

**33<sup>rd</sup> Annual UT School Law Conference**  
February 22-23, 2018 | Austin, Texas



**Top 10 Hits of Legal Issues in Special Education  
2017 Year in Review**

Dianna Bowen (aka Casey Kasem)  
[dbowen@thompsonhorton.com](mailto:dbowen@thompsonhorton.com)  
Thompson & Horton LLP  
500 North Akard Street, Suite 3150  
Dallas Texas 75201



1



***Andrew F. & FAPE***



2

## ***Andrew F. & FAPE***

- Parents of an autistic 5<sup>th</sup> grader with escalating behavioral problems complained that the district included almost identical goals in his IEPs for 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> grade years.
- The child was not participating in a general education setting and was not performing at grade level (unlike student in *Rowley*).
- So in this child's case, what does FAPE mean?

*Andrew F. by Joseph F. v. Douglas County Sch. Dist. RE-1,*  
69 IDELR 174 (U.S. 2017)

## ***Andrew F. & FAPE***

- In the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit, the standard for FAPE had been “merely more than de minimus” progress.
- Andrew's parents argued that FAPE amounts to “opportunities to achieve academic success, attain self-sufficiency, and contribute to society” equal to those available to non-disabled students.

*Andrew F. by Joseph F. v. Douglas County Sch. Dist. RE-1,*  
69 IDELR 174 (U.S. 2017)

## *Endrew F. & FAPE*

- The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Endrew F.* that a school must offer an IEP that is “**reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child’s unique circumstances.**”
- Court agreed with longstanding proposition that IDEA does not require an optimal, ideal, or potentially-maximizing education, but “barely more than de minimis” is too low compared to grade-to-grade advancement required for mainstreamed sped students
- Court also rejected parents’ proposed standard of “educational opportunities equal to those afforded to nondisabled individuals”

*Endrew F. by Joseph F. v. Douglas County Sch. Dist. RE-1,*  
69 IDELR 174 (U.S. 2017)

## *Endrew F. & FAPE*

- The IEP must be geared toward **progress**
  - “After all, the essential function of an IEP is to set out a plan for pursuing academic and functional advancement”
  - “program must be appropriately ambitious”
- “**in light of child’s circumstances**”
  - Reflects the individualized nature of special education
  - *Circumstances?* -- Type of disability, severity, environmental issues, behavior, parent participation/cooperation, etc...

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

## Title search: Top 10 Hits of Legal Issues in Special Education in 2017

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Hot Topics in School Law: Cyberbullying, Special Education Issues, and Copyright](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
33<sup>rd</sup> Annual School Law Conference session

"Top 10 Hits of Legal Issues in Special Education in 2017"