

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

BEFORE

THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

<p>In the Matter of the Expulsion of Dustin L by Wisconsin Rapids School District Board of Education</p>	<p>DECISION AND ORDER Appeal No.: 02-EX14</p>
--	--

NATURE OF THE APPEAL

This is an appeal to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 120.13(1)(c) from the order of the Wisconsin Rapids School District Board of Education to expel the above-named pupil from the Wisconsin Rapids School District. This appeal was filed by the pupil and received by the Department of Public Instruction on May 2, 2002.

In accordance with the provisions of Wis. Adm. Code § PI 1.04(5), this Decision and Order is confined to a review of the record of the school board hearing. The state superintendent's review authority is specified in § 120.13(1)(c). The state superintendent's role is to ensure that the required statutory procedures were followed, that the school board's decision was based upon one or more of the established statutory grounds, and that the school board was satisfied that the interest of the school district demands that the student be expelled.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The record contains a letter entitled "Notice of Expulsion Hearing," dated March 15, 2002, from the district administrator of the Wisconsin Rapids School District. The letter advised

a hearing would be held on March 26, 2002 that could result in the pupil's expulsion from the Wisconsin Rapids School District through his 21st birthday. The letter was sent separately to the pupil and his parents by certified mail. The letter alleged that the pupil engaged in conduct while at school or under the supervision of school authority which endangered the property, health, or safety of others. The letter specifically alleged that on February 28, 2002, Dustin brought and sold controlled substances, Aderol and Concerta, to a student at Lincoln High School.

The hearing was held in closed session on March 26, 2002. The pupil and his parents appeared at the hearing without counsel. At the hearing, the school district administration presented evidence concerning the grounds for expulsion. The pupil and his parents were given the opportunity to present evidence, to cross-examine witnesses, and to respond to the allegations.

After the hearing, the school board deliberated in closed session. The board found the pupil did engage in conduct while at school or while under the supervision of a school authority which endangered the property, health, or safety of others. The school board further found that the interests of the school demand the student's expulsion. The order for expulsion containing the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the school board, dated March 26, 2002, was mailed separately to the pupil and his parents. The order stated the pupil was expelled through end of the 2002-03 school year, with an opportunity for probationary readmission at the beginning of the second semester of the 2002-03 school year. Minutes of the school board expulsion hearing, an audiotape of the expulsion hearing and a transcript of the hearing are part of the record.

DISCUSSION

School districts are limited-purpose municipal corporations and have only such powers as are conferred specifically by statute or are necessarily implied therefrom. *Iverson v. Union Free High School District*, 186 Wis. 342, 353, 202 N.W. 788 (1925). A school board's power to expel students derives from § 120.13(1)(c), which establishes certain categories of offenses that may be the basis for an expulsion and sets out specific procedures that must be followed in the expulsion process.

In reviewing an appeal of an expulsion decision, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals has stated that the scope of the state superintendent's review is limited to that set out in § 120.13(1)(c). In *Racine Unified School District v. Thompson*, 107 Wis. 2d 657, 667, 321 N.W. 2d 334 (1982), the court of appeals *in dicta* stated: "The superintendent's review, then, would be one to insure that the school board followed the procedural mandates of subsection (c) concerning notice, right to counsel, etc." *Id.* In a related context, the court of appeals ruled this dictum has now become "embedded in Wisconsin school law." *Madison Metropolitan School District (Lenny G.) v. Wis. D.P.I.*, 199 Wis. 2d 1, 543 N.W. 2d 843 (1995). It is, therefore, incumbent upon the state superintendent in reviewing an expulsion decision to ensure that the required statutory procedures were followed, that the school board's decision is based upon one of the established statutory grounds, and that the school board is satisfied that the interests of the school district demand the pupil's expulsion.

The appeal in this case raises two issues. First, the parents allege that the punishment is excessive. The parents argue that Dustin is only 15 and that "Chapter 120-2 of the School District Government" states that the school board may expel a pupil who is at least 16 years of age. I am not sure what policy, rule or statute the parent is referring to in her argument.

Regardless, Wisconsin statutes do not limit expulsions to pupils over 16 years of age; therefore, expulsion was not prohibited. Furthermore, since the authority to “approve, reverse or modify the decision” was conferred upon the state superintendent by 1987 Wis. Act 88, § 3, the state superintendent has consistently declined to modify the length of expulsions. *David D. v. Central High School District of Westosha Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 429 (January 25, 2001); *Tony R. v. Lake Geneva Joint No. 1 School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 294 (June 24, 1996); *Brandon H. v. DeSoto Area School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 206 (May 3, 1993). The school board is in the best position to judge the demeanor of witnesses as well as to know and understand what its community requires as a response to school misconduct. It would be inappropriate for me, absent an extraordinary circumstance or a violation of procedural requirements, to second-guess the appropriateness of a school board's determination. In reviewing this case, I do not see the extraordinary circumstance or procedural violation that causes me to modify the pupil's expulsion period.

The parent also raises concerns regarding the lack of services or considerations given to Dustin's ADHD. The state superintendent has determined that an expulsion appeal is generally not the appropriate context within which to challenge a district's application of special education provisions to a particular pupil. Such a challenge is generally beyond the scope of Wis. Stats. § 120.13(1)(c). *Ryan S. v. Barron Area School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 417 (June 9, 2000); *Michael L. v. New Richmond School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 326 (June 2, 1997); and *Michael P. v. Kenosha Unified School District Board of Education*, Decision and Order No. 172 (October 8, 1990). If the parent believes her son requires special education services or a Section 504 plan to accommodate a disability, she must contact the school district. Additionally, the department maintains an extensive library of materials to explain

procedures related to special education complaints or appeals. These materials are easily accessible at the department's website at <http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/dpi/dlsea/een/index.html>. Or, the pupil or his parents may call the special education team at the Department of Public Instruction to get more information.

In reviewing the record in this case, I find the school district complied with all of the procedural requisites. I, therefore, affirm this expulsion.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based upon my review of the record in this case and the findings set out above, I conclude that the school board complied with all of the procedural requirements of § 120.13(1)(c).

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the expulsion of Dustin L. _____ by the Wisconsin Rapids School District Board of Education is affirmed.

Dated this 27th day of June, 2002



Anthony S. Evers, Ph.D.
Deputy State Superintendent of Public Instruction