

April May 2012 (642, 6443, & 644)

Legal Update for District School Administrators April – May 2012

Johnny R. Purvis*

West's Education Law Reporter

January 6, 2011 – Vol. 261 No. 3 (Pages 883 – 1166)

January 20, 2011 – Vol. 262 No. 1 (Pages 1 – 356)

February 3, 2011 – Vol. 262 No. 2 (Pages 357 – 733)

Terry James, Chair, Department of Leadership Studies, University of Central Arkansas
S. Ryan Niemeyer, Editor, Co-Director, Mississippi Teacher Corps and Assistant Professor,
Leadership and Counselor Education, University of Mississippi
Shelly Albritton, Technology Coordinator, Department of Leadership Studies, University of
Central Arkansas

Wendy Rickman, Assistant Professor, Department of Leadership Studies, University of Central
Arkansas

Safe, Orderly, and Productive School Institute

Department of Leadership Studies

University of Central Arkansas

201 Donaghey Avenue

230 Mashburn

Conway, AR 72035

*Phone: 501-450-5258 (office)

*E-mail: jpurvis@uca.edu

The **Legal Update for District School Administrators** is a monthly update of selected significant court cases pertaining to school administration. It is written by *Johnny R. Purvis for the **Safe, Orderly, and Productive School Institute** located in the Department of Leadership Studies at the University of Central Arkansas. If you have any questions or comments about these cases and their potential ramifications, please phone Purvis at ***501-450-5258**. In addition, feel free to contact Purvis regarding educational legal concerns; school safety and security issues; crisis management; student discipline/management issues; and concerns pertaining to gangs, cults, and alternative beliefs.

Topics:

- Abuse and Harassment
- Civil Rights
- Labor and Employment
- Religion
- School Boards
- Student Discipline

Topics

Abuse and Harassment:

“School Officials Not Deliberately Indifferent to Alleged Harassment of Student by His Peers”

Patterson v. Hudson Area Schools (E.D. Mich., 724 F. Supp. 2d 682), July 1, 2010.

School district was **not** deliberately indifferent to alleged sexual harassment of student by his peers, in violation of Title IX; whereas, teachers and school administrators responded to each incident of harassment for which they had notice. Furthermore, the district’s *responses were prompt and effective, district had policies in place for preventing and responding to sexual harassment, and school officials promoted activities that addressed sexual harassment*. The student’s parents agreed with arrangements made by the school district to deal with their son’s harassment and there was **no** evidence that school officials were aware of any adverse consequences from its actions or inactions that cause the plaintiff additional harm. **Note:** The middle/high school student experienced behaviors such as the following from his fellow students: being called him names such as “fag,” “faggot,” “gay,” “queer,” “man boobs,” “Mr. Clean,”; slapped by a female student; and generally bullied and teased.

Civil Rights:

“Display of Confederate Flag Would Have Resulted In a Substantial Disruption of the School’s Learning Environment”

Defore ex rel. Defore v. Spiva (C. A. 6 [Tenn.], 625 F. 3d 324), November 18, 2010.

All schools within the plaintiff’s school district have a student conduct code that fundamentally states “apparel or appearance, which tends to draw attention to an individual rather than to a learning situation, must be avoided.” The police further states that “clothing and accessories such as back packs, patches, jewelry, and notebooks must not display (1) racial or ethnic slurs/symbols, (2) gang affiliations, (3) vulgar, subversive, or sexually suggestive language or images; nor, should they promote products which students may not legally buy, such as alcohol, tobacco, and illegal drugs.” According to school officials, the school district has experienced a racially tense environment since 1956 when the school district was integrated. On October 30, 2006, the plaintiff, a high school student, wore a t-shirt to school bearing an image of the Confederate flag. School officials told the student he was in violation of the student code of conduct and he was asked to either turn the shirt inside-out or remove it; he refused to comply and was sent home. On November 6, 2006, the plaintiff wore a belt buckle to school that displayed an image of the Confederate flag. A school official informed the student that he was in violation of the code of conduct and when the plaintiff refused to comply with the school’s dress and grooming code, he was suspended. Prior to the aforementioned two incidents, the plaintiff had wore clothing depicting the Confederate flag to school, but complied when school officials requested that he remove or cover the clothing. The United States Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, held that school officials **reasonably forecast** that permitting the displays of Confederate flag would result in a substantial disruption of the school’s educational environment and/or material interference with schoolwork and school discipline. Thus, the suspension of the plaintiff for displaying the Confederate flag did **not** violate the student’s free speech clause of the First Amendment due to the fact that there was a history of racial tension, violence, and threats of violence in the school; plus, the Confederate flag was a controversial racial and political symbol.

“School Board Members Not Entitled to Qualified Immunity Teacher’s Right of Intimate Association Claim”

Talley v. Brentwood Union Free School Dist. (E.D.N.Y., 728 F. Supp. 2d 226), August 4, 2010.

School board members were **not** entitled to qualified immunity from probationary Caucasian teacher’s claim that members abstained from voting on her for full-time employment status and thereafter terminated her employment with the district in violation of her First Amendment right of “intimate association.” The aforementioned board members abstained from voting for the plaintiff due to the voting history of her father, who was also on the board. Any reasonable person would have understood that the right of intimate association **was violated** when there was a refusal to hire one family member *solely in retaliation for another family member’s exercise of his or her First Amendment rights*. Furthermore, the board members were motivated by race due to their statements “that there should be more minority teachers in the school district”; thus, the board members **violated** the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Labor and Employment:

“Nonrenewal of Teacher’s Contract Did Not Violate Her First Amendment Rights”

Evans-Marshall v. Board of Educ. Of Tipp City Exempted Village School Dist. (C.A.6 [Oho], 624 F. 3d 332), October 21, 2010.

High school English speech *was made pursuant to her duties* (well within her duties as defined by her job description as a classroom teacher) as an employee of the board of education; thus she **lacked free-speech right** to dictate the school’s curriculum. Therefore, **precluding** her claim for First Amendment retaliation arising from the non-renewal of her teacher contact due to the fact that under Ohio law, a board of education the *had exclusive right* to prescribe the curriculum for their schools. Even though the plaintiff was required to express herself to her students, such did **not** make her sovereign or otherwise trump the board’s curriculum choices.

“Termination of Non-Licensed Employee After Disqualifying Criminal Background Check Did Not Violate State Constitution”

Doe v. Ronan (Ohio, 937 N. E. 2d 556), October 26, 2010.

Discharged plaintiff of a public school district sued the school district and the interim superintendent in federal district court, alleging that his termination that was based on a background check that revealed a drug related felony conviction violated Ohio’s constitution. The plaintiff was convicted in 1976 for drug trafficking in violation of Ohio law and spent three years in a correctional facility. After being released, the plaintiff obtained a college degree, became a licensed social worker, and was certified as a chemical-dependency counselor. In 1997, the plaintiff’s conviction record was expunged according to Ohio law and he had no other criminal convictions. The plaintiff was employed as a “drug-free-school specialist” with the Cincinnati Public School District. The Supreme Court of Ohio held that the state statute prohibiting the employment of a school district employee who had been convicted of a “enumerated non-rehabilitative criminal offense” did **not** violate the plaintiff’s constitutional rights.

“Former Teacher Failed to Establish That She Suffered From Disability Due to Bipolar Disorder”

LaGatta v. Pennsylvania Cyber Charter School (W.D. Pa., 726 F. Supp. 2d 578), June 30, 2010.

Plaintiff, a former teacher and call center representative, for the Pennsylvania Cyber School (serves approximately 9,000 students) brought action against defendant alleging disability discrimination due to her disability (depression and bipolar disorder) under ADA. However, the employment issues that were used to dismiss the plaintiff were as follows: (1) talking on her cellular phone at work for extended periods of time; (2) taking two breaks in one afternoon; (3) complaints from other employees; and (4) not getting along with her supervisors. The United States District Court, W.D. in Pennsylvania held that the plaintiff **failed** to establish that she suffered from an actual disability due to her alleged bipolar disorder and depression, as required to maintain a claim under ADA. Plaintiff may have had difficulty at work with her fellow employees and supervisors; however, there was **no** evidence that her disorder was the cause of those difficulties, **nor did** the plaintiff demonstrate the inability to work a range of jobs.

“High School Vice Principal Failed to Adequately Plead First Amendment Retaliation Claim”

Corbett v. Duerring (S.D.W.Va., 726 F. Supp. 2d 648), July 21, 2010.

A high school vice principal sued a county school board and its superintendent in state court for wrongful termination in violation of public policy, negligent supervision, and a violation of his civil rights. The plaintiff alleged that he was a subject of retaliation in the form of non-promotion, discipline, and forced retirement for his refusal to “make deals” with or give special treatment to students based on the influence of their parents and as a result suffered lost wages, emotional distress, and humiliation. A United States District Court in West Virginia held that (1) In order to prevail on a First Amendment retaliation claim, a public employee **must** establish that (A) he engaged in protected expression regarding the matter of public concern, (B) his interest in First Amendment expression outweighs employer’s interest in efficient operation of the workplace, (C) he was deprived of some valuable benefit, and (D) a causal relationship exists between his protected expression on matters of public concern and his loss of the benefit and (2) The vice principal **failed** to allege facts sufficient to satisfy three of the four elements necessary to establish a First Amendment retaliation claim. **Note:** The plaintiff did establish that he was deprived of some valuable benefit in that he lost his employment.

“Middle School Principal Voluntarily Resigned Her Position”

Heutzenroeder v. Mesa County Valley School Dist. 51 (C.A. 10 [Colo.], 391 Fed. App. 688), August 3, 2010.

Former middle school principal **voluntarily resigned** her position, and therefore, was **not** constructively discharged from her employment with the school district; thus, **no** violation of her Fourteenth Amendment rights of the U. S. Constitution. The principal was placed on administrative leave, accepted a full-time position in another school district, and the district offered her another position at the same pay; but, the principal informed the district that she had accepted other employment.

Religion:

“Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance Did Not Violate Establishment Clause of the First Amendment”

Freedom from Religious Foundation v. Hanover School Dist. (C.A. 1 [N.H.], 626 F. 3d 1), December 12, 2010.

The New Hampshire School Patriot Act required all of the state’s public schools to set aside time during each school day for student voluntary and teacher-led recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance, which included the phrase “one Nation under God.” The requirement *applied equally to all students, regardless of their religious beliefs and gave all students the right to participate or not participate* in the recitation of the Pledge; thus the Act did **not** violate students’ rights under the Equal Protection Clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. **Note:** The plaintiffs, Jan and Pat Doe, identified themselves as atheist and agnostic, respectively and their children as either atheist or agnostic.

School Boards:

“Temporary Expulsion of Student Did Not Violate Her Due process Rights”

Anderson v. Hillsborough County School Bd. (C.A. 11 [Fla.], 390 Fed. App. 902), August 3, 2010.

Plaintiff, a former high school student, was expelled for ten school days for fighting and battery on an assistant principal prior to being placed in an alternative school rather than back into a “regular” high school. The plaintiff claimed that the temporary removal from her home high school and ultimate placement in an alternative school violated her due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment. The United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit, held that the plaintiff was **not** expelled without notice and a hearing, but was temporarily expelled until an administrative hearing could be held. Thus, school officials did **not** deprive the student of a property right to a public school education in violation of her due process rights by expelling her from school.

Student Discipline:

“Superintendent Hearing Required Prior to Assigning Student to an Alternative Learning Center”

Rone v. Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Bd. of Educ. (N. C. App., 701 S. E. 2d 284), November 2, 2010.

County board of education policy requiring a superintendent-level hearing before a high school student is confined to an alternative learning center (ALC) **applied** to plaintiff who was assigned to an ALC until a risk assessment was completed and deemed *not* to be a threat to himself or others. The plain language of the policy revealed that it **applied** all students assigned to the ALC *as an alternative to a suspension or expulsion*. The plaintiff was suspended from school for refusing a risk assessment and therefore assigned to the ALC as an alternative to suspension. **Note:** The ninth grader had threatened students at his high school and drew a picture depicting a female student being stabbed.

“Student’s Appeal of Her Expulsion from School Dismissed”

M.L.R. v. Pontotoc City School Dist. Bd. of Trustees (Miss. App., 46 So. 3d 874), November 2, 2010.

School officials along with police officers conducted a canine search of vehicles parked in a high school’s parking lot; thereupon, a drug dog alerted at a vehicle belonging to a eleventh grade female student. The student was called to the scene and officers asked her for permissions to search the interior of her car; she consented to the search. When asked before the search if there were drugs in the vehicle, she said no. During the search the officers found marijuana (.6 gram) in the plaintiff’s vehicle. She told officers that she had no knowledge of the marijuana and volunteered to take a drug test. Furthermore, she told officers that she had lent her vehicle to other students over the weekend that the bag in which the marijuana was found was not hers. School officials expelled the plaintiff for one school year for the possession of drugs in her vehicle on her high school’s campus. The Court of Appeals of Mississippi held that the expulsion of the plaintiff **was warranted**.

“Teacher Exceeded Her Scope of Authority in Administering Corporal Punishment”

Ex parte Monroe County Bd. of Educ. (Ala., 48 So. 3d 621), May 14, 2010.

Fifth grade teacher **exceeded** the scope of her authority in administering corporal punishment to a student when she did **not** administer the corporal punishment in the presence of an other school district employee as required by the school district’s policy regarding corporal punishment. Due to the aforementioned conclusion, she was **not** entitled to state immunity in the tort action against her on behalf of the student who was subjected to the corporal punishment.

Note: The teacher took the 12-year-old fifth grader, who was two years older than his classmates, into the school’s hallway and attempted to “hand-paddle” him using rulers taped together, who resisted by pulling his hand away several times. Thereupon, she retrieved her paddle from her classroom, took him into an empty classroom, and attempted to paddle him. The student repeatedly moved to avoid the spanking and at one point grabbed the paddle and attempted to take it away from the teacher. She made no further attempts to paddle the student, who then disobeyed her request for him to return to her classroom. The teacher then struck the student on one of his arms and one of his legs. Claims were filed against the teacher for negligence, wantonness (e.g. senseless and unjustifiable), and assault.

Books of Possible Interest: Two recent books published by Purvis –

1. Leadership: Lessons From the Coyote, www.authorhouse.com
2. Safe and Successful Schools: A Compendium for the New Millennium-Essential Strategies for Preventing, Responding, and Managing Student Discipline, www.authorhouse.com

Note: Johnny R. Purvis is currently a professor in the Department of Leadership Studies at the University of Central Arkansas. He retired (30.5 years) as a professor, Director of the Education Service Center, Executive Director of the Southern Education Consortium, and Director of the Mississippi Safe School Center at the University of Southern Mississippi. Additionally, he serves as a law enforcement officer in both Arkansas and Mississippi. He can be reached at the following **phone numbers:** 501-450-5258 (office) and 601-310-4559 (cell)