**Reflection Process**

By B. Polnick and D. Reed

Adapted from The Principal Portfolio, 2nd Edition (2000) by G. Brown and B. Irby

*Artifact: Identify the assignment. (Optional) Include any documents that support your completion of the assignment (documents may be scanned).*

001.3 The case of Anchorage School District v. M.P., a student with a disability and M.P., his parents

*Describe: Describe the findings for the assignments.*

In 2006, M.P was an elementary student in the Anchorage School District (ASD) diagnosed with high-functioning autism, pervasive developmental delay, and sensory integration dysfunction. M.P.’s parents, who are passionate advocates, filed several administrative and due process complaints against ASD. They were very concerned about their son’s educational progress, wanting of supplemental services, and felt that ASD did not share or exercise their concern.

When the IEP team met in 2006, a mutual IEP was developed from M.P. when he was in the second grade. The next year at his annual review meeting, ASD and his parents could not agree on a revised IEP. Several attempts to complete the revised IEP failed due to the parents rejecting sent IEPs from ASD. Due to this, an administrative proceeding commenced and decided that the 2006 IEP was to stay in place and be implemented until a new revised one was developed and agreed upon.

ASD grew impatient with the parents exercising their rights under IDEA and decided that were not going to develop an updated IEP for M.P. until a final decision was given at the administrative proceeding. By this time, M.P. transferred schools within ASD, repeated third grade at the request of his parents, and was still being serviced under the 2006 IEP. His parents filed for due process claiming that their son was denied a FAPE during the 2008 school year because his current school was still working under the 2006 IEP. The hearing office ruled in favor of the parent stating that the school district was unable to provide a FAPE because M.P. regressed in several academic areas and behavior goals. The parents also spent money on private tutoring for their son during his third grade academic year.

ASD appealed and the district court concluded that despite M.P.’s 2006 IEP was obsolete and outdated, it was due to his parents’ litigious approach that stopped the development of ASD developing a revised IEP. After the parents’ appeal, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals determined that ASD did not provide a FAPE and the parents are to be rewarded reimbursement for the private tutoring service expenses and all are in ordinance under IDEA.

*Analyze: a. Describe the importance of the findings for the assignment.*

After reading this case, I hope that the ASD understands the importance of students with disabilities receiving a FAPE. This legal case should have never made it this far to the appeals court if they would have listened more to the concerns of the parents in revising an IEP for M.P. The moment ASD decided to no longer develop the revised IEP is the moment they stopped offering M.P. a FAPE. The district court should have never ruled in favor of ASD because the parents were exercising their rights and being advocates for their child.

*b. Include connections to your 5 year goals or desired position.*

My desired position as a future independent contractor will enable me to fulfill my mission as a life-long learner.

*c. Compare/contrast elements in your findings to your experiences or previous knowledge.*

My experiences and previous knowledge has been enhanced by my education, research in the case studies I have reviewed, and direct on the job training with special education children.

*Appraise: Critique or describe whether any of your findings were beneficial to you or not.*

My findings are very beneficial because partnerships with the parent, school and community need to be improved

*Transform: a. Describe any future ideas or insights you gained.*

As an educational diagnostician, the one who evaluates the child to determine their strengths and weaknesses I would never let a case such as this reach a disagreement. As a committee, it is our duty and responsibility to make sure an IEP is developed, one that is measurable and the child is placed in the least restrictive environment. I hope since this was the school district’s first special education case, they have learned from their mistakes, committee members are adequately trained, and seek remedies so that an issue such as this one will never occur again. If it does, then the school district and parents can work together for the best interest of the child to receive a FAPE.

*b. Describe future plans for use of the ideas presented, including any changes in your current practices or, describe how the information confirmed your current practices and/or beliefs.*

My future plans are directly on target with the need to provide quality, individualized, education services for special needs citizens and increase parent and community involvement.