

EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS OF STUDENTS IN FOSTER CARE

A State-by-State Reference Guide

This document surveys state-specific statutory protections for children in foster care across three primary areas: (1) appointment of an educational decision maker or surrogate parent; (2) school of origin and school stability protections; and (3) disciplinary protections unique to foster youth. Each area builds upon a federal baseline established by IDEA, ESSA, the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act. States covered include Nevada, California, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, New Hampshire, Nebraska, Montana, New York, Texas, Florida, Ohio, Connecticut, Tennessee, Washington, Arkansas, Missouri, Colorado, Illinois, Oregon, New Jersey, Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, and Minnesota.

I. Federal Statutory Framework

Three federal statutes establish the floor of educational rights for children in foster care that states must meet or exceed:

- **IDEA, 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(2)** — Requires that whenever a child is a ward of the state, each educational agency must assign a surrogate parent who is not an employee of any agency involved in the child’s education or care. The state must make reasonable efforts to complete assignment within 30 days. Uniquely for wards of the state, the surrogate may alternatively be appointed by the judge overseeing the child’s care. IDEA § 1415(k) also provides disciplinary procedural safeguards for special-education-eligible foster youth.
- **McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, 42 U.S.C. § 11432** — Requires each LEA to designate a liaison for homeless and foster youth, ensure immediate enrollment, and apportion transportation costs between agencies (splitting equally if no agreement is reached) when a student crosses LEA lines. Defines “school of origin” as the school attended when permanently housed or last enrolled.
- **ESSA, 20 U.S.C. § 6312(c)(5)** — Requires each LEA to collaborate with the child welfare agency to designate a point of contact and develop written procedures governing transportation to the school of origin. Costs must be shared between the child welfare agency and the LEA.
- **Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act, 42 U.S.C. § 675(4)(A)** — Requires reasonable efforts to maintain children in foster care in their school of origin unless not in their best interests. This is the foundational federal mandate for school stability that ESSA operationalizes.

Key federal case: Baer v. Klagholz, 339 N.J.Super. 168 (2001) — Confirmed that the IDEA employee-exclusion rule for surrogate parents is a non-negotiable federal floor. A state regulation permitting nonpublic agency employees to serve as surrogate parents was held to improperly fail to conform to the federal conflict-of-interest standard.

II. Educational Decision Maker / Surrogate Parent Appointment

Every state must ensure surrogate parent appointment for foster youth eligible under IDEA. Many states have gone further by establishing court-based or agency-based appointment systems covering all foster youth — not just those with disabilities — and by specifying substantive duties that exceed the IDEA minimum.

Arizona — A.R.S. §§ 15-761(37) and 15-763.01

- **Dual-track system with explicit statutory coordination:** A.R.S. § 15-761(37) defines “surrogate parent” as a person appointed by the court or by the Department of Education pursuant to § 15-763.01.
- **Agency-based petition:** A petition for surrogate appointment shall be made to the Department of Education if the parent cannot be identified or located, the child is a ward of the state, parental rights have been terminated, or the child is an unaccompanied McKinney-Vento youth.
- **Court coordination mechanism:** The Department of Education must notify the court of competent jurisdiction when it appoints a surrogate parent for a ward of the state, ensuring judicial awareness of agency appointments.

California — Government Code § 7579.5

- **When a juvenile court cannot identify a responsible adult,** it must refer the child to the LEA for surrogate parent appointment under Government Code § 7579.5.
- **In re Samuel G., 174 Cal.App.4th 502 (2009):** Clarified that an LEA-appointed surrogate parent is legally distinct from a court-appointed educational representative; use of the term “surrogate” for a court appointee is technically a misnomer under California law.

Connecticut — Conn. Gen. Stat. § 10-94g

- **The Commissioner of Education is required to appoint surrogate parents,** with established procedures for objections and extensions.

Delaware — Del. Code Ann. tit. 10, § 930; tit. 14, § 3132

- **Family Court may appoint an EDM** for abused, dependent, neglected, or delinquent children in the Department’s custody.
- **Dual-role authorization:** An EDM meeting the qualifications under 14 Del. C. § 3132 may simultaneously serve as the IDEA educational surrogate parent.
- **For children not eligible for special education,** the EDM must address “all school discipline matters.”

Florida — Fla. Stat. § 39.0016; Juv. P. Rule 8.292

- **Comprehensive interagency agreements required** between the Department of Children and Families and school districts governing educational services for foster youth.
- **Guardian ad litem prioritized** when appointing surrogate parents.
- **Portability:** Surrogate parents must be accepted across school districts throughout the child’s time in state custody.
- **Juvenile Procedure Rule 8.292** provides the procedural mechanism for surrogate parent appointments in dependency court proceedings.

Georgia — O.C.G.A. § 15-11-201 (Case Plan Provision)

- **No standalone foster-care-specific surrogate appointment statute was identified.** Georgia’s Juvenile Code at O.C.G.A. § 15-11-201 requires that case plans include provisions for educational stability but does not mandate surrogate appointment in the education context.

Illinois — 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(k); 705 ILCS 405/2-10.2

- **Dual-track system:** The Illinois School Code mandates that whenever a child is a “youth in care” and the parents are unknown or unavailable, a surrogate parent must be assigned by the State Superintendent of Education.
- **Conflict-of-interest protections:** Surrogates may not be employees of the school district, any joint-agreement agency, any agency involved in the education or care of the student, or the State Board of Education.
- **Statutory immunity:** Persons participating in good faith as surrogate parents are immune from civil or criminal liability, except for willful and wanton misconduct.
- **Important limitation:** The statute expressly provides that assignment of a surrogate parent does not supersede, terminate, or suspend the parents’ legal authority relative to the child.
- **Juvenile court track (705 ILCS 405/2-10.2):** The juvenile court may also appoint a parent or legal guardian respondent as educational surrogate parent upon request, if the court finds it is in the child’s best interests. This mechanism supplements rather than displaces the school-code track.

Maryland — Educ. § 8-412

- **The local school superintendent must appoint a parent surrogate** within 30 days of a determination of need, mirroring the IDEA federal timeline.
- **Statute establishes specific qualifications** the surrogate must meet to represent the child in the educational decision-making process.

Michigan and Minnesota

- **No foster-care-specific surrogate parent appointment provisions were identified** in the sources retrieved for either state. Both appear to rely on IDEA’s general surrogate parent requirements as implemented through state education agency rules.

Montana — In re C.S., 374 Mont. 289 (2014)

- **A licensed foster parent qualifies as a “parent”** under both IDEA and Montana’s special education laws for purposes of surrogate parent appointment.
- **Where a willing, qualified foster parent exists,** the school district cannot insist on a third-party surrogate. Instructive cross-jurisdictionally for all states.

Nebraska — Neb. Rev. Stat. § 43-2,106.01

- **Juvenile courts have statutory authority** to appoint an educational surrogate for children in foster care.
- **In re Interest of Becka P., 296 Neb. 365 (2017):** The Nebraska Supreme Court confirmed that such an order affects parents’ substantial rights and is a final appealable order.

Nevada — NRS § 432B.462

- **Court appointment required** as soon as possible after a child protection petition is filed, but no later than the date of the disposition hearing.
- **Rebuttable presumption** that the parent or guardian should serve as EDM; overcome on motion if the parent is unwilling, unable, or if appointment is not in the child's best interests.
- **Preference for the permanent caregiver** if a non-parent is appointed; eligible persons include relatives within the fifth degree of consanguinity, foster parents, fictive kin, the guardian ad litem, or another qualified individual.
- **EDM duties include:** meeting with the child; addressing disciplinary issues with the child and school; ensuring FAPE including special education and transition services for children age 14 and older; consulting with the child welfare agency on school change determinations under NRS 388E.105; and participating in IEP meetings.
- **Expressly deemed a surrogate parent** under 34 C.F.R. § 300.519 (IDEA surrogate parent regulation). Appointment of a non-parent may not be used as evidence of parental unfitness.

New Hampshire — RSA § 186-C:14

- **Requires the Commissioner of Education (or designee) to appoint a surrogate parent** whenever the child is a ward of the state and in need of representation in the educational decision-making process.
- **Manchester School Dist. v. Crisman, 306 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2002):** Applied the statute to ensure surrogate appointment protects children with disabilities in state custody.

New Jersey — N.J.S.A. § 18A:46-6.3(h)

- **No standalone foster-care surrogate appointment statute was identified.** New Jersey's framework relies on a definitional inclusion: N.J.S.A. 18A:46-6.3(h) defines "parent" for special education purposes to include "resource family parent when willing to so serve," providing a practical IEP participation pathway but not a mandatory surrogate appointment requirement.

New York — Matter of A.L., 85 Misc.3d 1207(A) (2024)

- **A foster parent was appointed as educational surrogate** for the limited purposes of school enrollment and consent to standard educational evaluations.
- **Appointment included an automatic expiration provision** if the children were removed from the foster parent's care, demonstrating a tailored, child-centered approach.

Ohio — Ohio Rev. Code § 3323.05

- **Comprehensive due process protections** including surrogate parent assignment for wards of the state.
- **Complaint procedures with 20-day response requirements** and mediation opportunities, providing structured administrative remedies beyond federal law.

Oregon — ORS §§ 419A.004(36) and 419B.220; ORS § 343.035

- **Model mandatory appointment provision:** ORS 419B.220 requires that upon the request of any party, the juvenile court shall appoint a surrogate for a child in foster care who may be eligible for special education and does not already have a school-district-appointed surrogate.

The use of “shall” makes this a mandatory, non-discretionary appointment — exceeding the federal floor.

- **Statutory definition:** ORS 419A.004(36) defines “surrogate” as a person appointed by the court to protect the child’s right to receive procedural safeguards with respect to the provision of FAPE.
- **Education code track:** ORS 343.035 directs the State Board of Education to establish rules governing surrogate appointment, including rules applicable when the child is in foster care, when the child is an unaccompanied homeless youth, and when a parent or guardian is disqualified from appointment.

Pennsylvania — Juvenile Court Procedure Rules 147 and 1147

- **Dual-track system:** Rule 1147 governs dependency matters; Rule 147 governs delinquency matters.
- **The EDM is responsible for all decisions** concerning the child’s education, including special education, and may consent to or prohibit release of school records.
- **Eligible appointees:** family members, family friends, mentors, foster parents, former foster parents, CASA volunteers, and child welfare professionals.
- **A court should not appoint an EDM** where a parent, guardian, foster parent, or IDEA surrogate parent is competent, willing, and available.

Texas — Educ. Code § 29.015; Family Code § 263.0025

- **Foster parents may act as EDMs for children with disabilities** when DFPS is the managing conservator.
- **Training requirement:** Foster parents must complete required training within 90 days; school districts cannot require retraining if the foster parent has already completed an approved program.
- **Family Code § 263.0025** is the companion provision governing DFPS’s authority in special education decisions, providing a dual statutory framework.

III. School of Origin / School Stability Protections

The federal floor requires a best-interests determination before a child in foster care is moved from the school of origin, with a presumption in favor of remaining. The states below have built upon or significantly expanded this baseline.

Arizona — A.R.S. §§ 8-530.04; 15-701.04; 15-816.01 — Most Comprehensive

- **Five-day determination window:** Within five days after a child enters foster care or changes placement, the child, caseworker, parent or guardian, caregiver or foster parent, and representatives from the LEA shall jointly determine whether it is in the child’s best interest to remain in the school of origin.
- **Transportation during the determination process:** The Department of Child Safety must ensure transportation during the determination period itself — a protection not found in most other states.

- **Two-day enrollment and records transfer:** If a school change is determined, the new school must enroll the child within two days and the school of origin must transfer records within two days.
- **Cross-district transportation:** The Department and educational agency must jointly ensure transportation to whichever school is in the child's best interest, including charter schools and schools outside the child's current district; districts may cross boundaries to provide transportation.
- **High school graduation protections (A.R.S. § 15-701.04):** Charter schools and school districts are prohibited from requiring a foster child who transfers in grades 11 or 12 from satisfying course requirements in addition to or higher than state minimums for graduation.
- **Open enrollment preference (A.R.S. § 15-816.01):** School districts are authorized to give enrollment preference to foster youth in open enrollment.

Arkansas — Ark. Code Ann. § 9-28-113

- **Mandates continuity of educational services for children in foster care.**

California — Education Code § 48853.5

- **Most comprehensive school stability framework** among the originally surveyed states.
- **Strong temporal presumption:** School of origin continuation through graduation for high school students; through the end of the academic year for elementary students. This exceeds the federal floor in a meaningful, concrete way.
- **Detailed educational liaison duties** established for LEAs.
- **Immediate enrollment protections:** Schools may not condition enrollment on documentation, consistent with Nevada's approach.

The "through graduation" standard for high school students is the key protection the attorney identified as stronger than Nevada's. Nevada's NRS 388E.105 does not contain a comparable through-graduation guarantee.

Florida — Fla. Stat. § 39.0016

- **Requires that children remain in their school of origin when possible and in their best interest;** mandates notification of caregivers and caseworkers for safety purposes when a child changes school.

Georgia — O.C.G.A. §§ 15-11-201(b)(12) and 20-2-152.2

- **Case plan requirements (O.C.G.A. § 15-11-201(b)(12)):** Every case plan must include: (A) assurance that placement takes into account the appropriateness of the educational setting and proximity to the school of enrollment; (B) assurance that DFCS has coordinated with the LEA to keep the child in the school of enrollment; and (C) if a change is needed, assurance that DFCS and the LEA cooperated to ensure immediate appropriate enrollment with records transferred. These provisions largely mirror the Fostering Connections federal floor.
- **Trauma assessment at enrollment — unique model provision (O.C.G.A. § 20-2-152.2):** Upon enrollment of a foster care student, each local school system must immediately and deliberately assess whether exposure to trauma has had or is likely to have an adverse impact on the student's educational performance, including both academics and classroom behavior. The assessment must also determine whether an initial special education eligibility

evaluation should be commenced. This provision goes beyond the federal floor and is unique among the surveyed states.

Illinois — 20 ILCS 521/5(13) (Foster Children’s Bill of Rights)

- **The Foster Children’s Bill of Rights establishes** as a matter of state policy that every child in DCFS foster care has the right to attend school and participate in extracurricular, cultural, and personal enrichment activities with minimal disruptions to school attendance and educational stability.
- **Note:** Illinois’s school-of-origin implementation otherwise rests primarily on ESSA and McKinney-Vento as implemented through Illinois State Board of Education policy. No separate Illinois education code statute was identified that independently exceeds the federal floor’s substantive requirements.

Michigan and New Jersey

- **No standalone statutes were identified** that independently exceed the federal floor in school-of-origin protections for foster youth beyond the Fostering Connections Act and ESSA requirements. Both states rely primarily on federal frameworks as implemented through state education agency policies.

Minnesota — Minn. Stat. § 260C.212(c)(8)

- **Out-of-home placement plans must address educational stability**, including: (i) efforts to ensure the child remains in the same school in which enrolled prior to placement; or (ii) if not in the child’s best interest, efforts to ensure immediate and appropriate enrollment in a new school. Minnesota’s framework is largely parallel to the Fostering Connections Act requirements and does not contain the enhanced procedural mechanisms found in Arizona and Oregon.

Missouri — Mo. Stat. § 167.019

- **Requires agencies to consider a foster child’s school attendance area in placement decisions** and guarantees the right to remain in certain school districts, integrating school stability considerations into the placement process itself.

Nevada — NRS § 388E.105

- **Rebuttable presumption** in favor of remaining in the school of origin whenever a child enters foster care or changes placement.
- **Best-interests analysis by the child welfare agency** in consultation with the LEA and the child’s EDM. Required factors include: the child’s wishes; educational success and stability; any IEP or academic plan; English learner status; health and safety; availability of necessary services; whether a sibling is enrolled; and, if applicable, a plan for continued education if the child is admitted to a psychiatric facility.
- **Transportation costs may not be considered** as a factor in the best-interests determination.
- **Written notice required** to all interested parties if a school change is determined, with immediate enrollment in the new school guaranteed.
- **Immediate enrollment protection:** The receiving school may not refuse enrollment based on missing immunization records, birth certificate, proof of identity, prior school records, or any other documentation.

Oregon — ORS §§ 339.133 and 339.134 — Model Provision

- **Juvenile court must make the best-interest determination:** Under ORS 339.133(4)(a), a foster youth between ages 4 and 21 shall be considered a resident of the school district of origin unless a juvenile court — not merely the agency or school — determines it is not in the child’s best interest to continue. This judicial oversight requirement significantly exceeds the federal floor.
- **Statutory definitions:** ORS 339.133 defines both “school of origin” (the school attended before initial foster placement or before a change in placement) and “school district of origin,” providing definitional clarity.
- **Companion protections for voluntarily placed children (ORS 339.134):** Best interest for school-of-origin continuation may be demonstrated by factors including whether siblings attend the school and whether a change in routine would be detrimental to the child.

Tennessee — Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-6-3102(c)

- **Students placed in DCS custody shall remain enrolled** in the same public school attended prior to entering custody.
- **Best-interest determination made by DCS;** if enrollment in the prior school is not in the child’s best interest, the child is enrolled in the LEA where placed or where the parent resides. (Tenn. Op. Atty. Gen. No. 25-008 (2025))

Washington — RCW § 28A.225.350

- **18-factor best-interest determination:** Requires detailed best-interest analysis applying 18 specific student-centered factors before a school change may be made.
- **Shared transportation costs** between districts when a student crosses district lines to remain in the school of origin.

IV. Disciplinary Protections Unique to Foster Youth

At the federal level, IDEA § 1415(k) protects special-education-eligible foster youth from exclusionary discipline without adherence to procedural safeguards. Foster-care-specific disciplinary protections at the state level are the least-developed category across all surveyed states. The following states have enacted provisions that go beyond the IDEA baseline or impose foster-care-specific limitations.

Arizona — A.R.S. § 8-529(A)(7)

- **Foster Care Bill of Rights provision:** A child in foster care has the right to be disciplined in a manner appropriate to the child’s level of maturity and not to be subjected to physical discipline methods. This is a placement-focused protection and does not impose school-discipline-specific limitations.

Note: A.R.S. § 15-843 addresses pupil disciplinary proceedings generally without foster-care-specific carve-outs. No Arizona statute was identified requiring a nexus analysis or imposing suspension caps specifically for foster youth.

Colorado — C.R.S. § 22-32-138 — Strongest Enrollment Protections

- **Expressly limits expulsion-based enrollment denials:** Schools may only deny enrollment based on a prior expulsion if the offense involved drugs, weapons, or danger to self or others. This is the most protective enrollment denial restriction identified among all surveyed states.

- **Fee waivers and excused absences for court activities:** Provides comprehensive fee waivers and excused absences for foster youth attending court-related activities, addressing barriers that disproportionately affect foster youth.

Delaware — Del. Code tit. 10, § 930

- **Requires the EDM to take appropriate action** regarding “all school discipline matters” for children in foster care not otherwise covered by IDEA special education protections.

Michigan — MCL § 380.1311

- **A rebuttable presumption against expulsion** exists where a pupil has no history of suspension or expulsion. This provides incidental protection for some foster youth but is not foster-care-specific.

Nevada — NRS §§ 392.466 and 392.467 — Most Detailed

- **Applies to all students in foster care** (as defined by 45 C.F.R. § 1355.20), not just those with disabilities, under both NRS 392.466 (serious offenses) and NRS 392.467 (general suspension/expulsion).
- **Five-day suspension cap:** Once the school is on notice that a pupil is in foster care, the pupil may not be suspended for more than five days unless: (a) the principal reviews all available information and, if an EDM has been appointed, holds a meeting with that EDM; (b) the principal determines the pupil poses an ongoing threat; and (c) a determination is made that foster care status was not a factor in the behavior.
- **Mandatory causal-nexus review:** No later than the 10th school day after suspension begins, the principal must convene a meeting with the EDM (if appointed), a foster care advocate, and other relevant persons to assess whether the behavior was caused by or had a direct and substantial relationship to the child’s foster care status.
- **Consequences of a causal nexus finding:** The principal must either eliminate the suspension and provide behavioral and academic support, or — in cases involving weapons, controlled substances, battery, or habitual disciplinary problems — assign the pupil to a temporary alternative placement for no more than 45 school days.
- **NRS § 432B.462(7)(b) separately** requires the EDM to actively address disciplinary issues with the child and school, creating an affirmative advocacy obligation.

Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, and Georgia

- **No statutes were identified** in these states that impose foster-care-specific limitations on suspension or expulsion, require a nexus or causal analysis before discipline is imposed on a foster youth, provide fee waivers for court appearances, or restrict enrollment denials based on prior disciplinary history for foster youth.

Note: Illinois 105 ILCS 5/10-22.6 addresses suspension and expulsion generally and requires that discipline be construed consistently with IDEA, but contains no foster-care-specific provisions. Georgia O.C.G.A. § 20-2-751.2 authorizes schools to impose remaining disciplinary sanctions from another system’s order on enrolling students, which could adversely affect foster youth who transfer but provides no protective carve-out for them.

Notable Cases on Disciplinary Due Process

- **A.V. v. Plano Independent School District, 585 F.Supp.3d 881 (E.D. Tex. 2022):** Confirms that procedural due process protections apply equally to all students including those in foster care. Foster youth do not receive blanket immunity from school discipline, but procedural safeguards must be fully observed.
- **M.G. by Priscilla G. v. Yakima School District No. 7, 2 Wash.3d 786 (2024):** Washington Supreme Court recognized the application of procedural due process protections to foster youth in the school disciplinary context.

V. Cross-Cutting Topics

Transition Services for Foster Youth

IDEA's default age for transition planning is 16. Nevada's NRS 432B.462 requires EDMs to ensure transition services for children age 14 and older, representing one of the more protective state-level thresholds. Illinois exceeds even Nevada's standard:

- **Illinois — 105 ILCS 5/14-8.03(a-5):** Transition planning must begin no later than the first IEP in effect when the student turns 14½, or younger if the IEP Team determines appropriate. This age threshold is the most protective identified among all surveyed states and significantly exceeds the federal IDEA floor of 16.
- **Oregon — ORS 343.035(19):** Defines transition services in terms consistent with IDEA but does not set an earlier age threshold.
- **Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey:** No statutes were identified that independently set a transition services trigger age below IDEA's default of 16.

Surrogate Parent Authority in IEP Proceedings

The strongest model provisions for mandatory surrogate appointment in IEP proceedings are:

- **Oregon — ORS 419B.220:** Mandatory ("shall appoint") court appointment upon request of any party where the child may be eligible for special education and lacks a school-district-appointed surrogate. The most explicitly mandatory provision identified.
- **Illinois — 105 ILCS 5/14-8.02a(k):** Mandates State Superintendent appointment for all youth in care whose parents are unknown or unavailable.
- **Arizona — A.R.S. § 15-763.01:** Agency-based petition system with mandatory court notification for wards of the state, ensuring judicial awareness of all agency appointments.
- **Nevada — NRS 432B.462:** Court appointment required no later than the disposition hearing; EDM is expressly deemed a surrogate parent under 34 C.F.R. § 300.519.
- **New Jersey — N.J.S.A. 18A:46-6.3(h):** Resource family parents willing to serve are included within the definition of "parent" for IEP purposes. Provides a practical participation pathway but is not a mandatory appointment provision.

VI. Summary: State Protections at a Glance

The following summarizes which states were identified as having enacted legislation in each of the three categories addressed in this document. States with model or particularly strong provisions are noted.

- **Educational Decision Maker / Surrogate Parent:** Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Montana (case law), Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey (definitional only), New York (case law), Ohio, Oregon (model: mandatory court appointment), Pennsylvania, Texas. Georgia, Michigan, and Minnesota rely on IDEA's general requirements.
- **School of Origin / School Stability:** Arizona (most comprehensive: 5-day window, 2-day enrollment, cross-district transport, graduation protections), Arkansas, California (strong: through-graduation standard), Florida, Georgia (unique: trauma assessment at enrollment), Illinois (Bill of Rights), Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon (model: judicial best-interest determination), Tennessee, Washington (18-factor analysis). Michigan and New Jersey rely on federal frameworks.
- **Disciplinary Protections Unique to Foster Youth:** Arizona (Bill of Rights/physical discipline only), Colorado (strongest enrollment denial restrictions), Delaware, Michigan (general rebuttable presumption only), Nevada (most detailed: 5-day cap, causal-nexus review). Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, and Georgia have no foster-care-specific disciplinary provisions.

NOTE: This document is based on Westlaw research and reflects law as researched prior to August 2026. Practitioners should verify current statutory text and any amendments before relying on these summaries. This document is intended as a reference tool and does not constitute legal advice.