

Special Education Study Teaneck School District Teaneck, New Jersey

October 3, 2018

American Educational Consultants

Valerie McKenney, Project Lead/ Consultant

Faith B. Racusin, Special Education, Data Consultant

Dr. Harold M. Tarriff, Special Education Administrative Consultant

Jackie McKenney, Special Education Consultant

Jerry Brodsky, Project Advisor

American Educational Consultants provides educational consultative services to school districts, school personnel, parents and students.

For Information:

American Educational Consultants

25 Richland Dr.
Springfield, NJ 07081

5180 River Trail
Cleveland, OH 44124

Phone: 973-98EDCON (973-983-3266)

e-mail: americaneducationalconsultants@gmail.com

website: www.americanedcon.com/

Copyright © 2018 by American Educational Consultants. All rights reserved.

This report contains the results of proprietary research compiled for Teaneck School District (New Jersey) Schools for their own full, complete and exclusive use. No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, including photocopying, or by any information storage and retrieval system without prior permission in writing from American Educational Consultants, 25 Richland Dr., Springfield, NJ 07081.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	2
II.	Executive Summary Overview	6
III.	Commendations	
	A. District	11
	B. High School	12
	C. Middle School	12
	D. Elementary	12
IV.	Recommendations	
	A. District	13
	B. High School	18
	C. Middle School	20
	D. Elementary	21
V.	Vision for Future Years	
	A. Tier 1	22
	B. Tier 2	23
	C. Tier 3	24
VI.	Appendices	
	A. State Data Summary	
	B. Teaneck Financial Summary	
	C. Executive Summary Parent Group Responses	
	D. Common Special Education Acronyms	
	E. 1:1 Aide Guideline	
	F. Guidelines for Effective Communication with Parents	
	G. Summary Due Process Petitions 2014-2018	
	H. Resources used to complete the report	

Introduction

Educational leaders identify special education throughout the nation as an area that deserves scrutiny with respect to its costs and benefits educationally and economically, as well as any district's program strengths and improvement needs. Much research has been done on student identification practices, the effects of labeling students, best instructional practices and academic costs/benefits of special education programming. We know that extensive funding and energy is invested into staffing, programming, administering and defending special education.

The most significant challenge in education for all students is to provide quality and equitable instruction at reasonable costs. Local, state and national data can help us bring our perceptions of work/caseload, student success, and other aspects of special education programming into a best practices model.

It is laudatory that today the Teaneck School District leadership is asking itself in fact to what degree it is providing high quality and equitable instruction for special education students at reasonable costs and if not, asking American Educational Consultants how to do so – how to increase its special education program's effectiveness, increase student performance and at the same time control its special education costs.

1. With regards to Procedural Safeguards we have been asked to:

- A. Identify the degree with which Teaneck is compliant procedurally. We will develop a spreadsheet to ensure Teaneck is able to implement and maintain full compliance.
- B. Identify the degree with which Teaneck is in full compliance with best practices related to native language and what it needs to do to be in full compliance.
- C. Identify the degree with which Teaneck is compliant procedurally with regards to preferral interventions and what it needs to do to be in full compliance.
- D. Identify the degree to which Teaneck is compliant procedurally and what it needs to do to be in full compliance with best practices as related to medication.
- E. Identify the degree with which Teaneck is compliant procedurally, what it needs to do to be in full compliance with best practices and quality fiscal management.
- F. Identify from anecdotal data and sample IEP analysis, the degree with which Teaneck is in full compliance and what it needs to do to be in full compliance with best practices as related to student's native language.
- G. Reimbursement for unilateral placement by parents: we will identify from anecdotal and hard data, along with fiscal documentation, the degree with which Teaneck is compliant procedurally, what it needs to do to be in full compliance with best practices and quality fiscal management.

2. With regards to Services we have been asked to:

- A. For Child Study Team Members/Case Managers we will identify the degree to which Teaneck is staffed and functioning efficiently and effectively to serve students with disabilities.
- B. We will identify the degree to which Teaneck is staffed and functioning efficiently and effectively to serve students who may be identified as having disabilities and what opportunities it has to improve.
- C. With regards to Evaluation Procedures, we will identify from anecdotal and hard data the degree to which Teaneck is staffed and functioning efficiently and effectively to evaluate and serve students with and who may have disabilities and what opportunities it has to improve.
- D. We will ascertain the degree to which Teaneck is staffed and functioning efficiently and effectively to identify and provide related services to students with speech-language and other related services disabilities and what opportunities it has to improve.
- E. We will ascertain the degree to which Teaneck is staffed and functioning efficiently and effectively to process re-evaluations for students with disabilities.
- F. We will identify the degree to which Teaneck is staffed and functioning efficiently and effectively to provide related services to students with disabilities, Included in our analysis will be a determination of the degree to which Teaneck is over- or under-staffed when compared to national, state and regional norms, staff:student ratios and identified IEP needs.

3. With regards to Programs and Instruction:

- A. Our consulting team will evaluate best programmatic, curricular and pedagogical practices during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- B. Our consulting team will evaluate Least Restrictive Environment practices during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- C. We will evaluate SLP programming and practices during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- D. Our consulting team will evaluate aides and services programming and practices during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- E. Our consulting team will evaluate supplementary instruction and resource programming and practices during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- F. We will evaluate special class programs, secondary programs and vocational rehabilitation during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- G. Our consulting team will evaluate Home Instruction during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.

- H. Our consulting team will evaluate programs and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- I. We will identify the degree to which Teaneck prepares students with disabilities to be successful on statewide assessments as compared to state means and similarly situated schools, and report that information in both narrative and chart form.
- J. We will identify the degree to which Teaneck graduates students with disabilities as compared to state means and similarly situated schools.

4. With regards to Educational and Related services:

- A. Our consulting team will evaluate general requirements during the on-site visitation and identify commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- B. Approval procedures for clinics or agencies: given some clarification of this item, our consulting team will evaluate during the on-site visitation and identify the degree with which Teaneck is compliant with best practices.
- C. Cost effectiveness and efficiency of services provided by independent contractors and Region V, assuming difficulty evaluating an outside vendor, our consulting team will identify costs and level of efficiency of services provided by outside vendors and make recommendations such that full FAPE services are provided at the lowest costs necessary.

5 . Requirements for Services in NonPublic Schools

- A. Equitable participation under IDEA Part B: assuming difficulty evaluating an outside vendor, our consulting team will identify costs and level of efficiency of services provided by outside vendors and make recommendations such that full FAPE services are provided at the lowest costs necessary.
- B. Provision of programs and services under N.J.S.A. 18A, assuming difficulty evaluating an outside vendor, our consulting team will identify costs and level of efficiency of services provided by outside vendors and make recommendations such that full FAPE services are provided at the lowest costs necessary.
- C. Fiscal management provided under N.J.S.A. 18A, etc.: assuming difficulty evaluating an outside vendor, our consulting team will identify costs and level of efficiency of services provided by outside vendors and make recommendations such that full FAPE services are provided at the lowest costs necessary.
- D. End of year report provided under N.J.S.A. 18A, etc.: assuming difficulty evaluating an outside vendor, our consulting team will identify costs and level of efficiency of services provided by outside vendors and make recommendations such that full FAPE services are provided at the lowest costs necessary.
- E. Placement in accredited nonpublic schools, etc.: we will identify from anecdotal data and IEP analysis, the degree with which Teaneck is compliant procedurally, along with its obligation to provide FAPE, and what it needs to do to be in full compliance with best practices.

6. Additional Compliance Issues

- A. Review and comment on any due process petitions, petitions within the last 36 months, and complaint investigations concentrating on cases settled not according to district recommendations. We will review documents and anecdotal evidence and provide commendations and opportunities for improvement with the goal that Teaneck be in position to defend its actions to provide FAPE and proper process to every student with a disability.
- B. Prepare spreadsheet for each Child Study Team member and related service provider for dates of annuals and re-evaluations.
- C. Review and comment on referrals to Child Study Teams, building support, effectiveness of I&RS and RTI: our consulting team will evaluate during the on-site visitation and identify the degree with which Teaneck is compliant with best practices.
- D. Review and comment on Child Study Team visits to out of district schools, other than annuals/re-evaluations: our consulting team will evaluate during the on-site visitation and identify the degree with which Teaneck is compliant with best practices.
- E. Review and comment on out of district student attendance and if goals/objectives are being attained for all out of district placements: (see cost proposal line item); we will analyze out of district students and placements by gathering anecdotal and hard data and providing commendations and recommendations regarding costs and benefits, bearing in mind LRE and FAPE considerations.
- F. Review State and Federal report compliance: we will review documents and processes and provide commendations and recommendations for improvement.

7. Program Designs and Vision for Future Years

- A. Evaluate and make recommendations on articulation meetings and building level meetings: we will review documents, processes and anecdotal data to provide commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- B. Evaluate and make recommendations on projections for the 2018-2019 Budget including types of classes to be offered: we will review documents, processes and anecdotal data to provide commendations and recommendations for improvement.
- C. Comment on feasibility of returning out of district students to in-district placements: we will review anecdotal and hard data to provide recommendations about if, when and how to do so.
- E. Evaluate and make recommendations on I&RS, RTI and other intervention programs that can be offered; we will review anecdotal and hard data to provide recommendations about how to fully implement best practices in these areas and what effect program implementation is likely to have on increased student achievement and controlled costs.
- F. Evaluate and make recommendations on Language-based reading programs.
- G. Evaluate and make recommendations on providing programs in-district for behaviorally disabled students.
- H. We will review anecdotal and hard data to provide commendations and

recommendations about how to improve staff meetings and professional development offerings.

- I. We will review anecdotal and hard data to provide commendations and recommendations regarding how to ensure special education staff have optimum opportunity for maintaining best practice knowledge, skills and professional attitudes.
- J. We will review anecdotal and hard data, along with our team's expertise to provide commendations and recommendations on the topic of home instruction.
- K. We will review anecdotal and hard data, along with our team's expertise to provide commendations and recommendations on the topic of supplemental instruction.
- L. We will read, review and make edit suggestions from best practice model manuals, then review those edit suggestions with appropriate personnel for feasibility and process implementation planning with respect to suggested changes.
- M. We will review anecdotal and hard data, along with our team's expertise to provide commendations and recommendations on the topic of transportation.

8. Misc. Review

- A. We will identify over/under staffing levels based on national, state and similar-district ratios and IEP-necessary services for each staff sub-group.
- B. We will identify the degree to which Teaneck utilizes best practices and delineate commendations and opportunities for improvement.
- C. We will identify the degree to which Teaneck utilizes best practices as related to non-discriminatory identification and evaluation and delineate commendations and opportunities for improvement.
- D. We will identify the degree to which Teaneck takes advantage of technological efficiencies such as IEP Direct and make recommendations regarding improvement.
- E. We will use anecdotal and hard data available locally and statewide, to identify commendations and recommendations regarding student discipline and behavioral services and needs, with respect to students with disabilities.

Executive Summary Overview

Diversity within the Teaneck School system is identified as a strength. Within the schools the children are well accepted in classrooms. Individual differences in culture and/or background are not unduly highlighted in the day-to-day classroom activities.

A relative strength of the Teaneck school system lies in the staff. We found the staff to be professional, courteous, informative and engaged in their school, grade level/subject, and with a desire to articulate concerns related to their ability to provide quality education to Teaneck students. Based upon the information gathered in our research and visits, we believe that with an appropriate plan and supports, positive change can take place.

We found administrators to be knowledgeable with regards to the strengths of the district as well as the areas of concern. Building administrators identified issues of concern related to education in general, and specifically, the ability to sustain the current special education operation given all the conflicting needs. Currently, Teaneck does not have in place the necessary administrative/supervisory staff to direct, operate and implement best practices with respect to students with disabilities (SWD) but seems to be analyzing staffing to remediate these concerns. As a result, at the time of our analysis, some Teaneck students do not have access to a free and appropriate education education (FAPE) in a least restrictive environment (LRE), while others may be identified as SWDs but should not have been.

Within each of the buildings there seemed to be good relationships between administrators and staff. There is evidence of collaboration between teachers related to meeting the educational needs of all students. In addition, the paraprofessionals reported that they feel valued by both administrators and staff.

The Curriculum Directors seem to be a dedicated, hard working group of educators. One stated “we do the best we can” identifying a lack of resources. They stated that they are proud of the various curriculum documents that they have created over the past few years. It was reported that in the last few years the Curriculum Directors have begun to operationalize procedures through the creation of manuals. For example there are manuals for the I&RS as well as CST, although we saw little evidence of their use. Within this group there is clear support for each other and an understanding that there are issues of concern throughout the District.

There are several significant issues that need immediate attention. The Teaneck School District has enough good professionals with the capacity to make positive change. Most importantly we found your new superintendent very impressive as we were finalizing this report. Dr. Irving understands student needs and how to develop an improvement plan to ensure that students truly with special needs are serviced in an appropriate manner.

Overall, though, we found I&RS and CST members, along with teachers and support personnel, have spiraled into a culture of mediocrity and shortcutting that costs the district millions of dollars more than it should for students with disabilities, casts a *disabled* label onto hundreds of students who likely don't qualify nor deserve it, and causes restricted access to the full curriculum for many students who deserve that access and the opportunity to master important attainable

instructional goals.

First and foremost, the Teaneck School District has identified almost twice the expected number of students as having a disability that interferes with the students ability to appropriately access instruction. SWDs represent 13% of students across the United States, 15.8% of students in New Jersey but are 28.7% of the Teaneck student population. We also note that while total Teaneck student enrollments are trending downward, SWD enrollment is trending upward. In addition, we know typically the percentage of students receiving services decreases at the secondary level as the goal for students is independence. But this is not the case in Teaneck due to what we believe are practices that *over-encourage* SWD identification. These practices cause inordinately high caseloads, less efficient servicing of all student needs, and a spiraling inability to maintain proper and deserved instruction for truly disabled students.

With regards to classroom instruction, there was some evidence of best practices in the classrooms that we visited but we also saw practices no longer considered professionally appropriate. The best practices include the use of word walls, expectations and objectives visually presented; and teachers and paraprofessionals engaging with students and using manipulatives and multi-modality instruction. The *no longer appropriate* practices included over use of self-contained classrooms for SWD, special students' classrooms in lower level corners of the building, multiple aides in place where developing student independence would be more appropriate, and cursory and *patterned* annual IEP reviews as opposed to serious, individualized reviews.

A review of the 2016-2017 state data shows that the district met their target scores in both math and ELA but not in the area of inclusion in at least 80% of SWDs' school time.

With respect to serving students with disabilities, we found that the district has funded special education very generously. (Appendix 1, Table 12) In fact, so generously, that charting various data points with those of comparable schools, and state and national averages, we found Teaneck not only has among the highest % of students identified as SWD, but also among the highest per SWD pupil expenditures.

From a systemic perspective, this comprehensive analysis provides an opportunity for review and needed revision of important district/school components which should better support the overall structure and success of the school system, especially as related to special education. The commendations and fairly specific recommendations are designed to help the Teaneck School District identify areas of strength as well as help the district develop a multi-year improvement plan with respect to its delivery of the highest quality FAPE for students with disabilities at the most reasonable costs to taxpayers.

With respect to opportunities for improvement, among the most important, we identified:

1. The special education process itself is inconsistently implemented throughout the District. We found the current special education process, beginning with the I&RS work, data collection, referral, timely evaluation and meaningful parental involvement are inadequate and ripe for due process claims and/or settlements in lieu of. Proper pre-referral

intervention and ultimately student achievement results, all appear to depend on the particular staff involved, their training in, understanding of, and use of proper processes.

We recommend a full re-tooling be undertaken with respect to processes and procedures related to special education, goal writing, data recording and justification for staffing based upon what is considered best practices by today's educational standards. It is a given that this process is a major driver in the development of cost centers, especially related to the need for, and use of staff. Less than full attention to any part of this process can also be a catalyst for costly litigation.

2. Significant concerns in this report include: over identification and misidentification of students; legally delineated process timelines not always being met; lack of data to inform placement and program decisions; superseding least restrictive environment mandates for convenience; and a lack of appropriate programs matching student needs, especially students with emotional or behavioral issues. In light of these concerns, we recommend an immediate focus on tiered intervention practices and the re-training for all I&RS and CST members regarding their responsibilities to identify and serve SWD under FAPE and LRE federal and state mandates. We also recommend ensuring proper supervision of I&RS and CST members by administrators to both provide positive feedback as members perform to new expectations and notice to members when they fall short.
3. Currently, Teaneck is paying for-profit vendors for programs and services that could be provided in-district at a lower cost and aligned with LRE expectations. Parent input supported using in-district programs whenever possible, as well. We recommend I&RS and CST members be provided the District's expectations regarding in-house LRE programming being a priority for anything except when it is absolutely necessary and appropriate to provide the student services out-of-district.
4. Communication was identified by all stakeholders as a key issue of concern. There has been a clear disconnect between the central office and the building level administration. Several groups of staff members and parents identified a lack of knowledge related to Chain of Command questions. While an organizational chart exists, the vacant administrative positions may not allow the effective use of a chain of command. With the filling of vacancies, the District should ensure a clear communication path for any and all needs for both parents and staff. A FAQ for parents of SWD should be developed such that they know who to contact for what issue.
5. It is recommended that student transitions, grade to grade, and more specifically school to school for student with disabilities be reviewed. Mentoring or programming to support transitions need to be enhanced such that students and staff are prepared for the transitions, as well as natural building changes, inherent in the District's operation. The number of students entering and exiting the District throughout the year certainly is a District challenge but that also can be planned for and handled appropriately.
6. While there are clear procedures outlined for I&RS and CST processes, the amount of

litigation initiated suggests that these processes are not being adhered to with fidelity and there lacks a level of accountability to ensure that all components of the special education process are being followed. (Refer to Appendix G.)

7. At the building level the staff reported that they understand the idea of *best practices* but struggle to get ahead of just managing daily work. For example, while many professionals identified the co-teaching model as an excellent inclusionary model, most staff have never received training in a co-teaching model framework and often do not have common planning time. While many CST members identified how they should do their work, they pointed to their high case load as the reason they went through their processes in a more patterned/rote manner than an individualized one. We recommend identifying an order to developing best practices, one at a time, so staff can unfreeze their current practice, learn anew, and then refreeze the new practice in place.
8. Parents reported a variety of experiences with regards to the communication process in Special Education. (See Appendix C) We recommend the District keep parents' needs in mind but not allow individual parents to cause a change of direction or a focus that discounts the majority parents' needs/desires for their students.
9. Teaneck should consider reorganization of their upper level administrative team to include a Director of Student Services to oversee compliance and operational consistency of the department, along with one supervisor to oversee the CST model and related services, and another to support curriculum and instruction at all levels is recommended.
10. Professional Development in general, but especially as related to Special Education, was identified as an area that needs a strategic needs-based plan. The first step is to ensure all central office and building administrators have a thorough understanding of special education law and New Jersey policies and procedures related to special education. Some Professional Development topics should include: special education compliance; articulation for all Child Study Teams (CST) to ensure consistency and compliance to laws; monthly meetings by academic discipline to include needed training and SWD case studies; mentoring all new teachers and child study team members; training in co-teaching; strategies for differentiation and behavior management; and training on IEP Direct and Skyward for all clerical support staff.
11. Intervention and Referral Services (I&RS) was identified as a system in need of attention. We believe the lack of appropriate and timely tiered interventions is one reason for the high percentage of students referred and ultimately identified in need of special education within the Teaneck School System. (Appendix A, Table 4) While the I&RS process is outlined clearly, it appears that there lacks consistent membership, meaningful interventions, and a lack of data-driven decision making. The current I&RS system was identified by staff as ineffective, inconsistent, and at times was bypassed altogether.
12. The NJ Multi-Tiered System of Support needs be fully and immediately implemented throughout the District. This system provides students and staff a continuum of instructional strategies designed to support differentiated instruction for ALL students,

particularly effective for younger students and more challenging student engagement issues that arise in every classroom PreK-12. The result of a quality NJMTSS should be: appropriate SWD identification as opposed to the current twice the number practice; improved student achievement scores school wide, as more students are exposed to the full, state-tested curriculum; and a redistribution of tax funds into cost centers that benefit all students.

Following this report's narrative are several appendices: (A&B) the charts and graphs of hard data used to, along with the anecdotal data gathered from staff and parents during the site visits, served as the basis for our conclusions; (C) a summary of the three Teaneck parent response sessions we held; (D) explanations of acronyms; (E) Appropriate Use Guidelines for 1:1 Aide Requests; (F) Effective Communications With Parents; (G) a summary of Due Process petitions; and (H) a list of resources we used for the report.

It is clear that Teaneck has the potential to ensure that all students are able to garner college and career readiness skills as needed for all 21st Century learners. The ability to have clear and well-articulated systems will ensure that these goals are met for all.

Commendations

District Commendations:

1. The RFP was well written and demonstrated a thorough analysis of the needs of the district with respect to students with disabilities.
2. We met with administrators, teaching and support staff, and parents. All were courteous, professional and knowledgeable.
3. Administrators, teachers and related services staff, along with paraprofessionals, presented themselves as appropriately dedicated to performing their tasks in a manner that supported quality instruction for students with disabilities.

Commendations Specific to Teaneck High School

1. Principal was very attentive to the needs of students and staff. In addition, the administrative team appeared to have a solid rapport with the high school students.
2. Special Education Teachers and support staff appeared engaged with their students in the self-contained classroom.

Commendations Specific to Middle School

1. Administrators and staff at both middle schools understand the importance of forming positive and personal relationships with students to encourage full engagement.
2. The co-teaching model is used to support inclusion within both middle schools. While there has been some professional development in the utilizing of a co-teaching framework at both middle schools, there does not seem to be a clear understanding of a specific framework for this model.
3. Administrators report that students get along well and that SWD are included and welcomed in all school activities.
4. The Principals review all initial information related to Special Education referrals.

Commendations Specific to Pre K-Elementary Schools

1. It appears that teachers, paraprofessionals, related service providers and Principals in the elementary schools are highly committed to providing the best services to their students.
2. The one elementary school that employs the co-teaching model does it very well and could serve as a model for the other elementary schools.
3. Among the four elementary schools there is a wealth of skill, knowledge and talent. The opportunity exists to share those assets internally with colleagues via good professional development planning and administrative leadership.
4. Principals are knowledgeable about and involved in the special education programs in their buildings.

Recommendations

District Recommendations

1. Interim positions should only be used short-term to transition from a current administrator to a permanent replacement, when either the administrator's departure is unexpected or the permanent replacement is unable to begin employment when needed. Specifically, here, it appears programming and proper processing of suspected and identified students with disabilities requires naming permanent administrators in positions to lead the entire district team in an appropriate direction to increase the likelihood of student success and fiscal efficiency.
2. Currently the organizational structure of Teaneck upper level administration includes one Superintendent, one Assistant Superintendent, one Special Education Supervisor, and one (vacant) Special Education Supervisor. Given the magnitude of work needed within the Special Services domain, it is recommended that the district hire a Special Education Director, and two Special Education Supervisors. One supervisor that is an expert with regards to best practices in curriculum/instruction for SWD, and one supervisor that is an expert with regards to oversight of the Child Study Teams and related services at all levels.
3. Communication was identified as a central theme of concern among Teaneck stakeholders. A leading cause of mistrust, misinformation, and Due Process claims is a lack of communication between the school, its staff and its parents. We believe that proper staffing at the upper administrative level, along with support positions and appropriate professional development related to IEP development and processes will increase communication and trust between the school and the community. Effective School-Parent advisory groups as well as digital and hard-copy bulletins might help as well.
4. With regards to the providing of FAPE, many concerns were noted by stakeholders at all levels. The IEP process is inconsistent at best, non-compliant at worst. We did find high quality IEP process examples in various parts of the District. However, we did not find best practice data collection, data-driven IEP development, service plans directly resulting from the data/IEP development process, and results-driven renewal of that process annually consistently in place throughout the District.

Most staff knew of best practice techniques, knew the proper process as delineated here, and certainly wanted to provide their students the highest quality, goal-driven education. But we did not see evidence of implementation of a best practice IEP process such that

assigned staff and instruction could focus properly on individual students' instructional needs.

5. We recommend the District plan for, and implement, proper training of administrators and staff to ensure data collection is done appropriately, IEP meetings focus on instructional goal needs based on that data, appropriate staff are assigned specifically to service those instructional goal needs, and student progress be measured on IEP goal success. We found few instances of this process being fully and thoroughly followed during each stage. This task is essential to ensure the District has legally defensible IEPs.
6. A *zero-based budgeting* manner of staffing for instruction be utilized to ensure proper staffing levels. We found most staffing levels based on status quo or sincere desire on the part of staff and parents, but not levels based on clear, data-driven IEP service needs. Although we were not in any IEP meetings in the District, we commonly see this under/over staffing occur when meeting participants work backward from the services they want to the IEP goals that will get them those services, and further back to finding some justification, if asked, that will support those services.
7. It is common, and we found evidence here, that sometimes a staff member's availability to provide service to a student with a disability affects that staff member's input at the IEP meeting regarding including or excluding that student in the caseload or providing individual vs small group therapy, for example, or more or less weekly/monthly time for that service.
8. We know understaffing properly developed IEPs is illegal. We know that overstaffing properly developed IEPs is both counterproductive for the student's social independence goals, for example, as well is inappropriate with respect to spending taxpayer dollars appropriately, an obligation we have as a tax-supported public entity.
11. Paraprofessionals, as a group, are a similar set of employees. They are used in a wide variety of activities, some IEP-required, while most reported that they help students and teachers, some with IEP goals in mind, others just by being good helpers. We recommend a review of the use of paraprofessionals as outlined below:
 - a. Paraprofessionals may be trained and re-assigned to facilitate returning out-of-district students to in-district programs as an appropriate support during a specified period of transition. Paraprofessional positions could be re-structured to part-time positions, employing only the number of hours required for specific students and/or tasks.
 - b. Some paraprofessionals are a direct result of an appropriate IEP or medical need; but many are in place likely because of historical staffing levels. Students with

disabilities typically have a growing set of instructional and social independence goals and, in some settings, paraprofessional aides may be counterproductive to those goals. Historical staffing levels are not proper justification for current staffing level expenditures.

- c. We recommend identifying what each paraprofessional is doing on a daily basis and for whom. Our calculations identify Teaneck's need for paraprofessionals for SWD as probably one-half of the current number of paraprofessionals employed. We believe that with a thoughtful plan, it is possible for Teaneck to reduce between 25-30 paraprofessional positions within the next three years. This would be a net savings of close to \$1 million annually.
12. Indicative of the inconsistency of the IEP development process, we heard several references by staff on the need for E.D. programming. This troubled our team because that says either students have been identified as having a disability but are not being served properly by the district, or staff feel that they can identify "by gut" that students should be served within an identified category of special education not yet available on-site. An Emotional Disturbance identification is determined, as any other school-related disability by way of a clearly defined process. If some students indeed qualify for intervention within an Emotional Disturbance identification, they should be served properly according to FAPE mandates. If student misbehavior is about differences in expectations and enforcement, then the District or individual buildings should address student expectations, fair and equitable disciplinary processes, and positive behavioral supports and interventions.
13. The final step to ensure students with disabilities receive proper services begins when building principals create the next year's master schedule. We know as their master schedules are developed, principals as a practical matter must prioritize single section, shared staff, and many other scheduling needs unique to their building, staffing and student needs. Before finalizing that master schedule, though, they should also ensure that special education teachers and related services staff are able to arrange within it, IEP-driven student instructional and support services. This important pre-release assurance is critical to proper implementation of IEP-required service to students with disabilities.
14. With respect to IEPs, we believe the following might help guide Teaneck School District in its quest to improve:
 - a. The IEP is the primary document which provides meaningful participation to an eligible student's family. The District needs to make staff aware the IEP is a fluid document and capable of change as needed by the student at ANY time during the school year. Either school or parent can and should request an IEP meeting if they have evidence that the IEP needs to be changed in any way. The IEP is the parent's first line of information about the student. Parent education is the major component of meaningful participation and needs to be provided by the District.

- b. I&RS is only one step before considering the possibility of eligibility for services under IDEA. The I&RS Team should act as an efficient clearinghouse for pre-intervention services (NJTSS) accepting referrals, and designing tiered interventions and non Special Education solutions in an effort to possibly avoid the need for special education. Preference is to start with the I&RS process so that students are not rushed to referral, but there are circumstances where an evaluation must be done on an expedited timeline. Adherence to evaluation deadlines are critical and the I&RS process cannot be used to delay referral and eligibility. Parents should be educated as to the goals of the NJTSS and the process in the event that tiered instruction is not successful. There must be training for Child Study Teams, special education and regular education teachers on how these separate processes can be integrated as required by IDEA. We cannot emphasize enough the need for a full, robust tiered system of intervention support at all levels, but most importantly beginning at lower elementary school where normal variations in brain growth, maturation and child development is so critical to be mindful of, and so obviously inherent in our commitment to help students yet not identify them as identifiably disabled too early.
 - c. Data supporting and reporting on progress relating to the goals and objectives in an IEP is the keystone of evidence should there be a Due Process hearing. Data must be collected contemporaneously because grades on classroom tests do not necessarily align to data relating to IEP goals and objectives. It was noted that staff members do not consistently indicate the method of evaluation to be used on the goals and objectives in an IEP that are separate from the RTI and evaluations for eligibility. The IEP section indicating the data forms to be used must be completed. There should be provisions for both anecdotal and objective data to be collected for this purpose.
 - d. Consistent language across buildings should be used for IEP goals and objectives. Quality and appropriate goals of course are measurable. Further guidelines about IEP goals and objectives are easily obtained and likely already available in District manuals.
 - e. Mental health needs of students are a component of behavior and should be addressed in the IEP. At times this may necessitate the use of behavior plans to be used at school and at home. This may require consultation/coordination with private family therapists.
 - f. The definition of success for a SWD is defined within the IEP, not necessarily indicated by the letter grade in a mainstreamed class.
15. The goal of the Child Study Team should be to act as an efficient, effective identification starting point when a disability is suspected. In addition, this group should coordinate the comprehensive evaluations, write initial IEPs and oversee participating teachers and support staff to ensure the IEP process is fully compliant. It is our recommendation that

Child Study Teams are reminded as to the proper process to manage suspected disability status, including required timelines, forms, printed materials and guidance as to options. In addition, they need to ensure each SWD is placed into instructional settings designed for that student's success.

16. Transitioning students with disabilities between building levels and into and out of the school district is challenging. Courts are finding that appropriate transitions for students with disabilities are integral to providing FAPE.
17. The co-teaching model is a common *best practice* model for many reasons. Among them are the opportunities this model provides for students with disabilities to be included in the general education classroom and curriculum, the differentiation special education staff members can model for general education teachers, and the planning and implementation of curriculum for all students. The co-teaching model can be an expensive model because one classroom of students will have more than one teacher in the room. Where co-teaching is appropriate, it is recommended that staff involved in the co-teaching model have completed professional development to ensure that best practices of co-teaching are utilized.
19. Current data shows Teaneck School District is below the state target for students with disabilities in regular classrooms 80% of the time or more. We typically find this dilemma as an indicator that either there may be more pull-out related staff than a District needs or that data coding requires attention. Inclusion and access to the full curriculum are serious and important components of SWD programming, which is the reason this important data point is reported on publicly available school state reports.
20. With regards to curriculum and instruction, while adherence to the general Tier I curriculum is a goal for all students, differentiated instruction should be a practice in all classes to ensure equity in programming for all students. Anecdotal data and observation suggests a limited use of, and inconsistent use of best instructional practices and differentiated instruction throughout Teaneck Schools. Curriculum for students with disabilities should be matched to the greatest degree possible but does not need to be identical. Curriculum for students with severe disabilities can be adjusted, as appropriate, to a predetermined level of significance through the IEP.
21. With respect to staffing, we recommend that you hire a strong, knowledgeable Director of Special Services and two people for Supervisor of Special Services. While the need for this level of administrative support should diminish within two or three years, this level of support will ensure successful implementation of the district's plan for improvement within Special Education.
22. A meaningful Special Education Parent Advisory Committee should be in place, with diverse representation, and committed leadership by the new Director. Regular meetings with agenda input from all committee members, a website with relevant information, and minutes from formal meetings should be available to all constituencies.

23. Currently, the building level CST members generally have higher than appropriate caseloads. Proper identification and service/placement efforts should reduce those levels over time to more appropriate ratios.
24. Based upon both hard and anecdotal data we find over/under staffing for current IEP driven needs. The following additional recommendations are highlighted:
 - a. Addition of one to two Speech and Language Pathologists.
 - b. Future reduction of 1-2 School Psychologists **if** identified case loads indeed reduce significantly over time as anticipated.
 - c. Reduce 25-30 Paraprofessional positions over the next two to three years.
 - d. Reduce/eliminate the external contract status for those special education instructional and support employees currently employed in that manner as much as possible. Employ those employees needed as district employees. This would force recognition internally as to the costs of these services and bring proper supervisory controls of their services and performance in-district.
 - e. Reduce/eliminate multi-building assignments to the greatest extent possible.
 - f. Examine the number of special education teachers at the middle school level. (Currently that staffing is twice the number of teachers per pupil as compared to other buildings in the district.)
25. The Teaneck School District needs to carefully plan Professional Development for all special education instructional and support staff, at all levels based upon a clearly articulated vision and plan to ensure that teachers have both the skills and knowledge to implement appropriate educational practices in the 21st Century.

Recommendations Specific to Teaneck High School

1. Although it is common in secondary schools, general education teachers should be able to handle mild and moderate students with disabilities without a special education teacher also needing to be in the room. Teachers who differentiate their daily instructional plans typically find these students' behaviors and learning expectations within the parameters already present in their classrooms.
2. We know that most IEPs have independent learner goals that grow in importance during high school years. We also know that typically the more adults in the room, the less the student works on independence goals. With that in mind, we recommend a strong effort to minimize the extra adults in the room. Transitions away from counterproductive assignment of co-teachers and aides should be considered in each student's IEP review.
3. The co-teaching model doesn't necessarily mandate that certified Special Educators be content specialists as much as they be *differentiated instruction* specialists. Their presence should, in large part, provide the general education teacher the opportunity to gain expertise in engaging students at their levels of achievement and their learning styles, whether the special educator is in the room or simply consulting on the lesson plan and student engagement enhancements.

4. Review with CST members practices that appear to have become automatic or routinely put into IEPs yet have little, no, or counterproductive student achievement value. For instance, the for-credit resource support center class seems to be nothing more than a study hall that may or may not provide tutorial opportunities for the student. We recommend consideration be given to only having students' IEPs include such language when it is clear there is a need and that the assignment to that course is going to most likely provide access to specifically targeted instruction. The assumption should be that SWDs are just as able to take a full and curricularly normal course load as any other student until evidence appears to the contrary.
5. Assignment to self-contained core courses, such as replacement or practical courses, seems to occur much more routinely than likely appropriate for students with disabilities. Those placements should be considered the LRE **only** when inclusion in general education classes, with proper supports, would be unproductive in every way keeping in mind that especially at high school our IEP goals should include transition to be able to participate in regular life experiences. The more we isolate or aide the student, the more we curtail the student's ability to do so.
6. Serious consideration should be given to bringing out-of-district students and programs into the district as the LRE to provide FAPE. What may have begun as low incidence, today may no longer be the case. In-house alternative settings should be developed and provided under the umbrella of the school district such that those students can be included in regular school classes and activities where appropriate, and even where separate instructional programming is the most appropriate LRE, that setting should be at a district facility and staffed with district personnel unless clearly inappropriate.
7. We recommend CST members, high school administrators and guidance counselors, and/or other appropriate staff (possibly with parent and student input), convene to solve the cycle of issues that cause students with disabilities to be more self-contained than appropriate. We believe each constituency finds itself in a rut that causes the others to do what they do and ultimately make decisions that result in more students being served in settings that produce less access than appropriate to properly inclusive environments.
8. It appears that the incoming high school freshman class is just over 300 students and contains over 80 SWD. That is almost twice the number of SWD one should expect. The high school has two choices: simply serve and continue IEP services as currently written and likely to be expected to continue; or begin to gather data to see if it demonstrates that students are ready to transition into the general education population. We recommend they consider the latter while we also recommend that lower grade levels do that and re-evaluate their tiered system of interventions such that the line between the student who should be identified as having a disability and the student who simply needs interventions and/or accommodations to access instruction appropriately is more fairly drawn such that each student receive proper access to a full instructional curriculum. More time on tests, sitting in the front of the room, and being able to access the teacher's notes instead of relying on one's own difficult handwriting skills, for instance, are common

accommodations that do not require identification as a SWD.

9. High school has tiered instruction built into the course levels in many cases naturally. Many SWDs ought to be able to be included in those classes without the need for an additional teacher in the classroom full-time, nor a specially labeled core course just for them. That is what LRE means. Other SWDs indeed may need more focused support within a general education classroom, while a small number of SWDs likely need a more self-contained environment.
10. It is the goal of every IEP to provide access to FAPE in the LRE, which starts with an assumption that the general education classroom without full-time support is the appropriate place for the student and removes that option only when *data-based necessary*. In Teaneck, we believe the general assumptions about identifying and serving SWDs have been turned upside down for whatever reason(s) and should be righted at this time, one IEP, one student, at a time.

Recommendations Specific to Middle schools

1. The lack of placements and programming for students with emotional and behavioral identifications was identified as a concern. The data suggests that students may be coded in a particular manner to ensure placement and/or services. The current plan is to create a program at Thomas Jefferson for all district level middle school students who exhibit behavioral issues that cannot be managed within a larger setting. This program is being outsourced. It is recommended that this program be evaluated now and annually to ensure efficacy related to the quality of education for SWD and the services that are provided to these students.
2. The co-teaching model is used at both Benjamin Franklin Middle School as well as Thomas Jefferson Middle School. Staff report that the effectiveness of this model depends upon three things: the relationship between the two teachers, the time to plan, and the content knowledge/skill levels of the co-teachers. It is recommended that all teachers involved in co-teaching have exposure to the expectations of a truly effective co-teaching model. There are specific markers that highlight sound co-teaching practices and all staff should have access to this knowledge, opportunity to learn those skills, and be evaluated for maintaining the right professional attitudes about co-teaching.
3. Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Middle School staff reported a lack of programming options for middle school Special Education students. This information and pertinent hard data indicates that students are likely placed into program services based not upon their disability but rather where the school has a program and a seat. Typically this means CST members compromise on standards designed to identify and service specific and well defined disabilities using most often a *multiply disabled* mis-label. Another example is placement of misbehaving students in an *other disability-identified* classroom simply because it has a smaller number of students, more controllable for the misbehavior, yet one with limited academic content designed for students with cognitive issues rather than

behavioral issues.

4. It is recommended that all special education staff have proper training, supervision and expectations to ensure that IEPs are written and implemented properly to ensure students are placed and served in a least restrictive environment and receive FAPE.

Recommendations Specific to Elementary

1. Administration should empower general education teachers to modify instruction and accommodate students with minor differences in general education classrooms. Special Education teachers, along with I&RS and CST members can provide strategies and techniques as a precursor to a formal I&RS process referral.
2. Explore creating co-teaching classrooms in all elementary schools, at least one per grade level.
3. Principals should schedule *replacement classes* first, then build the master schedule. Consultation with Special Education teachers, therapists and CST members should provide data on the amount and structure of the services needed.
4. If, as our on-site team was told, there are self-contained SWD classrooms, we recommend full consideration be given to mainstreaming those students as is appropriate for LRE inclusion and access to the full curriculum.

VISION FOR THE FUTURE

A thorough analysis of the Teaneck School District Special Education Department and associated departments demonstrated a multitude of issues that need to be addressed to ensure compliance with FAPE for all students. These issues include but are not limited to: IEP compliance, use of software to support IEP compliance, inconsistency in special education processes and procedures, ineffective communication, and a lack of Professional Development.

Since it is typically not feasible to solve a multitude of issues at the same time, American Education Consulting offers the following tiered recommendations for your consideration:

Tier I Recommendations:

- a. It is recommended that you consider restructuring the leadership in your organization to include a Special Services Director as well as two Special Services Supervisors at least for the next few years, while necessary adjustments are being made. After that, one director plus one supervisor is likely. Raising the degree of accountability at all levels is necessary to ensure FAPE and LRE compliance. (Potential cost: \$400,000)
- b. Using outside consultants where internal capacity is lacking or overly dependent on current practices, develop a quarterly set of action plans and target results in terms of NJTSS training and implementation, reduction in over-identification of SWDs, in-district LRE placement transitions, and the most significant and *doable* improvement targets identified in this report. Identify, coach and nurture in-district professionals to build leadership capacity at all levels..
- c. Develop a Special Education Compliance Improvement Team of administrators and volunteer staff to steer professional development, process improvements and accountability as per this report. This multi-year comprehensive strategic plan will serve as a guideline to ensuring cost effective and appropriate services to SWD within the Teaneck School District. Use the strategic plan as a part of the overall budgeting process with the goal of reducing special education costs while increasing special student achievement on identified IEP goals.
- d. Create a professional development schedule to support all aspects of the strategic plan. The professional development plan should include but is not limited to the following; transformational leadership training for the administrative team, training for the I&RS Teams as well as the CSTs to ensure consistency of process and services. Additional professional development for all staff should include topics such as differentiation of instruction, training in best instructional practices, strategies to support students with behavioral issues, understanding different cultures and expectations within the school community, training in the use of data for decision making, and technology training to lessen the workload for all stakeholders.
- e. Typically a district of this size employs a Technology Director and tech support staff. Case Managers have not been trained to use the programs designed to simplify and mainstream work. In addition, assistive technology for SWD should be available and

utilized as appropriate. It is recommended that you rethink your current system of outsourcing technology needs.

- f. Develop a 2-3 year plan to reduce the amount of paraprofessionals needed within the district. In addition, it is recommended that paraprofessional services be a part of the district rather than outsourced. (Potential reallocation to general funds of \$1,000,000)
- g. Communicate your plan to all stakeholders during the 2018-2019 school year. A new administrative team provides new opportunities for success for all members of the Teaneck community. A strategic plan with targets, timelines and commitments to staff, students, parents and community, would demonstrate a sincere commitment by the District to proper improvement.
- h. A Special Education Parent Advisory Committee should be created with diverse representation, and committed leadership by the new Director. Regular meetings with agenda input from all committee members, a website with relevant information, and minutes from formal meetings should be available to all constituencies. Again here, if the new Director is not experienced in facilitating such a committee, you would likely want to use a consultant to facilitate for the first year.
- i. Begin the process of bringing out-of-district placed students in-district by ensuring appropriate instructional programs are available. This will require planning and effective communications with parents but one by one you will be providing FAPE in the truly LRE for many more SWD. *See Tier II Recommendation b. below for next steps.* (Potential reallocation to general funds of \$4,000,000 or more in the next three years)

Tier II Recommendations:

- a. Use the District Compliance tool created by AEC to ensure full compliance of all special education practices and use this tool as a part of the evaluation process for special education teachers.
- b. Develop a plan to reduce the amount of outside vendors used to provide routine special education services. Analyze the root cause of low incidence and out of district need that has emerged as high incidence and high out of district need. Use this information, in part, to create a plan to fully implement the NJ Tiered systems of Support program. Monitor closely both the I&RS and CST processes for compliance. Ensure the use of hard data to support all decisions related to tiered support, I&RS and CST.
- c. Budget recommendations for 2019-2020 should include the addition of 1-2 Speech and Language Pathologists and consideration of the number of School Psychologists for possible 1-2 reduction.
- d. Evaluate the number of, and use of, special education teachers at the middle school level. Data shows there are twice as many teachers at this level as the other levels, using student:teacher ratios. (Potential reallocation to general funds of up to \$2,000,000.)
- e. Dialogue with the District's representatives who settle Due Process claims to ensure they understand the District's goals and provide them the necessary process and student achievement documentation to successfully defend the District's position.

Tier III Recommendations

- a. Create a plan to reduce the caseloads of the CST team members. Proper identification and service/placements efforts should reduce caseloads over time to proper service levels.
- b. Currently, the level of inclusion for SWD is lower than what is considered appropriate. It is suggested that the district plan include a mechanism to provide a higher level of students with SWD the opportunity to be educated with their typical peers for access to the full curriculum.

In summary, we estimate it will take a concerted effort for the next two to three years and beyond to provide quality services to each properly identified disabled student, in a fiscally responsible manner.

It is unfair to students, unfair to staff and unfair to taxpayers to operate programming for students with disabilities in any way other than properly and efficiently under federal and state guidelines.

Our report is a beginning. Our services are available to you as per the RFP, our response to it, and the contractual agreement we have with you. Our recommendations here are designed to provide more appropriate services to students. Those services to students ultimately cost less, which subsequently allows those taxpayer dollars to help ALL students in the District. Shifting \$8,000,000 from special education to **all student** needs, shifts the current 52%:48% budget ratio special student needs:all student needs, to 44%:56%, which is much more appropriate for the school district. Please let us know how we can support your efforts.

Appendix A

Special Education Data Tables

(with State/Local Comparables)

This document is a summary of notable information related to the data that was collected for the Teaneck Special Education Audit.

Table 1: Teaneck Graduation Rates:

Student Group	2017 District	2017 State	2016 5 year District	2016 5 year state	Target Met?
District Wide	88.8%	90.5%	93.5%	91.8%	Not Yet
Students w/ Disabilities	79.1%	78.1%	86.3%	82.1%	Not Yet

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 2: Chronic Absenteeism for Teaneck:

Student Group	%	2016-17 Target	Target Met?
District	3.4%	10.30	Met
Students w/ Disabilities	6.8%	10.30	Met

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 3: Teaneck Enrollment Trends District Wide:

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Students District Wide	3,614	3,564	3,537

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 4: Enrollment Data for All Students and SWD 2016-2017 (with comparables):

District	General Enrollment	Enrolled Students with Disabilities	Classification Rate (%)
West Orange	6,728	1,346	20.01
Franklin	7382	1304	17.66
Hackensack	5775	1150	19.91
Egg Harbor Township	7,470	1060	14.19
South Plainfield	3,429	564	16.45
Teaneck	3,611	1,035	28.66
State	x	x	15.8
National	x	x	13.00

*Include public and private schools

Ratio: State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 5: Enrollment Trends for SWD:

District:	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
West Orange	12%	13%	13%
Franklin	23%	25%	22%
Hackensack	17%	18%	19%
Egg Harbor Township	12%	13%	14%
South Plainfield	14%	15%	16%
Teaneck	22%	24%	24%

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 6: English Language Arts Assessments, Participants and Performance (Teaneck):

Student Group	Valid Score	% taking test	District: % of testers met / exceed expectations	State: % of testers met / exceed expectations	2016-17 Annual Target	2016-17 Annual Target?
District Wide	1606	96.4%	57.30%	54.90%	53.4%	Met Target
Students w/ Disabilities	421	93.7%	*	20.50%	20.7%	Met Target

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 7: Statewide Assessments: Student with Disabilities who Met/Exceed Expectations (with comparables):

	2015	2016	2017	% Change from 2015-2017
West Orange	57.7%	61.1%	65.5%	7.8%
Franklin	44.4%	31.6%	49.1%	4.7%
Hackensack	37.0%	40.1%	40.6%	3.6%
Egg Harbor Township	46.4%	47.1%	47.8%	1.4%
South Plainfield	55.7%	65.3%	66%	10.3%
Teaneck	44.4%	29.1%	54.2%	9.8%

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 8: Student to Teacher Ratios w/ Comparable Districts

District	Teacher:Student Ratio	Administration:Student Ratio
West Orange	11:1	106:1
Franklin	9:1	109:1
Hackensack	14:1	636:1
Egg Harbor	12:1	181:1
South Plainfield	11:1	488:1
Teaneck	10:1	131:1
State Average	12:1	145:1

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 9 : Student Count By Disability (w/ Comparable Districts)

Children receiving free and appropriate education (ages 6-21- public schools only, taken from the New Jersey Office of Special Education Programs)

District	Autism	ED	HI	MD	ID	OHI	OI	SLD	SPI	TBI	VI
West Orange	119	20	4	125	52	194	0	366	241	5	1
Franklin	0	2	0	5	0	0	11	8	0	0	0
Hackensack	88	34	9	98	13	112	2	311	277	0	3
Egg Harbor Township	5	3	0	44	1	9	0	26	24	0	0
South Plainfield	32	11	5	21	16	120	0	219	69	0	1
Teaneck	82	20	0	173	17	159	2	253	86	0	1

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 9.1: Incidence of Disabilities, Percentages with Federal data:

Disability	% of students w/ Disabilities
Autism	4.5%
Emotional Disturbance	6.7%
Hearing Impairment/Deafness	1.2%
ID	7.6%
Multiple Disabilities	2.1%
Orthopedic Impairment	1.0%
Other Health Impairment	9.7%
SLD	39.0%
Speech/Language Impairment	22.0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.4%
Visual Impairment/Blindness	0.4%

Source: (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2009)

Table 10: Graduation Rates (with comparables, for ALL students and SWD)

District	Overall Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate SWD
West Orange	86.67%	69.77%
Franklin	n/a	n/a
Hackensack	92.07%	73.91%
Egg Harbor Township	94.18%	70.15%
South Plainfield	92.2%	73.91%
Teaneck	88.77%	79.10%

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 11: Per Pupil Expenditure - All Students

	Federal Funding	State/Local Funding	Total Per Pupil
West Orange	\$456	\$17,591	\$18,047
Franklin	\$451	\$17,907	\$18,358
Hackensack	\$682	\$15,006	\$15,688
Egg Harbor Township	\$492	\$13,871	\$14,369
South Plainfield	\$470	\$14,424	\$14,894
Teaneck	\$489	\$19,402	\$19,591

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 12: Post Secondary Plans (all students and SWD)

	% Total Enrolled in Any Institution	% Enrolled in 2-year Institution	% Enrolled in 4-year Institution	SWD- % Total Enrolled in Any Institution	SWD- % Enrolled in 2 Year Institution	SWD- % Enrolled in 4 Year Institution
West Orange	71.1%	29.5%	70.5%	61.3%	55.3%	44.7%
Franklin	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hackensack	70.5%	40.9%	59.1%	51.0%	57.5%	42.3%
Egg Harbor Township	72.9%	37.7%	62.3%	37.5%	86.7%	13.3%
South Plainfield	75.8%	42.0%	58.0%	56.3%	77.8%	22.8%
Teaneck	71.1%	25.9%	74.2%	63.0%	52.9%	47.1%
State	71.1%	29.5%	70.5%	n/a	n/a	n/a

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 13: SWD Discipline Reports by Incident

District	Violence	Vandalism	Weapons	Substance	Harassment, Intimidation, Bullying (HIB)	Incidents per 100 students enrolled
West Orange	15	4	1	26	38	1.26
Franklin	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Hackensack	42	4	1	7	35	1.56
Egg Harbor	69	10	8	18	13	1.55
South Plainfield	16	2	3	10	14	1.26
Teaneck	14	3	5	7	17	1.27

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 14: SWD Student Growth Data

	ELA: District Median	ELA: Statewide Median	Math: District Median	Math: Statewide Median
West Orange- District Wide	52	50	45	50
West Orange- SWD	*	41	*	43
Franklin- District Wide	47	50	52.5	50
Franklin- SWD	24.5	41	47	43
Hackensack- District Wide	54	50	45	50
Hackensack- SWD	46	41	35	43
Egg Harbor Township- District Wide	55	50	58	50
Egg Harbor Township- SWD	41	41	46.5	43
South Plainfield- District Wide	47	50	47	50
South Plainfield- SWD	*	41	*	43
Teaneck- District Wide	47.5	50	39	50
Teaneck- SWD	*	41	*	43

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

(As of October 15, 2016)

Table 15: ELA PARCC Testing Scores (All students and SWD)

District	Valid Score	% of student taking the test	District: % of testers Met/Exceed Expectations	State: % of testers Met/Exceed Expectations	Proficiency Rate for Federal Accountability	2016-17 Annual Target	Met 2016-17 Annual Target
West Orange-District Wide	1605	96.4	57.30	54.90	57.3	53.4	Met Target
West Orange-SWD	421	93.7	*	20.50	22.7	20.7	Met Target
Franklin-District Wide	287	97.0	53.00	54.90	53	51	Met Target
Franklin-SWD	74	96.1	*	20.50	*	9.7	Met Target
Hackensack-District Wide	2942	98.7	49.40	54.90	49.4	46.6	Met Target
Hackensack-SWD	1828	99.3	42.20	36.20	42.2	40.4	Met Target
Egg Harbor Township-District Wide	4183	96.8	52.90	54.90	52.9	48.3	Met Target
Egg Harbor Township-SWD	521	93.8	12.90	20.50	12.6	16.7	Not Met
South Plainfield-District Wide	1952	97.8	60.70	54.90	60.7	60.9	Met Target
South Plainfield-SWD	321	94.0	15.00	20.50	14.9	19.9	Not Met
Teaneck-District Wide	1605	96.4	57.30	54.90	57.3	53.4	Met Target
Teaneck-SWD	421	93.7	*	20.50	22.7	20.7	Met Target

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 16: Math PARCC testing Scores (All students and SWD)

District	Valid Score	% of student taking the test	District: % of testers Met/Exceed Expectations	State: % of testers Met/Exceed Expectations	Proficiency Rate for Federal Accountability	2016-17 Annual Target	Met 2016-17 Annual Target
West Orange-District Wide	3531	90.4	46.70	43.50	44.4	46.9	Not Met
West Orange-SWD	652	89.2	20.70	16.50	19.3	21.7	Met Target
Franklin-District Wide	286	96.6	40.50	43.50	40.5	29.1	Met Target
Franklin- SWD	73	94.8	*	16.50	*	5.4	Met Target
Hackensack-District Wide	2974	98.6	30.60	43.50	30.6	29.7	Met Target
Hackensack-SWD	573	97.0	10.60	16.50	10.6	12.9	Not Met
Egg Harbor Township-District Wide	4055	96.7	43.50	43.50	43.5	40.6	Met Target
Egg Harbor Township-SWD	497	93.2	13.10	16.50	12.8	14.3	Met Target
South Plainfield-District Wide	1957	97.8	46.40	43.50	46.4	48.3	Met Target
South Plainfield-SWD	323	94.4	13.70	16.50	13.6	16.7	Met Target
Teaneck-District Wide	1602	96.1	41.40	43.50	41.4	41.5	Met Target
Teaneck- SWD	418	93.0	17.00	16.50	16.7	17.9	Met Target

Table 17: SWD- Children Receiving Free and Appropriate Education (Ages 6-21 Public)

Student Count By Race (As of October 15, 2015)

	White	Hispanic	Black	Asian	2 or more Race	Assuming # of SWD from 2016
West Orange	264 (23.4%)	353 (31.3%)	241 (21.4%)	31 (3.1%)	27(2.4%)	1,127
Franklin	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	not reported	26?
Hackensack	98 (10.34%)	559 (59.0%)	247 (26.1%)	33 (3.5%)	0	947
Egg Harbor Township	41 (36.6%)	35 (31.3%)	30 (26.8%)	0	0	112
South Plainfield	241 (48.8%)	133 (26.9%)	73 (14.7%)	49 (9.9%)	0	494
Teaneck	145 (14%)	251 (24.3%)	330 (32.1%)	46 (4.4%)	13 (1.3%)	1,035

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 18: SWD- Children Receiving Free and Appropriate Education FAPE (Ages 6-21 Public)

Placement Data (As of October 15, 2016)

	Inside the regular class 80% or more of day	Inside the regular classroom no more than 79% of day but no less than 40% of day	Inside regular class for less than 40% of day	Separate School
Teaneck	273 (26.4%)	246 (23.7%)	177 (17.1%)	56 (5.41%)

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Table 19: Teaneck School District SWD Coding by School (in-District)

	Autism	Communication Impairment	S/Lang	MD	OHI	Pre-School	SLD	ED	Modertiate ID	VI	AI	Total by School
Bryant	10	11	3	1	15	58	5	0	0	0	0	103
Hawthorne	7	15	2	5	22	0	17	0	0	0	0	68
Lowell	13	3	4	6	20	0	34	1	5	1	1	87
Whittier	7	16	6	5	22	0	31	1	2	0	0	90
BFMS	12	12	5	20	47	0	47	5	5	0	0	107
TJMS	6	10	2	11	30	0	63	1	0	0	0	123
THS	19	7	0	59	58	0	126	4	3	0	0	277
District	74	74	22	107	214	58	323	12	15	1	2	902

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20: Related Services Data by School:

(All Related Services Data Pulled from IEP Direct May 29, 2018)**

Table 20.1 - Bryant Elementary:

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	Staffing Need	Currently Employed
OT	59	2,595	2	
Para	4	1,470	1	22
Speech Language	75	3,530	2	
Teacher of the Deaf	3	180		
PT	26	855	.6	

*Para requirements for pre-school classes

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.2 - Hawthorne Elementary

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	Staffing Need	Currently Employed
OT	21	1470	.5	
Para	1	1170	1	9
Speech Language	42	1850	.7	
PT	7	240	.1	
Counseling	4	135	.1	

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.3 - Lowell Elementary

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	Staffing Need	Currently Employed
OT	37	1305	.5	
Para	10	4650	2	16
Speech Language	53	2365	1	
Home Program Coordination	2	180	.2	
PT	5	270	.1	
Counseling	8	270	.2	

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.4 - Whittier Elementary

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	Staffing Need	Currently Employed
OT	39	1560	.6	
Para	4	1800	1	10
Speech Language	64	1910	.7	
Behavioral Intervention	1	90	.1	
PT	8	270	.1	
Counseling	6	190	.15	

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.5 - Benjamin Franklin Middle School

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	Staffing Need	Currently Employed
OT	28	1155	.4	
Para	7	2940	2.5	17
Speech Language	85	3060	1.2	
Counseling	28	850	.6	
PT	5	135	.1	
Social Skills	5	150	..1	

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.6- Thomas Jefferson Middle School

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	Staffing Need	Currently Employed
OT	22	870	.4	
Para	2	735	1	6
Speech Language	56	1980	.7	
Teacher of the Deaf	1	90	.05	
PT	1	30	.1	
Counseling	17	680	.5	
Commission for the Blind	1	60	.04	

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.7- Teaneck High School

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	Staffing Need	Currently Employed
OT	14	460	.2	
Para	7	3375	2.5	19
Speech Language	47	1730	.6	
Commission for the Blind	2	40	.03	
PT	3	150	.1	
Consultation to Nurse	2	40	.03	

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.8 - Out of District

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes
OT	54	2093
Para	17	7005
Speech Language	71	3466
Teacher of the Deaf	3	270
PT	27	1015
Behavioral Intervention	6	450
Commission for the Blind	2	150
Counseling	68	3930
Nursing Consult	4	1145
Social Skills	10	375

Data taken from IEP Direct, Report run on Tuesday May 29, 2017

Table 20.9- District Wide

Service	# of students receiving service	Weekly total minutes	# of FTE (assuming 4.67 hr/day) Average 1-2 students per session	Teaneck currently has:
OT	274	11,508	4	
Para	52	23,165	8.5-15.5	33-40 1:1
Speech Language	493	19,891	6.5	6
Teacher of the Deaf	6	450		
PT	82	2,965	1.2	
Behavioral Intervention	7	540		
Commission for the Blind	5	350		
Counseling	131	6,055	1.5* (1 student at a time)	8 School Psychs
Nursing Consult	6	1,185	.05 (1 student at a time)	School nurse on-site
Social Skills	15	525		

Table 21: Current CST team staffing

Role	Current FTE
Speech	6
Psychologist	8
LDT/C	5
Social Worker	4

Source: Teaneck Public Schools

Table 22: Staffing Comparison by District

	Special Ed. Director	Special Ed. Supervisor	CST	Special Ed Teachers
West Orange	1	3	24	131
Franklin	1	0	3	14
Hackensack	1	1	35	88
Egg Harbor	1	2		
South Plainfield	1	1	23	
Teaneck	0	1	24	88

Source: Central Office reporting from comparable districts

Table 23: Current Caseload for CST Members

Speech:

Role on CST	Size of Caseload	Buildings w/in district	# OOD placements locations	Caseload Target
Speech- 1	5	1	0	
Speech- 2	6	1	1	
Speech- 3	5	1	0	
Speech- 4	4	2	0	
Speech- 5	1	1	0	
Speech- 6	2	1	0	

Source; IEP Direct - June 4, 2018

Table 23.1: Current Caseload for CST Members

School Psych:

Role on CST	Size of Caseload	Buildings w/in district	# OOD placements locations	Caseload Target
School Psych-1	63	1	4	-8
School Psych-2	48	1	1	-3
School Psych-3	57	1	16	-2
School Psych-4	58	1	12	-13
School Psych-5	66	1	1	-11
School Psych-6	59	1	17	-9
School Psych-7	44	1	0	+1
School Psych-8	67	1	10	-12

Source: IEP Direct - June 4, 2018

Table 23.2: Current Caseload for CST Members

LDT/C:

Role on CST	Size of Caseload	Buildings w/in district	# OOD placements locations	Caseload Target
LDT/C-1	53	2	1	-3
LDT/C-2	62	1	2	-7
LDT/C-3	62	2	9	-12
LDT/C-4	37	1	0	+8
LDT/C-5	62	2	11	-12

Source: IEP Direct - June 4, 2018

Table 23.3: Current Caseload for CST Members

Social Worker:

Role on CST:	Size of Caseload	Buildings w/in district	# OOD placements locations	Caseload Target
Social Worker-1	69	3	11	-19
Social Worker -2	35	2	16	+20
Social Worker-3	68	1	14	-13
Social Worker-4	68	2	12	-13

Source: IEP Direct - June 4, 2018

Table 24: Current Paras Staffing/Need by building

School	Current # of paras	# of minutes per students IEP	Para Need Per IEP minutes (based on weekly IEP minutes)
Bryant	22	1,470	1
Hawthorne	9	1,170	1
Lowell	16	4,650	2
Whittier	10	1,800	1
Ben Franklin MS	17	2,940	2.5
Thomas Jefferson MS	6	735	1
Teaneck High School	19	3,375	2.5

Report from district June 6, 2018

Table 25: Special Ed. Teacher Count by Building

School	# of Special Educators	# of Identified Students:	Ratio- Identified Students to Special Ed. teachers
Bryant	9	103	11.4:1
Hawthorne	8	68	8.5:1
Lowell	8	87	10.9:1
Whittier	7	90	12.9:1
BFMS	19	107	5.6:1
TJMH	20	123	6.2:1
THS	17	277	16.3:1

Report from district June 6, 2018

Table 26: 2016-17 Budget Summary:

Enrollment	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Estimate
Pupils on Rolls Reg. Full-Time	3,236	3,136.	3,139.30
Pupils on Roll Regular Shared-Time	7.0	11.0	11.0
Pupils on Role Special Ed. Full-Time	770.9	822.0	910.0
Pupils On Rolls Special Ed Shared-Time		2.0	2.0
Pupils on Roll SUBTOTAL	4,012	3,971.0	4,062.0
Pupils in Private School Placements	50.0	50.0	0.0
Pupils Sent to Other Districts Regular	3.0	0.0	0.0
Pupils Sent to Other District Special Ed	62.0	61.0	22.0
Pupils Received		1.0	0.0
Pupils in State Facilities	3.0	2.0	2.0

Source: Teaneck Public Schools

Table 26.1: Budget Category:

Enrollment	2014 Actual	2015 Actual	2016 Estimate
Extraordinary Aid	874,109	1,050,000	875,000
Medicaid Reimbursement	94,240	58,170	103,205
Title I	463,123	397,018	397,018
Title II	129,989	98,631	98,631
Title III	30,199	21,724	21,724
IDEA Part B (Handicapped)	1,017,090	922,306	922,306
Special Education Instruction	9,442,253	9,599,775	10,207,194
Basic Skills/Remedial- Instruction	1,841,905	1,577,893	1,660,452
Undist. Expend- Speech/OT/PT/Related Services	2,220,703	2,369,104	2,282,892
Undist. Expenditures- CST	2,265,910	2,305,139	2,427,452
Undist. Expenditures- Support Serv.-General Admin	1,116,493	1,168,199	1,220,498
Undist. Expenditures- Support Serv. School Admin	3,131,317	2,943,294	2,982,843

Source: Teaneck Public Schools

Table 27: Teaneck School District; Percentages of SWD by race:

Race:	Overall % of Teaneck Population:	% of that race SWD:	% National Average
Black	36%	26%	16%
Hispanic	37%	19%	12%
White	9%	43%	14%
Asian	11%	11%	7%
Teaneck Average		29%	
New Jersey Average		17%	
National Average		13%	

Conclusions: (1) Three times more of enrolled white students are identified SWD than should be expected.

(2) Teaneck has almost twice as many SWD as should be expected.

(3) Teaneck has more SWD as should be expected in EVERY racial subgroup

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

National Center for Education Statistics

Table 27.1: Teaneck SWD # By Gender:

Female:	270 SWD	.34
Male:	527 SWD	.67

Various references identify $\frac{1}{3}:\frac{2}{3}$ ratio of girls to boys in special education referrals and identification of students with disabilities. Conclusion: Teaneck has about the same ratio of male/female SWD as is common in schools nationally.

State of NJ DOE- District Performance Reports

Thomas Fordham Institute

Gender Differences in Learning Disabilities By [Douglas Haddad](#) Updated December 19, 2017

National Center for Education Statistics

Appendix B

Teaneck Financial Summary

ENROLLMENT							
	<u>2014</u> <u>-15</u>	<u>2015-</u> <u>16</u>	<u>2016-</u> <u>17</u>	<u>2017-</u> <u>18</u>	<u>2018-</u> <u>19</u>	<u>Avg</u> <u>Inc/De</u> <u>c</u>	
Half day 3yr	15	19	19	24	28		
Half day 4yr	53	37	39	40	57		
Full day K	175	201	181	175	188		
One	204	177	199	173	180		
Two	211	209	183	181	178		
Three	215	214	203	170	176		
Four	184	209	189	197	165		
Five	208	179	215	192	207		
Six	191	201	184	215	202		
Seven	229	200	191	186	215		
Eight	233	252	203	202	199		
Nine	253	261	248	222	212		
Ten	272	269	270	242	210		
Eleven	254	277	267	276	246		
Twelve	285	255	260	279	281		
Special Ed Elem	353	323	329	344	361		
SPED Middle	172	181	196	205	201		
SPED HS	220	229	266	231	279		
Out of district	116	115	111	119	117		
Total Enrollment	384	3808	3753	3673	3702	5 YR Inc/De c	
		-	-	-	-	-	
% Increase/Dec		0.91 %	1.44 %	2.13 %	0.79 %	0.924 %	3.669 %
Charter	321	320	329	352	358		
		-					
% Increase/Dec		0.31 %	2.81%	6.99%	1.70%	2.799 %	

Source: Teaneck Public Schools
Data

Received	1	0	1	1	1		
SPECIAL ED ENROLLMENT							
Special Ed Elem	353	323	329	344	361		
SPED Middle	172	181	196	205	201		
SPED HS	220	229	266	231	279		
Out of district	116	115	111	119	118		
Total Sped Enroll.	861	848	902	899	959		5 YR Inc/Dec c
		-					
% Increase/Dec		1.51 %	6.37%	0.33%	6.67%	2.800 %	11.38 %
% of Sped to total Enrollment	22.4 %	22.3 %	24.0%	24.5%	25.9%		
Special Ed Elem							
Special Ed Elem	353	323	329	344	361		5 YR Inc/Dec c
		-					
% Increase/Dec		8.50 %	1.86%	4.56%	4.94%	0.715 %	2.27%
SPED Middle							
SPED Middle	172	181	196	205	201		
		5.23					
% Increase/Dec		%	8.29%	4.59%	1.95%	4.040 %	16.86 %
SPED HS							
SPED HS	220	229	266	231	279		
				-			
% Increase/Dec		4.09 %	16.16 %	13.16 %	20.78 %	6.967 %	26.82 %
Total in-district sped	745	733	791	780	841		
Source: Teaneck Public Schools Data							

Regular Instruction Enrollment

Half day 3yr	15	19	19	24	28
Half day 4yr	53	37	39	40	57
Full day K	175	201	181	175	188
One	204	177	199	173	180
Two	211	209	183	181	178
Three	215	214	203	170	176
Four	184	209	189	197	165
Five	208	179	215	192	207
Six	191	201	184	215	202
Seven	229	200	191	186	215
Eight	233	252	203	202	199
Nine	253	261	248	222	212
Ten	272	269	270	242	210
Eleven	254	277	267	276	246
Twelve	285	255	260	279	281
	2982	2960	2851	2774	2744

Source: Teaneck Public Schools Data

Unilateral Placements					
SCHOOL	Payment	2017-2018 Tuition	2017-2018 Transportation	2018-2019 Tuition	2018-2019 Transportation
	Parent Paying / Currently in Litigation				
OOD PLACEMENT	Parent Paying				
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Residential	?			
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying	\$50,375.00	\$13,375.00	\$18,900.00	\$9,500.00
OOD PLACEMENT	Parent Paying				
OOD PLACEMENT	???				
	Parent Paying / Currently in Litigation				
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying	\$50,000.00		\$50,000.00	
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Tuition Only	\$64,050.00			
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Tuition Only / Residential	\$30,890.50			
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying	\$50,000.00		\$50,000.00	
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Tuition Only / Residential	\$272,524.47			

	District	\$95,500.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District	\$85,260.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	Parent		
	Paying /		
	Currentl		
	y in		
	Litigatio		
OOD PLACEMENT	n		
	District	\$33,000.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District	\$66,500.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District	\$50,000.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District		
	Paying /		
	Tuition		
	Only /		
	Residen	\$94,993.	\$97,842
OOD PLACEMENT	tial	00	.79
	Parent		
	Paying /		
	Currentl		
	y in		
	Litigatio		
OOD PLACEMENT	n		
	District	\$50,000.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	Parent		
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying		
	District		
	Paying /		
	Tuition		
	Only /		
	Residen	\$184,800	
OOD PLACEMENT	tial	.00	
Source: Teaneck Public			
Schools Data			

2018-2019 Private School Projected Budget					
SCHOOL	Payment	2017-2018 Tuition	2017-2018 Transportation	2018-2019 Tuition	2018-2019 Transportation
	Parent Paying / Currently in Litigation				
OOD PLACEMENT	Parent Paying				
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Residential	?			
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying	\$50,375.00	\$13,375.00	\$18,900.00	\$9,500.00
OOD PLACEMENT	Parent Paying				
OOD PLACEMENT	????				
	Parent Paying / Currently in Litigation				
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying	\$50,000.00		\$50,000.00	
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Tuition Only	\$64,050.00			
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Tuition Only / Residential	\$30,890.50			
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying	\$50,000.00		\$50,000.00	
OOD PLACEMENT	District Paying / Tuition Only / Residential	\$272,524.47			

	District	\$95,500.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District	\$85,260.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	Parent		
	Paying /		
	Currentl		
	y in		
	Litigatio		
OOD PLACEMENT	n		
	District	\$33,000.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District	\$66,500.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District	\$50,000.	
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying	00	
	District		
	Paying /		
	Tuition		
	Only /		
	Residen	\$94,993.	\$97,842
OOD PLACEMENT	tial	00	.79
	Parent		
	Paying /		
	Currentl		
	y in		
	Litigatio		
OOD PLACEMENT	n		
	District	\$50,000.	
	Paying	00	
	Parent		
OOD PLACEMENT	Paying		
	District		
	Paying /		
	Tuition		
	Only /		
	Residen	\$184,800	
OOD PLACEMENT	tial	.00	
Source: Teaneck Public			
Schools Data			

**2018-2019 Public School
Projected Budget**

Program	# of Students	Tuition-2017-2018	3%	3% Difference	5%	5% Difference	10%	10% Difference	TOTAL
MCD	1	\$25,712.16	\$26,483.52	\$771.36	\$26,997.77	\$1,285.61	\$29,131.88	\$3,419.72	\$26,483.52
MD	2	\$35,640.00	\$36,709.20	\$1,069.20	\$37,422.00	\$1,782.00	\$40,380.12	\$4,740.12	\$36,709.20
MD	1	\$42,310.00	\$43,579.30	\$1,269.30	\$44,425.50	\$2,100.00	\$47,937.23	\$5,627.23	\$43,579.30
MD	2	\$32,325.00	\$33,294.75	\$969.75	\$33,941.25	\$1,605.00	\$36,624.23	\$4,299.23	\$33,294.75
Autism	1	\$67,191.00	\$69,206.73	\$2,015.73	\$70,550.55	\$3,300.00	\$76,127.40	\$8,936.40	\$69,206.73
Autism	3	\$73,910.00	\$76,127.30	\$2,217.30	\$77,605.50	\$3,600.00	\$83,740.03	\$9,830.03	\$76,127.30
1:1 Aide	2	\$44,880.00	\$46,226.40	\$1,346.40	\$47,124.00	\$2,200.00	\$50,849.04	\$5,969.04	\$46,226.40
MD	1	\$66,500.00	\$68,495.00	\$1,995.00	\$69,825.00	\$3,300.00	\$75,344.50	\$8,844.50	\$68,495.00
LD	1	\$45,000.00	\$46,350.00	\$1,350.00	\$47,250.00	\$2,200.00	\$50,985.00	\$5,985.00	\$46,350.00
1:1 Aide	3	\$42,532.00	\$43,807.96	\$1,275.96	\$44,658.60	\$2,100.00	\$48,188.76	\$5,656.76	\$43,807.96
Autism	6	\$60,442.00	\$62,255.26	\$1,813.26	\$63,464.10	\$3,000.00	\$68,480.79	\$8,038.79	\$62,255.26
MD	7	\$41,929.00	\$43,186.87	\$1,257.87	\$44,025.45	\$2,000.00	\$47,505.56	\$5,576.56	\$43,186.87
BD	2	\$49,330.00	\$50,809.90	\$1,479.90	\$51,796.50	\$2,400.00	\$55,890.89	\$6,560.89	\$50,809.90
BD	1	\$65,280.00	\$67,238.40	\$1,958.40	\$68,544.54	\$3,200.00	\$73,962.96	\$8,682.24	\$67,238.40

					00	0	24		40
LD	7	\$21,748.00	\$22,400.44	\$652.44	\$22,835.40	\$1,874.00	\$24,640.48	\$2,892.48	\$156,803.08
\$1,847,881.96									
\$75,350,809,978,950,819.62									
9.16 1.03 .87 5.62 46 8.14 58.98 6									

Total Stud. 40

Source:
Teaneck
Public
Schools Data

2018-2019
Projected
Budget Region
V

2017-2018	Cost	3%	3% Difference	5%	5% Difference	10%	10% Difference
Speech & Language	\$150,000.00	\$154,500.00	\$4,500.00	\$15,913.50	\$9,135.00	\$16,390.05	\$13,909.05
Nursing	\$100,000.00	\$103,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$10,609.00	\$6,090.00	\$10,927.70	\$9,272.70
ABA Home Programing	\$35,000.00	\$36,050.00	\$1,050.00	\$37,131.50	\$2,131.50	\$38,245.45	\$3,245.45
Consultant Services	\$250,000.00	\$257,500.00	\$7,500.00	\$26,522.50	\$15,225.00	\$27,318.75	\$23,181.75
Non Public	\$99,000.00	\$101,970.00	\$2,970.00	\$10,502.90	\$6,291.00	\$10,817.97	\$9,179.97
Evaluations - Fees Due in June	\$17,361.00	\$17,881.83	\$520.83	\$18,418.28	\$1,057.28	\$18,970.83	\$1,609.83
Direct Services - Fees Due in June	\$118,879.00	\$122,445.37	\$3,566.37	\$12,611.87	\$7,397.33	\$12,990.29	\$11,023.29
Grand Total:	\$770,240.00	\$793,347.20	\$23,107.20	\$81,714.62	\$46,907.62	\$84,166.04	\$71,422.04

Source:

**Instructional
Expenditures
Analysis**

Expenditure Analysis

	<u>2015</u>	<u>2016</u>	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>
Reg Instruction	24,293,730	22,109,378	22,725,775	23,560,209
Tuition	537,739	535,799	531,078	643,139
	24,831,469	22,645,177	23,256,853	24,203,347
Special Education				
Instuction	9,442,453	8,978,358	10,166,675	10,733,496
Tuition	7,022,936	6,725,266	6,720,396	8,604,489
Related Services	2,220,703	2,178,893	2,126,464	2,247,977
Extraordinary Svcs.	1,548,912	2,052,067	1,681,864	1,909,700
CST	2,265,910	2,127,847	2,184,213	2,353,144
	22,500,914	22,062,431	22,879,612	25,848,806
Total Instruction	47,332,383	44,707,608	46,136,465	50,052,153
Reg	52%	51%	50%	48%
Sped	48%	49%	50%	52%

Regular

Enrollment	2,960	2,851	2,774	2,744
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Per Pupil Cost	8,389	7,943	8,384	8,820
	78%	76%	76%	74%

Sped				
Enrollment	848	902	899	959
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Per pupil Cost	26,534	24,459	25,450	26,954
	22%	24%	24%	26%

Total				
Enrollment	3,808	3,753	3,673	3,703
Source:				
Teaneck				
Public				
Schools Data				

Appendix C
Teaneck Public Schools
Summary of
Parent Focus Group Responses

May/June, 2018

As part of American Educational Consultants' special education study, parents were offered the opportunity to provide input through their responses to a standard written set of items and oral discussion questions by way of attendance at three pre-scheduled focus group sessions (5/15/18, 5/21/18, 6/7/18) and/or communication via phone or emails.

Just under 40 parents attended the sessions in total, appeared to represent a wide array of views, and should be considered a reliable random sample, valid for its' purpose.

The results are intended to help the district make program and operational decisions with knowledge that the below results likely are indicative of the larger group they represent.

Summary of parent results:

1. Grading Teaneck's special education services, parents rated the following as doing a **good job** in the areas of:
 - a. Parents are considered equal team members
 - b. General education teachers are aware of child's unique needs

2. Grading Teaneck's special education services, parents rated the following as doing a **fair job** in the areas of:
 - a. SPED teachers are available to address parent concerns
 - b. SPED staff are knowledgeable and professional about my child's needs
 - c. My child has appropriate access to the general curriculum

3. Grading Teaneck's special education services, parents rated the following as doing a **poor job** in the areas of:
 - a. Requests for assistance are met in a timely manner
 - b. Student evaluations are presented in a manner that is easy to read and understand
 - c. Student evaluations are complete and cover all areas related to student strengths and needs

- d. Student IEPs are presented in a manner that is easy to read and understand
 - e. Student IEPs are complete and cover all necessary student needs
 - f. Parents are appropriately informed about student progress
 - g. Staff welcome parent input and incorporate parent suggestions into programming
 - h. General education teachers implement my child's IEP in their classrooms
 - i. Written & verbal communication are presented in an understandable way
 - j. My child's educational & functional needs are appropriately addressed
 - k. My child with disabilities is held to the same high standards as children without disabilities
 - l. My child uses appropriate technology at school
 - m. The school closely monitors my child's progress throughout the school day and in all their programs and activities
 - n. If my child is not making progress toward an IEP goal, the school informs me before the end of the year and discusses a plan for helping my child attain that goal
4. During focused discussion, parents identified **strengths** of Teaneck SPED are:
- a. Wonderful and experienced staff of SPED teachers
 - b. Communication from SPED teachers and paraprofessionals
 - c. Culture of inclusion and kindness from students and staff to students with special needs
 - d. Diversity of community
5. During focused discussion, parents identified that **areas of improvement** for Teaneck SPED should be:
- a. Lack of proper communication from administration
 - b. Distrust with administration and CST in regard to acting in the best interest of the children
 - c. Incomplete paperwork and paperwork with significant errors
 - d. Lack of appropriate programs in home schools
 - e. Perception that hiring an advocate or attorney is the only way to receive appropriate services
 - f. Lack of SPED parent support group
 - g. Consistency between buildings and programs
 - h. Lack of consistent progress reporting
 - i. Not meeting timelines for evaluations and IEPs
 - j. Lack of communication when students transition between schools and/or case manager changes

Parents of students of all ages were happy with their children's special education teachers. Areas of dissatisfaction are discussed in more depth throughout the report but include the areas of: administrative communication, IEP accuracy, in-district program options, lack of SPED parent group, consistency in programs from K-12, and trust in case managers and CST.

Numerous parents, with children in out-of-district placements, expressed interest in returning their children to home schools for better relationships with local peers and a sense of belonging in the community.

Appendix D Acronyms

Disability Codes:

AU	Autism and Autism Spectrum Disorder, including Asperger's Syndrome
CI	Communication Impaired
ED	Emotional Disturbance
HI	Hearing Impaired
ID	Intellectually Disabled
MD	Multiple Disabilities
OHI	Other Health Impaired
Orth	Orthopedic Impairment
PSD	Preschool Child with a Disability
SLD	Specific Learning Disabilities
TBI	Traumatic Brain Injury
VI	Visually Impaired

Additional Special Education Acronyms:

FTE: Full Time Equivalent
IEP: Individualized Educational Program
LRE: Least Restrictive Environment
OT: Occupational Therapy
OOD: Out of District

PT: Physical Therapy
SPED Special Education
SWD: Student with a Disability; Students with Disabilities

Terms Specifics to New Jersey:

Approved Private Schools for Students with Disabilities
CST: Child Study Team
ESLS: Eligible for Speech/Language Services (this refers to “speech only” students)
ICS: In-class Support
I&RS: Intervention and Referral Services
LDT-C: Learning Disabilities Teacher-Consultant
Non-Approved Private Schools for Students with Disabilities [Naples Placements]
Non-Public Services [Parochial Schools] Chapter 192 - Compensatory Services Chapter 193 - Evaluation and Determination of Eligibility
P.R.I.S.E. - Parental Rights in Special Education
RC: Resource Center

Appendix E

Guidelines for Determining a Student with a Disability's Need for a 1:1 Aide

The purpose of this following information is to provide guidance to assist IEP teams in determining a student with a disability's need for a 1:1 aide. A recommendation for an individual aide is a significant programmatic decision and one that should only be made after a comprehensive discussion of other options considered, and clear documentation as to why those options are not appropriate. While, some students may temporarily need the support of a 1:1 aide to receive a free appropriate public education, for other students the assignment of a 1:1 aide may be unnecessarily and inappropriately restrictive.

A goal for all students with disabilities is to promote and maximize independence. IEP teams are responsible for developing and implementing individualized education programs that promote such independence. When a team determines that a student needs a 1:1 aide, it should always be considered a time-limited recommendation and specific conditions/goals must be established to fade the use of the 1:1 aide.

1:1 aides should not be used as a substitute for certified, qualified teachers for an individual student or as a substitute for an appropriately developed and implemented behavioral intervention plan or as the primary staff member responsible for implementation of a behavioral intervention plan. While a teaching assistant may assist in related instructional work, primary instruction should be provided to the student by a certified teacher. A teacher aide may assist in the implementation of a behavioral intervention plan, but should not provide instructional services to the student.

Considerations for Determining if a Student Needs a 1:1 Aide

Each decision to recommend a 1:1 aide must weigh the factors of both (1) the student's individual needs and (2) the available supports in the setting where the student's IEP will be implemented. There are a number of important considerations that must be made by the team in regard to each of these factors. These include, but are not limited to, consideration of each of the following:

- The student's individual instructional, physical and/or health needs that require additional adult assistance.
- The skills and goals the student is planned to achieve that will reduce or eliminate the need for the 1:1 aide.
- The specific role (e.g., instructional, assistance with personal hygiene) that the aide will provide for the student.
- Other natural supports, accommodations and/or services that could support the student to meet these needs (e.g., behavioral intervention plan; environmental accommodations or modifications; changes in scheduling; instructional materials in alternate formats; assistive technology devices; peer-to-peer supports).
- The extent (e.g., portions of the school day) or circumstances (e.g., for transitions from class to class) the student would need the assistance of a 1:1 aide.

- The potential benefits from assignment of the 1:1 aide and how these will be measured to determine continuation of the recommendation.
- The potential negative impact of assignment of a 1:1 aide for the student (e.g., self-image, isolation and/or development of independence).

Roles and Responsibilities of the 1:1 Aide

When the decision is made that a student requires a 1:1 aide, school personnel must:

- consider the qualifications of the individual (i.e., teaching assistant or teacher aide) that would be necessary to meet the needs of the student.
- establish a plan to monitor the student's progress toward the goals to be addressed by the assignment of the 1:1 aide and the student's continuing need for the 1:1 aide;
- consider, as appropriate, a plan for progressively reducing the support provided to the student and his or her dependence on an aide over time;
- plan for substitutes to serve as the student's 1:1 aide to cover staff absences in order to ensure the student receives the recommended IEP services of the 1:1 aide; and
- ensure that the 1:1 aide has access to a copy of the student's IEP, has been informed of his or her responsibilities for IEP implementation for the student and has received the professional development and supervision necessary to carry out these responsibilities.

Once a team recommends a 1:1 aide for an individual student, the staff person is expected to be in close proximity to and working with that student throughout the assigned period.

Checklist to Determine a Student's Need For a 1:1 Aide

Health/Personal Care

- Student requires non-medical specialized health care support (e.g., feeding, assistance with braces or prosthesis).
- Student requires positioning or bracing multiple times daily.
- Student requires health-related interventions multiple times daily.
- Student requires direct assistance with most personal care.

Behavior

- Student presents with serious behavior problems with ongoing (daily) incidents of injurious behaviors to self and/or others or student runs away.
- Student has a functional behavioral assessment and a behavioral intervention plan that is implemented with fidelity.

Instruction

- Student cannot participate in a group without frequent verbal and/or physical prompting to stay on task and follow directions.

Inclusion in General Education Classes

- Student needs an adult in constant close proximity for direct instruction.
- Student requires individualized assistance to transition to and from class more than 80 percent of the time.
- Student needs an adult in close proximity to supervise social interactions with peers at all times.

1:1 Aide Planning Considerations and Recommendations

What are the needs of the student which necessitate the assignment of a 1:1 aide?	
What skills and goals must the student achieve to reduce or eliminate the need for a 1:1 aide?	
What are the potential benefits of the assignment of a 1:1 aide?	
What is the potential negative impact of assignment of a 1:1 aide?	
What role will 1:1 aide fulfill (e.g., instructional; behavior support; personal hygiene assistance)?	
For what specific activities (e.g., toileting) and/or times of day (e.g., transition to and from the bus) is the aide needed?	
What qualifications of the individual (i.e., teaching assistant or teacher aide) is necessary to meet the needs of the student?	
What is the plan to monitor the student's progress toward the goals to be addressed by the assignment of the 1:1 aide and the student's continuing need for the 1:1 aide?	
What is the plan for progressively reducing the support provided to the student and his or her dependence on an aide over time?	
If student's 1:1 aide is absent, who will cover in order to ensure the student receives the recommended IEP services of the 1:1 aide or how will substitute staff support be arranged?	
Who/how will 1:1 aide have access to a copy of the student's IEP, and be informed of his or her responsibilities for IEP implementation for the student?	
What, if any professional development and supervision will aide need to carry out these responsibilities?	

Appendix F

GUIDELINES FOR EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION WITH PARENTS SEEKING IEP CHANGES

The Individuals with Disabilities Act mandates that school districts provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to all students identified as disabled under the Act. An appropriate education has been deemed by the courts as *an education reasonably calculated to provide benefit* to meet a child's needs. Therein lies the rub. Appropriate and reasonable are often defined differently by parents and school personnel. Nonetheless, effective communication can prevent escalating problems associated with the provision of FAPE. The goal must always be to resolve questions in a positive manner and as quickly as possible.

Common disputes in special education revolve around eligibility, failure to provide FAPE, failure to implement the IEP, and inappropriate discipline and placement. It is not unusual for parents and districts to have different academic and behavioral expectations for students. These differences cause strong emotions and high anxiety. Therefore it is critical to resolve these issues at the lowest level, before people become entrenched in their opinions.

The following is a list of communication issues where the District loses the confidence of the parent they are trying to work with:

1. Poor or no follow up after a meeting has been held;
2. Misbelief that an agreement has been reached by one party, not the other;
3. Intentional vagueness; misleading facts; withholding of information; misstating the law.
4. Intimidation, for example, where a parent shows up to face a large number of school personnel show with no prior notice. District is required to provide written notice of who (at least by job title) will be attending the meeting.

5. Body language; nonverbal eye rolling; heads down; folding of hands over chest during the entire meeting; placement of watch on the table; private conversations during large meetings; all communicating to the parent that the District personnel aren't taking the parents concerned seriously.
6. Projecting arrogance or impatience. Remember this is the first time this parent is experiencing something which may be commonplace for the District personnel.
7. The District's credibility will be based on the competence and trustworthiness displayed to the parent.
8. Patronization; comparing this parent's child to other children not the subject of the meeting; laughing at a parent's suggestion; cost of educating child is made an issue;

When any of these processes usurp the subject of the meeting, the question becomes how to solve the situation before parents seek litigation. When you negotiate to resolve problems, you must put yourself in the other person's position. Remember there is no *complete win* for either side, even if you proceed to litigation. Ask yourself, how does the other side see the problem? What are they afraid of? Listen more than you talk. Remember everyone wants to save face. Positive and empathetic interactions settle issues. Unfortunately, parent and school conflicts are normal and inevitable. The District's goal should be positive, avoid litigation, and do what's best for each child in cooperation and with the support of the parent.

Appendix G

Summary of Teaneck Due Process Petitions 2014-2018

A thorough review of available information was conducted including IEP Direct access to records and the 12/12/17 update to Teaneck from Isabel Machado, its special education attorney. A follow-up telephone conversation was held with Ms. Machado to ensure accurate interpretation. That legal update apparently was intended to supply information to the Teaneck Board of Education relating to settlement agreements, agreements pending Board approval, and pending cases/matters.

Of the 36 cases handled during the 2014/15, 2015/16, and 2016/17 school years, 23 were approved as settled, 3 were currently awaiting Board of Education approval, and 10 cases were pending further action. Several of the above cases had begun before this three year window and many include settlements for future years, one in-fact was agreed to through June, 2023.

We understand every student's IEP and service plan by definition is individualized, and with respect to settlements each is fact specific with each filing having its own unique set of circumstances. We did identify, however, several trends worthy of serious consideration.

Specifically, with respect to unilateral placements by parents:

1. We found that several placements were initiated due to failure to timely/thoroughly evaluate.
2. We found most often these placements were to religious-affiliated non-public schools.
3. We found several unilateral placements were agreed to prior to the students ever attending Teaneck Schools.
4. We found most were represented by the same attorney[s].
5. We found a very limited number of schools used as these unilaterally determined service providers.

Specifically, with respect to multi-year agreements:

1. We found the agreements typically were set for a term of 2-4 years.
2. We found the agreements were funded by the District from nominal amounts up to \$500,000 for one student.
3. We found siblings commonly having identical identifications and settlements.
4. We found an inordinate number, apparently the default, identifications of Multiple Disabilities. We know from applicable code, that MD corresponds to *multiply handicapped* and *multiple disabilities*, and means the presence of two or more disabling conditions, the combination of which causes such severe educational needs that they cannot be accommodated in a program designed solely to address one of the impairments. Multiple disabilities includes cognitively impaired-blindness, cognitively impaired-orthopedic impairment, etc. The existence of two disabling conditions alone shall not serve as a basis for

a classification of multiply disabled. We find it hard to believe all these students by this definition should be identified MD.

5. We found group therapy services are typical for Speech, OT and PT for these students, again maybe appropriate or maybe simple defaults for numbers of students instead of individualized as required by law.

We were provided nothing to indicate any cases were litigated via normal Due Process Hearings, nor any via Complaint Investigations.

We recommend:

1. Training for I&RS and CST members have as a component a clear and thorough process for assessing parental requests for public funding of private schools, especially the handling of those requests subsequent to unilateral placements of students. Information we received from Teaneck indicates to us that (a) IEPs are not being truly individualized in these situations and (b) evidence demonstrating Teaneck's inability to provide FAPE in the LRE in-district is not available but then again, neither might there be evidence to demonstrate Teaneck is a proper placement and can provide proper instruction and support.

2. It was indicated that personnel turn-over is a factor in litigating successfully. Although personnel might change, a complete, thorough and accurate written record would mitigate this difficulty. Part of the record should have in-district program success data for prior student placements.

3. Although economics is sometimes considered, that is, deciding that the cost of agreeing and settling a case with the parent is less than the potential cost of the CST-recommended placement for that case, the District should consider the long-term costs/benefits of settlements and out-of-district placements vs. LRE in-district programming. Additionally, consideration should be given to what winning due process cases does to dissuade others from the desire to enter that process without just cause.

4. *One case at a time* should be the mantra for bringing students back into the District, where appropriate. These specific cases should be identified, data gathered, meetings held between the District personnel and the Board's special education attorney, and the case presented such that the District is prepared to win a Due Process Hearing. It is appropriate to spend taxpayer dollars outside the District when it cannot provide FAPE to a SWD. But where it can, it should because that by definition is the LRE. We believe there likely are many students currently being served out of district at higher than necessary taxpayer expense, that either should be in-district or on self-pay status. LRE is in-district where appropriate. And in-district typically is both in the best interest of the child and the best cost-benefit placement as well.

5. We recognize there are a small number of students in need of services that are low-incidence to Teaneck. We also recognize there are likely some severely disabled students whose specialized services are better available in area facilities that specialize in those severe disabilities. But overall, it appears that there are groups of students being identified

improperly for the purpose of having the public pay for their private education and summer camp experiences (under a questionable use of ESY). Parents have an option to use private schools. But the school district should not be obligated, save appropriate identification of SWD, and strong evidence that such private placement is the LRE for that student or that Teaneck is unable to provide FAPE in-district.

Appendix H

Resources used in the Teaneck Special Education Audit

1. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, http://www.asha.org/uploadedFiles/ASHA/Practice_Portal/Professional_Issues/Caseload_and_Workload/2015-2016-State-Caseload-Sizes-for-School-SLPs.pdf
2. Approved Private Schools for Students with Disabilities (In-State)
<https://homeroom5.doe.state.nj.us/apssd/>
3. Clarification of Rules Regarding Placements
<https://www.state.nj.us/education/specialed/info/051809rules.pdf>
4. From Emotions to Advocacy, Peter and Pam Wright, Wrightslaw (2002)
5. IEP (formerly IEP Direct) by Frontline Education; Frontline Technologies Group, LLC
6. Intervention and Referral Services Manual
<https://www.state.nj.us/education/students/irs/manual.pdf>
7. National Association of School Psychologists, Ratio of Students Per School Psychologist by State: https://www.nasponline.org/Documents/.../Ratios_by_State_2005_and_2010.pdf
8. Negotiation Skills for Parents, Ohio Legal Rights (2002) pgs. 8-12
9. NJDOE Website [NJDOE Data](#)
10. New Jersey Administrative Code (N.J.A.C. 6AA:14)
<https://www.state.nj.us/education/code/current/title6a/chap14/pdf>
11. New Jersey Tiered System of Supports
<https://state.nj.us/education/njtss>
12. Parental Rights in Special Education (P.R.I.S.E.)
<https://www.state.nj.us/education/specialed/form/prise/prise.pdf>
13. PBIS: Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports <http://www.pbis.org/>
14. RTI Action Network, What's Your Plan? Accurate Decision Making within a Multi-Tier System of Supports: Critical Areas in Tier 1 by Terri Metcalf, M.Ed., J.D., Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative (MiBLSi)
<http://www.rtinetwork.org/essential/tieredinstruction/tier1/accurate-decision-making-within-a-multi-tier-system-of-supports-critical-areas-in-tier-1>

15. Teaneck School District Information provided by Administrative Team
16. Teaneck Special Services Manual
17. Teaneck School District online website [Teaneck School District Website](#)
18. Working with Difficult People, Simon D'Arcy, Frank Sanitate Association Public Service