



SCHOOL LAW NOTES

MARCH 26, 2026

Student Issues

Dancing Around Legal Landmines: Prom Guidance..... 1

Sixth Circuit Upholds Expulsion for Threatening Violence at School..... 2

Parent Access to Student Video Surveillance..... 3

Special Education

Addressing Special Education Needs in a Virtual Learning Setting 3

Labor & Employment

Is Your Substitute Teacher Entitled to a Permanent Position? 5

Finance & Transactions

The Path of Lease Resistance: Installment Purchase Agreements..... 5

What Is in There? Understanding Pre-Bond Agreements..... 6

Miscellaneous

Digital Accessibility: Time to Level Up..... 7

2026 Tuesdays with Thrun Webinar Series 8

Upcoming Thrun Board Policy Manual Price Increase..... 9

Upcoming Speaking Engagements

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| MICHAEL D. GRESENS | CRISTINA T. PATZELT |
| CHRISTOPHER J. IAMARINO | PHILIP G. CLARK |
| RAYMOND M. DAVIS | PIOTR M. MATUSIAK |
| MICHELE R. EADDY | JESSICA E. MCNAMARA |
| KIRK C. HERALD | ERIN H. WALZ |
| ROBERT A. DIETZEL | RYAN J. MURRAY |
| KATHERINE WOLF BROADDUS | MACKENZIE D. FLYNN |
| DANIEL R. MARTIN | KATHRYN R. CHURCH |
| JENNIFER K. STARLIN | MARYJO D. BANASIK |
| TIMOTHY T. GARDNER, JR. | CATHLEEN M. DOOLEY |
| IAN F. KOFFLER | KELLY S. BOWMAN |
| FREDRIC G. HEIDEMANN | AUSTIN W. MUNROE |
| RYAN J. NICHOLSON | |

- GORDON W. VAN WIEREN, JR. (OF COUNSEL)
- ROY H. HENLEY (OF COUNSEL)
- BRADFORD W. SPRINGER (OF COUNSEL)

THRUNLAW.COM

**EAST LANSING
NOVI
WEST MICHIGAN**

Dancing Around Legal Landmines: Prom Guidance

Prom season is fast approaching – along with a myriad of related legal issues. To navigate those concerns, school officials should be aware of the following best practices to ensure a successful celebration.

Attendance

Attending prom is a privilege, not a constitutional right. School officials may revoke that privilege if a student fails to comply with reasonable conduct standards. A student cannot, however, be precluded from attending prom based on a protected classification (e.g., race, religion, or gender).

Dates

Schools can only regulate student prom dates for non-discriminatory reasons. For example, schools may prohibit students from bringing dates who are currently suspended or expelled from school. Schools may also adopt a policy that prohibits bringing dates from other schools; they cannot, however, exclude a prom date based on a protected classification. All policies must be applied uniformly and communicated to students and parents in writing in advance.

Legal trouble arises when schools refuse to permit same-sex dates. Courts have made clear that a school rule barring same-sex dates infringes on students’ First Amendment association rights and Title IX’s prohibition against sex discrimination. Imposing such a policy risks inviting legal problems, media scrutiny, and potential liability.

Dress Codes

Schools may impose dress codes at prom to ensure that students wear proper attire and to address legitimate concerns about safety or disruption. Schools may *not* impose gender-specific dress codes (e.g., female students must wear dresses; male students must wear tuxedos). Imposing gender-specific dress codes could result in a complaint alleging sex discrimination based on a student’s failure to conform to gender stereotypes. Schools rarely succeed in such cases. Be sure to provide notice of any dress codes to students early, ideally by the time of prom ticket sales.

Searches & Breath Alcohol Tests

A school official may initiate a student search if there is “reasonable suspicion” the student violated the law or a school rule. A search includes inspecting a student’s person or property, such as a purse, bag, or cell phone. Any search must be justified at its inception and reasonable in scope and must be limited to areas where the item sought could reasonably be located. Conducting a strip search is never advisable for school officials and should be left to law enforcement.

If a school plans to administer random, suspicionless breath alcohol tests at prom, they should be performed only pursuant to a policy permitting such searches and after providing advance written notice to students. If your school intends to administer suspicionless breath alcohol tests, we recommend including language directly on prom tickets stating that students consent to random, suspicionless searches, which may include a breath alcohol test, as a condition of entry into prom. Thrun Policy Service subscribers should also review Policy 5103 (Search and Seizure) in advance to ensure that any potential testing complies with applicable requirements.

A student who tests positive on a breath alcohol test or appears intoxicated may be excluded from prom. School officials should ensure that any student who is suspected of having consumed drugs or alcohol has a safe ride home.

Dancing Style

Some schools have implemented rules prohibiting certain types of dancing (e.g., “twerking” or “grinding”). Clear and uniformly applied rules are generally permitted, but students could challenge dancing restrictions as a violation of their First Amendment right to freedom of expression. Such a challenge has not yet been heard by any appellate court, and a successful lawsuit is unlikely if the rules are reasonable, clear, and uniformly applied to all students.

Policies

Like all school policies, rules related to prom must be applied in a uniform and nondiscriminatory manner. A legitimate policy or rule can still become the basis for a lawsuit if it is not applied equally to all similarly situated students. Be sure to remind students that prom is a school-sponsored event, regardless of the location, and that all school rules remain in effect during the dance. Consistent reminders of expected conduct before the dance should help minimize problems on the big night.



Sixth Circuit Upholds Expulsion for Threatening Violence at School

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, whose decisions are binding in Michigan, recently upheld a decision supporting a school’s expulsion of a high school student who threatened to “shoot up the school,” and rejecting claims that the expulsion was unconstitutional. *Reedy v Huron School District*, Case No. 25-1234 (CA 6, 2026). While the opinion is unpublished and not binding precedent, it still provides useful insight into how courts may analyze similar situations.

D.R., a high school student, told a classmate to “shut up or else I’m going to shoot up the school like Oxford.” This verbal threat took place eight days after the 2021 school shooting in Oxford, Michigan, and fewer than 70 miles away from the tragedy. A teacher overheard the comment, school administrators responded, and D.R. was ultimately expelled following an investigation and hearing.

D.R. and his mother sued the school, alleging constitutional due process and freedom of speech violations. The federal trial court dismissed the case at an early stage, ruling that even if the facts in the complaint were all true, they did not establish a constitutional violation. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed that decision.

The Sixth Circuit acknowledged that public school students facing expulsion or suspension for more than 10 school days are entitled to due process pursuant to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Goss v Lopez*. The court noted that adequate due process, at a minimum, includes verbal or written notice of the charges against the student, an explanation of the evidence the authorities have, and an opportunity to present the student’s side of the story.

The court found that the school satisfied these minimum “notice and hearing” requirements because there was a thorough investigation the day of the incident, D.R. attended a hearing, and at that hearing, D.R. presented his side of the story.

For the freedom of speech claims, the Sixth Circuit reiterated the *Tinker v Des Moines* standard that schools can generally forbid or punish student speech that causes, or that school officials can reasonably forecast will cause, a “substantial disruption of or material interference with school activities.” In applying this standard, the court noted that an actual disruption need not have occurred to punish the speech. Recent events occurring nearby, such as the Oxford school shooting, may be considered, and educators are given a high degree of deference in the exercise of their professional judgment.

Considering those factors, the Sixth Circuit found it reasonable for school officials to believe that a threat to shoot up the school, especially considering recent circumstances in Oxford, caused or was likely to cause a substantial disruption of or material interference with school activities. The school’s decision to expel D.R., therefore, did not violate the First Amendment.

While not binding precedent, this decision reinforces that courts will generally defer to school officials addressing threats of violence, particularly when those threats occur under circumstances that reasonably heighten safety concerns. Ensuring a prompt response, a well-documented process, and compliance with basic due process requirements will help position schools to defend such decisions if challenged.

Parent Access to Student Video Surveillance

Surveillance cameras are now common on school campuses and in school vehicles. Although they enhance safety, they can also create legal questions related to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), particularly when a parent asks to review or obtain video footage of their child.

Under FERPA, a parent generally has a right to review video surveillance that is an education record for their child. Surveillance videos of students are considered education records if they are “directly related” to a student or students and are maintained by the school.

To determine whether surveillance video is “directly related” to a student and constitutes an education record, school officials should consider:

1. whether the school uses or intends to use the video for official purposes (including disciplinary action) involving a student (including the victim of any such disciplinary incident);
2. whether the video shows a student in violation of local, state, or federal law;
3. whether the video shows a student getting injured, attacked, victimized, ill, or having a health emergency; and
4. whether the person or entity who took the video intends to make a specific student the focus of the video.

A video that merely captures students in the background as bystanders is usually not “directly related” to those students. Also, videos that are created and maintained by the school’s law enforcement unit are not FERPA-protected education records. If those videos are provided to and then maintained by the school, however, they may become education records.

Surveillance Video with Multiple Students

When a parent requests to review surveillance video that depicts their student and another student, school officials should determine if they can reasonably redact or segregate the video portions that relate directly to the other student without destroying the video’s meaning. If redaction is financially feasible or reasonably possible, the school should redact or blur personally identifiable information, such as faces, of the other student(s) before allowing a parent to view it.

If redaction is not feasible, then the parents of all students for whom the video is an education record must be permitted to review and inspect the video. FERPA does not require the school to provide a copy of the video to parents.

If a parent submits a Freedom of Information Act request, however, the parent may be entitled to receive the video of their student if images of other students whose appearance makes the video an education record for them can be redacted without destroying the video’s meaning.

School officials can find further guidance on disclosing photos and videos of students in the U.S. Department of Education’s Student Privacy Policy Office’s FAQs on the subject, found [here](#).



Addressing Special Education Needs in a Virtual Learning Setting

The Michigan Merit Curriculum requires that students complete at least 20 hours of online learning to earn a high school diploma. Recognizing that special education students may have unique needs related to this requirement, MDE recently published [guidance](#) and an accompanying [FAQ](#) document for school officials and members of individual education program (IEP) Teams. This guidance is valuable even for students who are on a Personal Curriculum or non-diploma track, as nearly every student in Michigan is likely to encounter virtual learning at some point in their academic career.

Virtual Schools & Programs

The guidance differentiates “virtual school” and “virtual program.” A virtual school is a complete educational institution operated by a public school academy or a school district. Virtual schools must meet the same requirements as traditional brick-and-mortar schools. They have their own staff and administration, issue credits, and grant diplomas.

Virtual programs, on the other hand, include a specific course, modules, or sets of courses offered online, and may be operated within an existing school. Virtual programs may be taken by students as supplementary or part-time education alongside classes at a brick-and-mortar school.

Virtual learning can occur through various modes and types of instructional delivery, including synchronous or asynchronous and blended, online, or digital learning. MDE notes that when a special education student receives virtual instruction, the student’s IEP should indicate the mode of instructional delivery, which must be based on careful consideration by the IEP Team.

MDE reminds school officials that both virtual schools and brick-and-mortar schools with virtual programs are subject to all IDEA requirements, including child find obligations, offering a free

appropriate public education (FAPE), and providing modifications and accommodations.

Who Is Responsible for FAPE?

When a special education student attends a virtual school, school officials must understand which public school entity is responsible for the provision of FAPE to the student.

- If a student attends a virtual school operated by their resident district, the district is responsible for the provision of FAPE.
- If a student attends a virtual school through schools of choice, the district operating the virtual school is responsible for the provision of FAPE.
- If the district where the student is enrolled contracts with a third-party vendor or management company to operate virtual programming or an online course, the district in which the student is enrolled remains responsible for the provision of FAPE.

Regardless of whether instruction is virtual, brick-and-mortar, or provided through a third party, the enrolling district is legally responsible for ensuring FAPE, while the ISD oversees compliance across its member districts.

The guidance does not address the complexities of determining FAPE responsibility for students enrolled in public school academies and participating in virtual education.

Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

All students with IEPs, including those enrolled in a virtual school, are entitled to be educated in their LRE. Virtual schools must provide the full continuum of placements, from the general education setting to home instruction, but are not required to operate every option themselves. Virtual schools, like brick-and-mortar schools, may contract with another entity to meet their full LRE continuum obligation.

If a school offers virtual learning options, a student's IEP Team must consider whether the student can receive FAPE in a virtual learning environment. Before denying a student who wants to access virtual learning that opportunity, the IEP Team must determine whether there are supplementary aids and services that could support the student in the virtual learning environment.

Discipline in a Virtual Learning Setting

Students with IEPs who are enrolled in a virtual school or program are entitled to the same discipline protections as students in traditional learning environments. If removed for disciplinary reasons for ten consecutive days or ten cumulative days

constituting a pattern, a student is entitled to a manifestation determination review. If the misconduct was a manifestation of the student's disability, then the student must be returned to their IEP placement.

Additionally, if a school moves a student to a virtual learning program because of behaviors, the move is considered a disciplinary change of placement and is generally subject to the manifestation determination requirement. There is an exception to this rule if the student is afforded the same opportunity to participate in the general education curriculum, continues to receive the services specified in the IEP, and continues to participate with non-disabled students to the extent they would have in their current placement.

Virtual Instruction for Students Attending Brick-and-Mortar Schools

IEP Teams may only rely on virtual learning for a student enrolled in a brick-and-mortar school when the student meets the criteria for homebound/hospitalized instruction or has been placed in an Interim Alternative Educational Setting (IAES) for disciplinary reasons in compliance with the IDEA. Even if a student is homebound/hospitalized or in an IAES, the virtual instruction placement may not be made unless the IEP Team determines that the student can receive FAPE in that setting.

Virtual instruction may not be used as a form of discipline for students with disruptive behaviors.

IEP Team Considerations

In Appendix A of the guidance, [Table 1](#) provides a useful chart to guide IEP Teams that are considering virtual learning for students with IEPs. The table identifies each required IEP component, lists the virtual learning considerations relevant to that portion of an IEP, and provides examples of potential learning supports. As this lengthy table indicates, IEP Teams must thoroughly analyze whether virtual learning is appropriate for a student with an IEP and how to support the student in the virtual learning environment.

[Appendix B](#) of the guidance provides concrete examples of accessibility issues that may arise in a virtual learning environment, as well as possible solutions. It includes potential accommodations or modifications for presenting materials, responding to instruction, addressing attention or executive functioning deficits, and creating a conducive learning environment.



Is Your Substitute Teacher Entitled to a Permanent Position?

As the school year winds down, we remind school officials of Revised School Code (RSC) Section 1236 and how it affects a substitute teacher's rights to continued employment, compensation, and fringe benefits. The Michigan Court of Appeals has interpreted "substitute teacher" to mean, for purposes of Section 1236, a teacher who serves in place of a regular teacher. This interpretation does *not* apply to a substitute teacher retained through a third-party contractor.

Under Section 1236, a substitute teacher employed by a school for at least 150 days of a 180-day school year must, after all other teachers have been re-employed, be given the first opportunity (either during that school year or the immediately succeeding school year) to accept a contract for any position for which the substitute teacher is certified. The same right of first refusal applies to a substitute teacher employed for at least 180 days in an ISD operating a 220-day program. This right does not apply to a substitute teacher who fulfills the duties of a "teacher who is unable to teach due to a terminal illness."

Section 1236 defines a "day" as "the working day of the regular, full-time teacher for whom the substitute teacher substitutes." A quarter-day, half-day, or other daily fraction of the substitute's service must be counted as the fraction worked, unless the school acknowledges and pays a fractional day as a full day, in which case it counts as a full day.

If a substitute teacher is assigned to one specific teaching position and completes 60 days in that assignment, the substitute is entitled to a salary of not less than the minimum salary on the school's current schedule for the duration of the assignment, as well as leave time and "other privileges." Although the statute does not define "other privileges," an informal Attorney General opinion suggests that the term includes the benefits granted to regularly employed teachers under a collective bargaining agreement.

Although RSC Section 1233 permits some degree of flexibility in employing non-certificated or non-permitted substitute teachers, those individuals are not entitled to a permanent teaching position unless they hold a valid teaching certificate.

School officials should closely monitor the number of days worked by each school-employed substitute teacher, as failing to do so may significantly affect the school's staffing levels and budgetary considerations.

• ● •

The Path of Lease Resistance: Installment Purchase Agreements

When schools seek to purchase new equipment (e.g., buses, copiers, or tablets), vendors frequently offer financing packages in the form of a lease purchase agreement (LPA) or other type of financing lease through a third-party leasing company. Though seemingly straightforward, the terms contained in LPAs can be extremely disadvantageous.

LPAs are different from "true" leases and rental agreements. In a true lease, the leasing company typically remains the equipment owner. With an LPA, however, equipment ownership is transferred to the school. In exchange, the school pledges general fund dollars to make lease payments over time. Those payments include interest that the leasing company treats as tax-exempt, which triggers Internal Revenue Code implications. Additionally, the leasing company often holds a security interest in the equipment and may reclaim it if the school fails to make the lease payments or otherwise breaches the LPA's terms.

We strongly recommend that school officials avoid LPAs and other financing leases because they often include unfavorable, or even illegal, terms, including the following:

- the school must pay closing fees, document processing fees, and other hidden fees;
- the leasing company is authorized to unilaterally increase monthly payments without the school's consent;
- the school must pay the leasing company's attorney fees and collection fees if a default or dispute occurs;
- the school must indemnify the leasing company, which is prohibited by Michigan law;
- the school must pay personal property taxes on the equipment. Despite its tax-exempt status, a school may still be assessed if the leasing company incorrectly reports the equipment to the local assessor;
- the school waives its right to a jury trial in the event of a contract dispute;
- the school waives its statutory rights and remedies, such as the ability to revoke acceptance of latently defective equipment;
- the school agrees to litigation in another state and to be subject to that state's laws;
- if a default occurs, the leasing company may: (1) charge the school excessive late fees, (2) charge the school default interest, (3) repossess the equipment by entering the

school's building at any time without permission or notice, and (4) continue to require the school to make lease payments;

- the school may be required to pay service charges (e.g., copier maintenance fees) to the leasing company even if the vendor goes out of business;
- the school official who signed the LPA agrees to assume personal liability if the school defaults;
- the leasing company may collect school officials' contact information and send tele-marketing calls and spam emails; or
- the leasing company may claim default for minor issues, such as misspellings or insignificant incomplete information in the agreement, entitling the leasing company to remedies.

Vendors and leasing companies are generally unfamiliar with laws affecting Michigan schools, resulting in LPA terms that may violate state law or federal tax law. Typically, those concerns are not discovered until late in the process when legal counsel reviews the financing documents. Correcting those errors may cause significant delay. Because most leasing companies are reluctant to change their "form" documents, school officials may be left with the difficult decision to either delay equipment delivery while securing alternative financing or sign an unfavorable, and potentially unlawful, agreement.

To avoid those hazards, school officials should contact their Thrun finance attorney to discuss available options at least six weeks before the anticipated equipment delivery date. Instead of an LPA, we recommend financing equipment through an installment purchase agreement (IPA) with a local bank. Thrun's IPA documents have been prepared and approved by our attorneys, have favorable terms for schools, and are widely accepted by Michigan banks and financial institutions.

As a final note, if a school has an outstanding bond that was issued in 2019 or after, the school may have a continuing disclosure obligation that arises from either a new LPA or IPA. School officials should review that possible obligation with their Thrun finance attorney. For Thrun Policy Service subscribers, continuing disclosure protocols are included in Policy 3212 (Post-Issuance Disclosure Compliance).



What Is in There? Understanding Pre-Bond Agreements

As schools begin planning for bond elections to finance large construction projects, architectural or construction management firms may offer pre-bond agreements. These agreements can provide valuable guidance in planning, estimating costs, and preparing for bond elections and projects, but they also carry potential pitfalls if not negotiated carefully.

Scope of Services

Pre-bond agreements typically outline a range of services that architects and construction managers will perform before a bond vote, including:

- conducting facilities assessments to identify project needs;
- developing preliminary cost estimates;
- establishing project timelines and milestones if the bond is authorized by voters; and
- coordinating with financial advisors, legal counsel, or other consultants.

The services may also include community engagement activities, such as public forums, surveys, or presentations at school board meetings, and assistance with the Michigan Department of Treasury preliminary qualification (PQ) application and PQ meeting.

Services should be sufficiently described in the pre-bond agreement so that all parties share the same expectations and school officials can verify that the agreed-upon services have been completed.

Payment Terms

Commonly, pre-bond services are provided at no cost, if the architectural or construction management firm is retained to perform post-election services if the bond proposal is approved by voters. If the bond proposal is not approved, firms typically do not charge for these services. If, however, the bond proposal passes and the school chooses not to retain the firm, the agreement may allow the firm to bill for actual, reasonable costs, often subject to a not-to-exceed cap. This structure protects the school from unnecessary expenses while ensuring firms are compensated if their pre-bond work is ultimately used.

Exercise Caution

Though pre-bond agreements are typically brief, school officials should still be mindful when executing them, as they may include unwanted terms and conditions regarding post-bond implementation services, undesirable limitation of liability provisions, extensive markups on reimbursable expenses, and other additional fees.

School officials must examine the proposed fee structure if the project moves forward. For example, the fee structure may be based on a percentage of an overly broad “cost of work” definition, including other consultant fees, overhead, and unused contingencies, which in turn could cause an otherwise apparently reasonable percentage-based fee to balloon.

Some firms may also seek broad rights to project documents. These terms can limit a school’s flexibility if not addressed. Pre-bond agreements should preserve the school’s ability to use any drawings resulting from the agreement, as well as the ability to terminate and the right to use the American Institute of Architects contract forms, subject to modification, for the construction project.

School officials may feel pressured to sign an agreement to obtain pre-bond services as soon as possible, especially when the construction firm agrees to delay charging for services until after bond passage. While architects and construction managers are valuable assets in preparing for a bond election, schools should approach pre-bond agreements strategically because they can affect post-bond implementation and construction services. Understanding the scope, fees, and contract terms, and insisting on legal review *before* signing, will support the school’s long-term construction goals without creating unnecessary obligations or risk.



Digital Accessibility: Time to Level Up

Michigan schools are entering a new era of digital accessibility. The Department of Justice recently issued a final rule (Rule) under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) setting technical accessibility standards for school websites and mobile applications. Understanding the Rule’s requirements is the first step toward compliance.

Web Content Accessibility Guidelines

Generally, the Rule requires web content and mobile apps provided or made available by a public entity (including schools), whether directly or through contractual licensing or other arrangements, to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.

The Rule incorporates by reference the [Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1](#) (WCAG 2.1), which are designed to ensure that digital content is accessible to individuals with a range of disabilities, including visual, auditory, physical, speech, cognitive, language, learning, and neurological disabilities. The Rule broadly applies to digital content, including materials such as text, images, audio, video, animations, controls, and electronic documents, as well as software

applications designed for use on smartphones and tablets.

Accessibility is rated based on three levels of conformance: A, AA, and AAA (level A being the least accessible, and level AAA being the most accessible). The Rule requires public entities to comply with Levels A and AA.

For example, WCAG 2.1 outlines the following levels of conformance for time-based media (e.g., videos, webinars, livestreams):

- Level A: Captions must be provided for all prerecorded audio content in synchronized media.
- Level AA: Captions must be provided for all live audio content in synchronized media.
- Level AAA: Sign language interpretation must be provided for all prerecorded audio content in synchronized media.

Based on these conformance levels, schools must provide captions for all prerecorded and live audio content in synchronized media. Schools are not, however, required to provide sign language interpretation for prerecorded audio content.

Exempt Content

The Rule exempts five categories of digital content from the accessibility standards:

1. *Archived Web Content* that: (a) was created, or that reproduces paper documents or physical media created, before the compliance date (defined below); (b) is retained exclusively for reference, research, or recordkeeping; (c) is not altered or updated after archiving; and (d) is organized and stored in a dedicated area identified as “archived.”
2. *Preexisting Conventional Electronic Documents (CEDs)*, which include PDFs, word processor files, presentations, and spreadsheets made available on a school’s website or mobile app before the compliance date, so long as the CED is not currently used to apply for, gain access to, or participate in school services, programs, or activities.
3. *Third Party Content* posted by an outside party, unless the content is posted by the third party on behalf of the school through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements.
4. *Individualized, Password-Protected, or Secured CEDs* that are (a) about a specific individual, their property, or their account and (b) password-protected or otherwise secured.

5. *Preexisting Social Media Posts* posted before the compliance date.

Compliance Dates

Unless a school can demonstrate that compliance with the Rule would result in a fundamental alteration to the nature of a service, program, or activity, or an undue financial or administrative burden, the school must meet one of the following timeframes for compliance, whichever is applicable based on its total population:

- Schools with a total community population of 50,000 or more must ensure their web content and mobile apps meet the above requirements by **April 24, 2026**.
- Schools with a total community population of less than 50,000 must ensure their web content and mobile apps comply by **April 26, 2027**.

A school’s total population is determined by using the most recent available data from the U.S. Census Bureau, which can be: (1) the decennial Census, (2) the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates for local districts, or (3) if neither source provides an estimate, by combining the Census population of the governments that the school serves.

Implementation

For some schools, the compliance date is just around the corner; for other schools, there is still a year to prepare. Either way, school officials should start planning for implementation, which may require establishing a digital accessibility team, conducting an internal audit of web content and mobile apps, and reviewing vendor contracts. Failure to comply could result in an Office for Civil Rights complaint, deferral of federal financial assistance, or a lawsuit.

As an initial step, school officials may consider identifying the person(s) a student, parent, or community member can contact if they encounter a disability-related barrier to accessing the school’s web content or mobile apps. Although not required by the Rule, this small step can help mitigate risk by providing a clear and practical mechanism to resolve accessibility issues early.

More information on implementing the Rule can be found on the [ADA website](#). Please contact Kelly Bowman at kbowman@thrunlaw.com or (517) 374-8831 with any questions about the Rule’s requirements.



2026 Tuesdays with Thrun Webinar Series

As part of our service to retainer clients, Thrun Law Firm will conduct a series of 1-hour webinars this spring. The *Tuesdays with Thrun* webinar series will be offered at no charge to our retainer clients.

Webinars will be held on the following dates/times and will cover the following topics:

- Tuesday, April 14, 2026
 - 8:30 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.: How to Use Legal Counsel
 - 9:45 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.: How to Deal with an Employee’s Claim of Harassment
 - 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.: Parent Complaints – the Good, the Bad, and the AI
- Tuesday, April 28, 2026
 - 8:30 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.: Hot Topics in Public Bargaining
 - 9:45 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.: Student Discipline 101 – Back to Basics for Administrators
 - 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.: Election Planning and Strategies
- Tuesday, May 12, 2026
 - 8:30 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.: Managing your District’s Personnel Files
 - 9:45 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.: First Amendment Tightrope – Student Activism, Threats, and Social Media
 - 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.: School Contracting 101

Michigan School Business Officials (MSBO) is offering up to nine State Continuing Education Class Hours (SCECHs) to individuals attending this series. A SCECH form will be provided to all registrants via email following the final session on May 12. There will be a fee of \$15 (paid to MSBO) to submit this SCECH form regardless of the number of webinars attended.

A link to register for this webinar series has been provided to Thrun retainer clients in a recent [E-Blast](#). Please contact Lucas Savoie (LSavoie@ThrunLaw.com) with any questions or to receive the registration link. We look forward to seeing you at our webinars!



Upcoming Thrun Board Policy Manual Price Increase

School districts and ISDs that are considering making the transition to the Thrun Board Policy Service should be aware of an upcoming price increase. On July 1, 2026, the initial price of the Thrun Board Policy Manual will increase by \$1,000, and the initial price of the Thrun Administrative Guidelines and Forms will increase by \$500. At this time, there will not be an increase to the cost of the related Thrun Model Student and Employee Handbooks or the cost of the annual updates to policy service materials. For more details, please visit www.ThrunLaw.com/content/policy-service to view the Thrun Policy Service order form with updated pricing.

Schools can submit the policy service order form before July 1, 2026 to avoid this price increase. Submitting the order form will not obligate the school to immediately initiate the policy adoption process. The school's review and implementation of the Thrun Policy Manual can be completed whenever it best suits the school's needs after the order form is submitted.

The Thrun Policy Service provides the most effective, user-friendly, and legally-sound policy service in Michigan, and is endorsed by the Michigan Association of School Boards as the preferred provider of board policies for Michigan school districts and ISDs. If you have any questions about the Thrun Policy Service or are interested in setting up a free, virtual presentation to learn more about the benefits of Thrun policies, please contact Policy@ThrunLaw.com.



Date	Organization	Attorney(s)	Topic
April 14, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	<i>Tuesdays with Thrun</i> Webinars How to Use Legal Counsel (8:30 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.) How to Deal with an Employee’s Claim of Harassment (9:45 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.) Parent Complaints – the Good, the Bad, and the AI (11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)
April 21, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Daniel R. Martin Bradford W. Springer	Legal Update (8:35am – 9:30am)
April 21, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Ryan J. Nicholson	A Year in the Life of a School Business Official (8:45am – 9:45am)
April 21, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Raymond M. Davis	Current Trends from the Bargaining Table (1:15pm – 2:15pm)
April 21, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	MaryJo D. Banasik	Labor Negotiations Update (2:15pm – 3:00pm)
April 21, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Christopher J. Iamarino	Bonding/Borrowing/Investing (1:15pm – 4:30pm)
April 22, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Ryan J. Nicholson	Dealing with Boosters and Activity Funds (9:20am – 10:20am)
April 22, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Daniel R. Martin Kelly S. Bowman	Legal Update (9:20am – 10:20am)
April 22, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Timothy T. Gardner, Jr.	Collective Bargaining: Advanced Strategies (10:40am – 11:40am)
April 22, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Ian F. Koffler Mackenzie D. Flynn	Bond Issuance 101 (10:40am – 11:40am)

Date	Organization	Attorney(s)	Topic
April 22, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	2020 Title IX Regulations Comprehensive Training Webinar
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Piotr M. Matusiak	Pupil Accounting Update on Rules and Regulations (8:20am – 9:20am)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Daniel R. Martin	Breaking Up Is Hard to Do (8:20am – 9:20am)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Michael D. Gresens	Getting to Know the L-4029 (8:20am – 9:20am)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Ian F. Koffler	Bond Financing: Best Practices for Districts (8:20am – 9:20am)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Ian F. Koffler	Capital Projects from an ISD Perspective (9:40am – 10:40am)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Ryan J. Murray	What is the “Employment File” Anyway? (9:40am – 10:40am)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Christopher J. Iamarino Mackenzie D. Flynn	Prevailing Wage: What’s Old Is New Again (9:40am – 10:40am)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Daniel R. Martin	Human Resources Investigations (1:15pm – 1:45pm)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Austin W. Munroe	ESTA Basics for Payroll (2:00pm – 2:30pm)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Ryan J. Nicholson Erin H. Walz	When to Call Your Attorney (2:00pm – 2:30pm)
April 23, 2026	MSBO Annual Conference	Philip G. Clark	Trademarks and Copyrights in Schools (2:00pm – 2:30pm)



Schedule of Upcoming Speaking Engagements

Thrun Law Firm attorneys are scheduled to speak on the legal topics listed below.
 For additional information, please contact the sponsoring organization.
www.thrunlaw.com/calendar/list

Date	Organization	Attorney(s)	Topic
April 28, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	<p><i>Tuesdays with Thrun Webinars</i></p> <p>Hot Topics in Public Bargaining: Tenure Cases, MERC Update, & More (8:30 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.)</p> <p>Student Discipline 101 – Back to Basics for Administrators (9:45 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.)</p> <p>Election Planning and Strategies (11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)</p>
May 6, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	Thrun Labor Webinar Series – Employee Disability & Religious Accommodations
May 12, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	<p><i>Tuesdays with Thrun Webinars</i></p> <p>Managing your District’s Personnel Files (8:30 a.m. – 9:35 a.m.)</p> <p>First Amendment Tightrope – Student Activism, Threats, and Social Media (9:45 a.m. – 10:50 a.m.)</p> <p>School Contracting 101 (11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)</p>
May 20, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Philip G. Clark Jessica E. McNamara	School Resource Officers (SROs) Webinar
June 11 & 12, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	Policy Implementation Webinars
August 19, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	Thrun Labor Webinar Series – Employee Speech
September 10 & 11, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	Policy Implementation Webinars
September 16, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	Thrun Labor Webinar Series – Employee Absenteeism & Evaluations



Schedule of Upcoming Speaking Engagements

Thrun Law Firm attorneys are scheduled to speak on the legal topics listed below.
For additional information, please contact the sponsoring organization.
www.thrunlaw.com/calendar/list

Date	Organization	Attorney(s)	Topic
November 18, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	Thrun Labor Webinar Series – CBA Summary: Grievances & Collective Bargaining
December 10 & 11, 2026	Thrun Law Firm, P.C.	Thrun Attorneys	Policy Implementation Webinars