

Special Education Due Process

Reflection 1: RR and LR obo BR v. West Orange Board of Education

The case *RR and LR obo BR v. West Orange Bd of Educ* (2023) is an action concerning an Individualized Education Program as insufficiently offered through a public school in New Jersey. It was brought forward by the parents of a 14-year-old child having several diagnoses. B.R. has numerous diagnoses like Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), ADHD, a specific learning disorder with writing expression, and language disorder. B.R. is gifted with a brilliant IQ of 129. However, B.R. has difficulties in executive functioning, noise sensitivity, auditory comprehension, and social-emotional (Warshaw et al., 2023). The parents complain that the proposed IEP does not fulfil the essential elements of Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Parents sought placement for B.R. at Winston Preparatory School (Winston, NJ), a private school with small class sizes and the kind of individualized support that B.R. had achieved success with previously. B.R.'s parents argued that this proposed setting for the public school would somehow be general education classes with 18-25 children and very little support. They further indicated that although it had one-on-one paraprofessional support, it would reduce the chances of stigmatization and increased anxiety (Küry & Fischer, 2025). The points also indicate the few speech or occupational therapy services, which were much lower compared to the great deals of therapy B.R. had ever been getting. Parents would want the District to pay for B.R.'s further schooling at Winston NJ.

Administrative Law Judge Kimberly A. Moss decided in support of the parents in her ruling. On January 18, 2023, the final decision established that B.R. did not receive adequate Free Appropriate Public Education through the developed IEP. The court determined that the IEP lacked sufficient provisions to meet the essential needs of B.R.'s disabilities including his sound sensitivities to his requirements for controlled settings and his social and emotional difficulties

(Lindner & Schwab, 2020). Following this decision, the West Orange Board of Education received orders to fund B.R.'s enrollment at the appropriate educational setting, which Winston NJ had been determined to be.

Yes, the educational institution broke the requirements of FAPE. According to *Andrew F. v. Douglas County School District (2017)*, the IDEA specifies that students with disabilities need an IEP. It provides progress appropriate for their individual situations as determined by the school administrators. The educational plan failed to address the specific needs for learning and emotional growth and made B.R. unique. The court decision established that *Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley (1982)* had already established the framework. In this case, the Supreme Court required that students receive meaningful educational advantages instead of basic progress (Küry & Fischer, 2025). Additionally, the *Lascari v. Lascari v. Board of Education (1989)* decision strongly supports educational organizations to create IEP goals that are detailed and measurable and the District did not meet this requirement. The ALJ determined through his findings that B.R.'s IEP lacked proper process and inadequate substance regarding its development.

I picked this case because it showcases the difficulties of educating students who are "twice exceptional" both gifted and suffering from severe disabilities. It shows the complexities of developing an IEP. It is not just academically sufficient but also deals with emotional, social, and sensory concerns. I found it particularly interesting how the court highlighted the holistic nature of education and the place of expert testimony in this case (Warshaw et al., 2023). This case highlights the paramount importance of individualization in special education and schools must go beyond nominal compliance with IDEA, understanding the needs of each child and fulfilling them.

References

- Küry, L., & Fischer, C. (2025). The Self-Perceptions of Twice-Exceptional Children: A Systematic review. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 44.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010044>
- Lindner, K., & Schwab, S. (2020). Differentiation and individualisation in inclusive education: a systematic review and narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1813450>
- Warshaw, J., Macciolo, M., Warshaw Law Firm LLC, & Methfessel & Werbel, P.C. (2023). FINAL DECISION. In *OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW*.
<https://www.nj.gov/education/legal/specialed/2023/jan/2021-32939ER.pdf>