

# FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION

## *The Law and Children with Disabilities*

Third Edition



H. Rutherford Turnbull III

# FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION

## *The Law and Children with Disabilities*

Third Edition



**H. Rutherford Turnbull III**  
*The University of Kansas*



LOVE PUBLISHING COMPANY  
Denver, Colorado 80222

*To Jay, for whom these rights have meant  
so much;  
Amy and Kate, who teach and learn  
from Jay;  
Ann, our best teacher; and  
Ruth W. Turnbull, gone but everlasting.*

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic,  
mechanical, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 89-84214

Copyright © 1990 Love Publishing Company

Printed in the U.S.A.

ISBN 0-89108-211-5

---

# PREFACE

---

*The goal of American education is to value each child as equally an individual and entitled to equal opportunity of development of his own capacities, be they large or small in range. ... Each has needs of his own as significant to him as those of others are to them. The very fact of natural and psychological inequality is all the more reason for establishment by law of equality of opportunity, since otherwise the former becomes a means of oppression of the less gifted.*

—Thomas Dewey

Dewey's sentiments have a familiar ring to those of us who have been working to establish the rights of children with disabilities to a free appropriate education. He admonishes us to value all individuals, whomever and whatever they are, recognize their needs and satisfy them, establish equal educational opportunity by law, and change a system that oppresses some because of their inequalities. How surprised Dewey would be to learn that his views have become so widely accepted!

This book tells the story of the initial rejection and ultimate acceptance of those ideas. It also shows how law adopts these ideas and enacts them as the idea of equal educational opportunities for children with disabilities. Its essential teaching is legal. Its essential message is moral: A person who is less able is not less worthy.

In the mid-1980s, the public schools—the governmental system that casts the widest net and exercises the greatest influence over us (next to the tax and revenue departments)—have finally begun to come to terms with educating all these children. How the nation's public schools have dealt with the challenge and opportunity of educating these children in the past, and how they must do so under present law, is this book's initial focus.

The book next analyzes in detail the six principles of special education law: (1) zero reject, or the right of every child to be included in a free appropriate publicly supported educational system; (2) nondiscriminatory classification, or the right to be fairly evaluated so that correct educational programs and placement can be achieved; (3) individu-

alized and appropriate education, so that an education can be meaningful; (4) least restrictive placement, so the child may associate with nondisabled students to the maximum extent appropriate to his or her needs; (5) due process, so the child and child advocates may have an opportunity to challenge any aspect of education; and (6) parent participation, so the child's family may be involved in what happens in school.

Recognizing that these six principles generate widespread resistance, the last part of the book presents the most common objections to these principles. It also attempts to answer those objections on two major grounds: (1) the beliefs that support the principles, and (2) the system of values that undergird the principles.

Now, a word or two about the terminology used in this book. Federal special education laws use the terms *handicapped* and *handicapped children*—for example, the Education for The Handicapped Act and its important amendment, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. I do not prefer that usage for two reasons. First, it emphasizes the characteristic of the child—namely, the disability—which society turns into a handicap by not accommodating to it, thereby relegating the child to secondary status as a student and person. Second, the collective noun form (the handicapped) implies that all children with disabilities are alike and not individuals.

I prefer “children with disabilities,” with a substitution of “students” or “persons/people” for “children” and a substitution of “mental retardation” or “learning disabilities” (or other specific disability) for “disabilities” or “disabled” when the specific is preferable to the general. To resolve the problem of being consistent with federal laws and adhering to my own preferences, I sometimes use the federal term and sometimes my own. Undoubtedly, a change in federal terminology is desirable.

The first version of this book (written in 1978) focused on the new federal laws, the developments that led to them, and the implications of those laws for schools, students and parents, and institutions of higher education. Since then, the literature of special education has been flooded with research and commentary on implementation of the laws. Therefore, it does not seem appropriate to preserve the implementation focus of the first edition in the second version or in this one.

Moreover, since 1978 there have been significant developments in interpretation of the federal law. Literally hundreds of judgments have been entered concerning the meaning of “free appropriate public education.” Since the first book emphasized developments leading up to the federal laws and the content of those laws, it seems particularly appropriate for subsequent editions to analyze and comment on the most important judgments and their effects.

For these two reasons only, this book is not co-authored by the original authors but is authored by only one of them, H.R. Turnbull. Ann Turnbull is a special educator whose contributions to the first book were principally with respect to implications of the law. Since that focus is not present in this or the previous edition, she is not shown as a co-author. Nonetheless, she has contributed to the development of this book in important professional and personal ways, and the present author—her colleague and husband—gratefully acknowledges all those contributions.

In addition, the author is extraordinarily appreciative of Dorothy Johanning and Judith A. Roesler, a law student who has been most helpful on technical matters. Both are exceptionally talented members of the staff of The University of Kansas. Through their professional skills and buoyant personalities, they have immensely aided in the production of this book. Finally, the many students at The University of Kansas who read and responded to the earlier book and helped sharpen it are entitled to—and hereby receive—my special thanks.

In the end, however, the greatest appreciation is owed to those pioneering parents and advocates who initiated the civil rights movement in education by challenging racial segregation; to the equally pioneering and risk-taking parents and professionals who started the revolution that we now call the right-to-education movement; to the members of Congress who brought the federal government into the lives of children with disabilities and their parents; and to the children who are disabled and who, through their disabilities, character, and sheer pluck, contribute so positively to the lives of their teachers, families, and friends.

H.R.T. III

---

# CONTENTS

---

Preface, xi	
<b>I INTRODUCTION TO THE LAW</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction to the American Legal System</b>	<b>3</b>
Federalism, 3	
Lawmakers: Who Makes the Law? 4	
Case Law and the Courts, 6	
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> , 7	
<b>2 Introduction to Law and Free Appropriate Public Education</b>	<b>11</b>
Egalitarianism and Normalization, 11	
Equal Protection: Judicial Precedents, 12	
The History of Federal Legislation: Statutory Preludes to the EHA, 13	
School Practices, 14	
Other Practices, 15	
Reasons for the Practices, 16	
Characteristics of Court Orders and Legislation, 17	
The EHA and Section 504: Once Over Lightly, 18	
The Relationship of the Two Laws, 18	
The State Plan, 19	
Handicapped Children: Definitions, 20	
Other Differences Between the EHA and Section 504, 22	
Notes, 23	
<b>II THE SIX MAJOR PRINCIPLES</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3 Zero Reject</b>	<b>27</b>
Constitutional Foundations, 27	
<i>Brown</i> as Precedent in Right-to-Education Cases, 27	
The Evolution of Equal Protection Analysis, 28	

- PARC* and *Mills*, 30
- Uses of Equal Protection for Zero Reject, 32
- Federal Legislation, 37
  - Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE), 37
  - Early Intervention and Special Education, 37
  - Transition Out of School, 40
  - Coverage: LEAs, IEOs, Residential Facilities, and Private Schools, 41
  - Direct Services by SEA, 43
  - Child Census, 43
  - Service Priorities, 44
  - Appropriate Education and Functional Exclusion, 45
  - Hiring People with Disabilities, 45
  - Comprehensive System of Personnel Development, 46
  - Single-Agency Responsibility, 46
  - Use of Private Insurance; Free Education, 48
  - Architectural Barriers, 48
  - Section 504, 48
- Case Law, 49
  - Expulsion, 50
  - Educability, 52
  - Students with AIDS, 57
  - Section 504's Requirements: Reasonableness, Cost, and Burden of Proof, 61
  - Compensatory Education, 66
  - Participation in Sports, 67
  - Qualification for Services, 67
  - Minimum Competency Testing, 68
  - Children's Residence, 69
- Effects of the Zero Reject Rule, 70
  - New Definitions for Equality, 70
  - Precedent Setting by Early Cases, 73
  - Change of Locus of Control of Education, 73
  - Cost-Effective Education, 73
  - Parent Participation, 74
  - Family Services and Relationship to Other Federal Policy, 74
  - New Growth Industry, 76
  - Expanded Practices and Individualization, 76
  - The Integration Impetus, 77
  - Lifetime Service, 77
  - "Defective" Newborns, 78
  - Personal Growth, 78
  - New Norms and Pluralism, 79
- Notes, 79

#### **4 Testing, Classification, and Placement**

81

- Constitutional Foundations, 81
- Pre-EHA Criticisms of Testing, 81
- Pre-EHA Court-Ordered Remedies, 83
- Why Testing is Required, 84



- Federal Legislation, 85
  - Nondiscriminatory Evaluation Procedures, 85
  - Ceiling, 87
  - Part H—Infants and Toddlers, 87
  - “Learning Disability” Narrowly Defined, 88
  - Service Priorities, 89
  - Recoupment, 89
  - Accounting, 90
  - Due Process Hearing, 90
  - Sanctions, 90
  - Section 504, 90

- Case Law, 91
  - Larry P.*, 91
  - PASE*, 93
  - Ability Grouping, 96
  - Larry P.*, *PASE*, and Ability Grouping Cases—Effects, 96
  - Other Cases, 98

- Observations About Classification, 99
  - Perceptions and the Bias in Classification, 100
  - Who Classifies, 103
  - How We Classify, 103
  - Why We Classify, 104

- Legal Responses to Classification, 107
  - How We Classify, 107
  - Why We Classify, 109

- Effects of the Nondiscriminatory Evaluation Rule, 112
  - Major Effects, 112
  - New Concerns, 114

Notes, 116

## 5 Individualized and Appropriate Education

119

- Constitutional Foundations, 119
  - Pre-EHA Case Law, 119
  - Pre-EHA Court Remedies, 120
- Federal Legislation, 121
  - Individualized Education, 121
  - The IEP, 121
  - Other Statutory Provisions for Appropriate Education, 124
  - Determining What is Appropriate, 125
  - Part H, 126
  - Section 504, 128
- Post-EHA Cases, 129
  - Appropriate Education and the Supreme Court, 129
  - Appropriate Education, Not Maximum Development, 131
  - The 12-Month School Year, 132
  - The *Rowley* Standard Interpreted, 132
  - The Process Definition, 133
  - Judicial Reliance on Expert Judgment, 134

Other Factors, 134	
Related Services, 134	
Governmental Problems Arising from the Related Services Requirements, 139	
Intergovernmental Coordination, 139	
The Single-Agency Provision, 139	
Interests of Handicapped Children and Functions of Governments, 141	
Traditional Roles of Education, 141	
New Functions of Education, 142	
Values and Principles, 142	
Practical Considerations vs. Integration, 143	
Notes, 143	
<b>6 Least Restrictive Appropriate Educational Placement</b>	<b>145</b>
The Debate, 145	
Constitutional Foundations, 146	
The LRA Principle, 146	
The LRA Doctrine in Education, 147	
Pre-EHA Case Law, 148	
Preference for the LRA, 148	
Court Remedies, 149	
Reasons for the LRA Preference, 149	
Federal Legislation, 151	
The EHA, 151	
Section 504, 154	
Reasons for the LRA Requirement, 156	
Dual Systems in Society and Education, 156	
Effects of the Dual System in Education, 158	
The Nature of LRA: Rebuttable Presumption, 161	
LRA as a Presumption, 163	
LRA and Values, 164	
The Judicial Interpretation, 167	
LRA and Appropriate Education, 167	
Conceptual Frameworks, 169	
Appropriate Education, 170	
Rebutting the Presumption, 179	
The Harmful Effects Issue, 179	
Prediction and Placement, 180	
Educability, 181	
Competing Equities (Other than Costs), 183	
Expulsion: Not an LRA Option, 183	
Conclusion, 184	
Notes, 187	
<b>7 Procedural Due Process</b>	<b>193</b>
Constitutional Foundations, 193	
Pre-EHA Court Decisions, 194	
Notification, 194	

- Evaluation and Placement, 194
- Periodic Reevaluation, 196
- Misuse of Disciplinary Procedures, 196
- Classification Criteria, 197
- Expunction or Correction of Records, 197
- Federal Legislation, 197
  - Access to Records, 198
  - Evaluation, 198
  - Surrogate Parents, 199
  - Notice, 199
  - Complaints and Due Process Hearings, 200
  - Section 504, 203
- Post-EHA Cases, 203
  - Exhaustion of Remedies, 203
  - Burden of Proof, 205
  - Retroactive Application of the EHA, 205
  - Due Process Hearing Officer, 206
  - When a Hearing Is Not Available, 207
  - Statute of Limitations, 209
- The Reality, 210
- Notes, 211

## **8 Parent Participation and Shared Decision Making 213**

- Constitutional Foundations, 213
- Federal Legislation, 214
  - Notice, Consultation, and Hearings, 214
  - Advisory Panels, 215
  - Access to System Records, 215
  - Protection of Student Records, 215
  - Part H, 216
  - Section 504, 216
- Judicial Interpretations, 216
- Rights to Information, 217
- Notes, 219

## **III ENFORCING THE LAW 221**

### **9 Case Law Techniques 223**

- Compliance, 223
- Pre-EHA Compliance Techniques, 223
  - Contempt Citations, 224
  - Court-Appointed Masters, 224
  - Other Judicial Remedies, 225
  - Financial Reallocation and Withholding of Funds, 225
  - Federal Abstention, Mootness, Dormancy, and Voluntary Dismissals, 226
  - Access to Student Records in Class Action Suits, 227

Post-EHA Compliance Techniques in Court, 228	
Damages—Malpractice, 228	
Attorneys' Fees, Private Right of Action, and Exclusive Remedy, 234	
The Handicapped Children's Protection Act: Reversing <i>Smith v. Robinson</i> , 236	
The Supreme Court's Conservative Approach and EHA, 238	
Pennhurst, 238	
Sovereign Immunity, 240	
Federalism, 241	
Antidiscrimination, 243	
Notes, 246	

## 10 Statutory Techniques

249

Enforcement, 249	
Putting Money Where the Problems Are, 249	
A Bit of History, 222	
Federal Funding Techniques, 251	
"Average Expenditures," 252	
Ceiling, 252	
Limitation on "Allowable" Administrative Costs, 252	
Disentitled LEAs, 253	
Funds for Territories and BIA, 253	
Ratable Reductions, 253	
Research, Innovation, Training, and Dissemination Activities, 254	
Post-Secondary Education Programs, 254	
Antidilution Provisions/Excess Costs, 254	
Consolidated Applications, 257	
SEA Direct Services, 257	
Effective Special Education, 258	
Federal Assistance and Involvement in State and Local Programs, 258	
Conformity with Other Federal Programs, 259	
Program Effectiveness, 259	
Program Accountability, 259	
Limitations on Administrative Costs, 260	
Sanctions, 260	
Fiscal Accountability, 261	

## IV FREE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC EDUCATION AND THE AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEM

263

### 11 Objections to the EHA and Answers to Them

265

### 12 Underlying Beliefs and Values in Right-to-Education Laws

275

Role of Law, 276	
Dual System of Law, 276	
Law Reform Movement, 277	

---

Nature and Sources of Right-to-Education Policy, 278
Egalitarianism, Equal Protection, and Due Process, 278
Normalization and Integration/Least Restriction/Mainstreaming, 279
Relationship of the Right-to-Education Movement to Other Federal Policies and Laws, 280
Forces Influencing Federal Laws, 280
Major Concepts of the Federal Laws, 281
Techniques and Nature of Law Reform, 284
The Underlying Beliefs: A Right-to-Education Credo, 287
The Law, Our Beliefs, and Our Values, 288
Putting Our Beliefs and Values to Work: Concepts into Law, 289
A Concluding Note, 290
A Caveat, 291
Notes, 292

APPENDIX A <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> , 293
APPENDIX B <i>Southeastern Community College v. Davis</i> , 297
APPENDIX C <i>Board v. Rowley</i> , 307
APPENDIX D <i>Irving ISD v. Tatro</i> , 321
APPENDIX E EHA Definitions, 327
GLOSSARY, 335
TABLE OF CASES, 341
CASE INDEX, 351
SUBJECT INDEX, 357

**SECTION I**  
**Introduction to the Law**



---

# I

---

# Introduction to the American Legal System

---

## FEDERALISM

The law serves many purposes, among them ordering the public affairs of individuals and their governments and resolving disputes between them. These seemingly simple purposes are accomplished through an intricate network. To explain the workings of that network, we will use some familiar images.

Public law can be thought of in terms of three parallel ladders—descending rungs of parallel authority affecting the relationships between individuals and their governments and between various levels of government. At the top of the federal ladder is the United States Constitution; in the middle are laws enacted by Congress pursuant to constitutional authority; and on the bottom are regulations issued by federal agencies pursuant to congressional authority. Next to this ladder stands one representing the state governments, and it has similar rungs of parallel authority: state constitutions, state statutes, and state agency regulations. Finally, next to the state ladder is the local ladder with its three rungs: the charters of local governments, local ordinances, and local regulations.

The whole picture shows that the highest source of law in each “ladder” is the fundamental governing document: the federal Constitution, the state constitution, and the local charter. Federal, state, and local statutes are next in line, followed by federal, state, and local agency regulations:



<i>Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>
Constitution	Constitution	Charter
Statutes	Statutes	Ordinances
Regulations	Regulations	Regulations

This system of parallel governments (federal, state, and local) is known as the *federal system*; as a form of government, it is known as *federalism*.

Two major principles are involved in the form of government known as federalism. First, there is the sharing of responsibility and power between the federal, state, and local governments. As pointed out later in this chapter, the responsibility for and power over the education of children with disabilities is shared between those governments. Traditionally, local and state school boards (or other governing bodies) had the greatest responsibility and power. Recently, however, responsibility and power have been allocated in greater part to the federal government. This shift is the result of the court cases that began with the desegregation cases in 1954, and it gathered force with two cases decided in 1972 (as pointed out later in this chapter and in chapter 2.) It also is the result of legislation—the Education of the Handicapped Act, which is reviewed in detail later in this book.

Second, there is the supremacy of federal constitutional and statutory law. Early in the history of this country, the Supreme Court, in *Marbury v. Madison*, made it clear that the Constitution of the United States and laws passed by Congress to implement the Constitution are the supreme law of the land. This means that state and local school boards must comply with federal law if, among other things, they receive federal funds (as they do when they educate children who have disabilities with money allocated to them under the Education of the Handicapped Act) or if their laws are in conflict with federal constitutional law or federal statutes. Clearly, the supremacy doctrine has permitted the federal role in the education of children with disabilities.

## **LAWMAKERS: WHO MAKES THE LAW?**

For each source of law there is a lawmaker—a group of persons who make the law. For the federal Constitution and its amendments the initial lawmakers were the delegates to the constitutional convention and subsequently the legislatures of the various states that acted to ratify constitutional amendments (other than the first 10, the Bill of Rights, which was drafted by delegates themselves). The delegates were representatives of the franchised citizens of the states. Thus, the source of the federal Constitution was the citizenry of the United States. This is generally true, too, with respect to the constitutions of states and charters of local governments.