li> <li>The need for specially designed instruction, and</li> <li>Any specific criteria from Virginia regulations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|---|---|
| Requirements for Initial Evaluation S-14  |   |
| Requirements for Initial Evaluation   | Requirements for Initial Evaluation   |
| Multi-disciplinary assessment in all areas of suspected disability<br>Include at least two assessments and shall be conducted by at least two | To the conduct of a comprehensive and individualized assessment of all<br>areas of suspected disability that is capable of identifying a child's strengths<br>and weaknesses, from whereupon sound conclusions can be deduced and,  |

| members of the child study team in those areas in which they have             | a determination made. Users should be aware that New Jersey requires at      |
|---|--|
| appropriate training or are qualified through their professional licensure or | least two assessments and shall be conducted by at least two members of      |
| educational certification   | the child study team in those areas in which they have appropriate training  |
|   | or are qualified through their professional licensure or educational         |
|   | certification.   |
|   |  |
| Be conducted in the language or form most likely to yield accurate            | Federal and state regulations require assessments and their tools be         |
| information on what the child knows and can do academically,                  | implemented in a manner that is non-discriminatory (racial, cultural) and    |
| developmentally and functionally, unless it is not feasible to so do.         | administered in the student's native language. Overall, the tools utilized   |
|   | and their methodology should yield the most accurate information on a        |
| Apply standards of validity, reliability and administration for each          | child's capability (functionally, developmentally, and academically). These  |
| assessment by trained personnel in accordance with the protocols and          | tools should be used for their intended purpose and administered             |
| instructions of the producer of the assessment                                | according to their standards and norms. Finally, instruments utilized should |
|   | be of the highest standards of validity and reliability in the context for   |
| Include, where appropriate, or required, the use of a standardized test(s)    | which they are being used. Only personnel trained in the protocols and       |
|   | instructions of the instruments should be involved in their administration.  |
|   |  |
|   | Norm referenced tests, like other data sources, should never be solely used  |
|   | for decision-making. Contrary, they should be combined with other sources    |
|   | of data as they are snapshots of a child's performance in a particular       |
|   | domain and instance. Moreover, some norm referenced tests and their          |
|   | scores are more reliable than others. Consequently, assessments must be      |
|   | carefully considered and determined appropriate in a given context.          |
|   |  |
|   | These tests should be administered according to the test publisher's         |
|   | guidelines and their scores cautiously calculated in the same manner. Users  |
|   | should equally select which scores that provide the most appropriate data.   |
|   | See individual test publisher guidance, consult peer-reviewed publications,  |
|   | and state regulations.   |
|   | Test scores should be analyzed and documented in the context of inevitable   |
|   | error that is inherent to standardized tests. As a consequence, C-SEP        |
|   | encourages team members to use standard scores with their confidence         |
|   | intervals. This data should be considered and presented in a manner that     |
|   | reflects which results were obtained, why this data was used, and its        |
|   | significance in relation to student performance.                             |
|   |  |
|   | C-SEP recommends using the most recent version of the assessment             |
|   | selected to ensure that the instrument and the data it provides is current.  |

| <ul> <li>Include a functional assessment of academic performance and where appropriate, a functional behavioral assessment, an assessment of the language needs of a child with limited English proficiency, assessment of the student's communication needs, and assessment of the need for assistive technology devices and services.</li> <li>Each of the following components shall be completed by at least one evaluator: <ul> <li>A minimum of one structured observation by one evaluator in other than a testing session; and</li> <li>An interview with the student's parent;</li> <li>An interview with the teacher(s) referring the potentially disabled student;</li> <li>A review of the student's developmental/educational history including records and interviews;</li> <li>A review of interventions documented by the classroom teacher(s) and others who work with the student;</li> <li>One or more informal measure(s) which may include, but not be limited to surveys and inventories; analysis of work; trial teaching; self report; criterion referenced tests; curriculum based assessment; and informal rating scales; and</li> </ul> </li> <li>Beginning at age 14, or younger if appropriate, include assessment(s) to determine appropriate postsecondary outcomes.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Simultaneously, and as mentioned above, only individuals qualified to administer the assessment should do so. In instances were expected standards are not followed (e.g., the publisher guidance for administration), deviations should be accurately documented and their potential implications on the findings noted.</li> <li>A comprehensive assessment should include a functional assessment of academic performance and where appropriate, a functional behavioral assessment, an assessment of the language needs of a child with limited English proficiency, assessment of the student's communication needs, and assessment of the need for assistive technology devices and services.</li> <li>C-SEP users should be aware that New Jersey requires the following components be completed by at least one evaluator: <ul> <li>A minimum of one structured observation by one evaluator in other than a testing session; and</li> <li>An interview with the student's parent;</li> <li>A review of the student's developmental/educational history including records and interviews;</li> <li>A review of interventions documented by the classroom teacher(s) and others who work with the student;</li> <li>One or more informal measure(s) which may include, but not be limited to surveys and inventories; analysis of work; trial teaching; self-report; criterion referenced tests; curriculum-based assessment; and informal rating scales; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|--|--|
| Written Report S-17  |  |
| Requirements for Written Report of Evaluation<br>Results:  | Requirements for Written Report of Evaluation<br>Results:  |
| At the discretion of the district, the written report may be prepared collaboratively by the evaluators  | New Jersey regulations permits the IEP to be written collectively by the team, or by individual team members who prepare a report on the   |

| or   | assessment data they have collected.   |
|--|--|
| each evaluator may prepare an individually written report of the results of his or her assessments   | מאבאאוופות עמנמ נוופץ וומעפ נטוופגופט.   |
| Each written report shall be dated and signed by the individual(s) who conducted the assessment.   | Each report must be data and signed by those responsible for its production.   |
| <ul> <li>Each report shall include:</li> <li>An appraisal of the student's current functioning and an analysis of the instructional implication(s) appropriate to the professional discipline of the evaluator;</li> <li>A statement regarding relevant behavior of the student, either reported or observed, and the relationship of that behavior to the student's functioning;</li> <li>If an assessment is not included under standard conditions, the extent to which it varied from standard conditions;</li> </ul>  | Thorough documentation of the assessment is essential on the academic<br>and behavioral performance of the child being assessed. This includes<br>explaining which data was collected, how it was interpreted and which<br>decisions were made based on the data. This information should be<br>detailed in the reports and included in a student's educational records.<br>According to Virginia, reports should include a summary of the assessment<br>activities, descriptions of the student's performance, observation notes,<br>data and norm-referenced scores, a summary of strengths and weaknesses,<br>and recommendations for those working with the student. Evaluators may<br>provide recommendations, but they may not determine eligibility or related<br>services for students. When students differ from the norming population<br>or participate using a non-standard administration, professionals are<br>encouraged to reference the administration manual for specific<br>instructions.<br>If an assessment varies from standard protocol, the extent to which it<br>varied and the conditions which led to this deviation should be<br>documented. |
| <ul> <li>When a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability, the documentation of the determination of eligibility shall include a statement of: <ul> <li>Whether the student has a specific learning disability;</li> <li>The basis for making the determination;</li> <li>The relevant behavior noted during the observation;</li> <li>The relationship of that behavior to the student's academic performance;</li> <li>Educationally relevant medical findings, if any;</li> <li>If a severe discrepancy methodology is utilized, whether there is a severe discrepancy between achievement and ability that is not correctable without special education and related services;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>According to New Jersey, the documentation of the determination of eligibility should include a statement of: <ul> <li>Whether the student has a specific learning disability;</li> <li>The basis for making the determination;</li> <li>The relevant behavior noted during the observation;</li> <li>The relationship of that behavior to the student's academic performance;</li> <li>Educationally relevant medical findings, if any;</li> <li>If a severe discrepancy methodology is utilized, whether there is a severe discrepancy between achievement and ability that is not correctable without special education and related services;</li> <li>Determination concerning the effects of environmental, cultural or</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |

| The determination concerning the effects of environmental                       | economic disadvantage;  |
|---|---|
| The determination concerning the encets of environmental,                       | -   |
| cultural or economic disadvantage;  | • Whether the student achieves commensurate with his or her age;                |
| Whether the student achieves commensurate with his or her age;                  | If a response to scientifically based interventions methodology is              |
| If a response to scientifically based interventions methodology is              | utilized, the instructional strategies utilized and the student-                |
| utilized, the instructional strategies utilized and the student-                | centered data collected with respect to the student; and                        |
| centered data collected with respect to the student; and                        | <ul> <li>Whether there are strengths or weaknesses, or both, in</li> </ul>      |
| <ul> <li>Whether there are strengths or weaknesses, or both, in</li> </ul>      | performance or achievement relative to intellectual development                 |
| performance or achievement relative to intellectual development                 | in one of the following areas that require special education and                |
| in one of the following areas that require special education and                | related services:   |
| related services:   | Oral expression;  |
| Oral expression;  | <ul> <li>Listening comprehension;</li> </ul>                                    |
| Listening comprehension;  | Written expression;   |
| Written expression;   | Basic reading skill;  |
| Basic reading skill;  | Reading fluency skills;   |
| Reading fluency skills;   | Reading comprehension;  |
| Reading comprehension;  | Mathematics calculation; and  |
| Mathematics calculation; and  | <ul> <li>Mathematics problem solving.</li> </ul>                                |
| <ul> <li>Mathematics problem solving.</li> </ul>                                | ······································  |
|   | Additionally, each team member shall certify in writing whether his or her      |
| Additionally, each team member shall certify in writing whether his or her      | report is in accordance with the conclusion of eligibility of the student. If   |
| report is in accordance with the conclusion of eligibility of the student. If   | his or her report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team must |
| his or her report does not reflect the conclusion of eligibility, the team must | submit a separate statement presenting his or her conclusions.                  |
| submit a separate statement presenting his or her conclusions.                  |   |
|   |   |
| Acceptance of Written Reports:  | Acceptance of Written Reports:  |
| When conducting an initial evaluation or a reevaluation, the reports and        | For guidance on accepting reports, see New Jersey state regulations.            |
| assessments of child student team members or related services providers         |   |
| from other public school districts, Department of Education approved            |   |
| clinics or agencies, educational services commissions or jointure               |   |
| commissions or professionals in private practice may be submitted by the        |   |
| parents to the child study team for consideration. Each report and              |   |
| assessment shall be reviewed and considered by the child study team or          |   |
| related service provider with relevant knowledge or expertise.                  |   |
|   |   |
| A report or component thereof may be utilized as a required assessment, if      |   |
| the assessment has been conducted within one year of the evaluation and         |   |
| the child study team determines the report and assessment meet the              |   |
| requirements of 3.4(h).   |   |

## **Resources:**

New Jersey Department of Education. (2007). Special Education Process: From Child-Find, Referral, Evaluation, and Eligibility To IEP Development, Annual Review and Reevaluation Companion Document to NJOSEP Code Trainings. October/November 2006 (Updated 2007)