

From Clinic to Classroom:
Investigating IEPs and Diagnostic Clinical Evaluation
Recommendations for Students with a FASD Diagnosis

Emalise Mitchell, EdS, NCSP
Doctoral Dissertation May 2026
University of Washington
emitch3@uw.edu
Seattle, Washington, USA

1

CLINICAL STUDY POPULATION

88 children aged 8-18

Diagnosed at the University of Washington FASDPN clinic between 2021-2024

56% female 42% White 1% foster care

Diagnoses across the fetal alcohol spectrum

3 FAS
60 SE/AE
25 ND/AE

70% had co-occurring ADHD

Autism was excluded

2

KEY QUESTIONS & FINDINGS

What proportion of the 88 patients had a preexisting IEP?

- 45 patients (51%) had a preexisting IEP
- 43 patients (49%) did not

Did the prevalence of a preexisting IEP vary by diagnosis? **Yes**

- FAS (2 of 3) 67%
- SE/AE (35 of 60) 58%
- ND/AE (8 of 25) 32%

3

Did the prevalence of a pre-existing IEP vary by caregiver status, race, sex assigned at birth, and homeschool status?

- **Foster care** (4 of 5) 80%
- **Not in foster care** (41 of 83) 50%

- **White** (22 of 37) 59%
- **NonWhite** (23 of 51) 45%

- **Female** (23 of 49) 47%
- **Male** (22 of 39) 56%

- **Homeschooled** (0 of 10) 0%
- **Not homeschooled** (45 of 78) 58%

4

Among the 45 patients with preexisting IEPs, what was the prevalence of each IEP eligibility category?

Special Ed Eligibility Categories	FAS (n = 2)	SE/AE (n = 35)	ND/AE (n = 8)	Total (n = 45)
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Other Health Impaired	2 (100%)	22 (62%)	5 (17%)	29 (64%)
Specific Learning Disability	0	5 (14%)	1 (17%)	6 (13%)
Emotional/Behavioral Disturbance	0	2 (5%)	2 (5%)	4 (9%)
Developmental/Intellectual Disability	0	4 (11%)	0	4 (9%)
Multiple Disabilities	0	2 (5%)	0	2 (4%)
Autism Spectrum Disorder	Not included	Not included	Not included	Not included
Deaf-Blindness	0	0	0	0
Deafness	0	0	0	0
Hearing impairment	0	0	0	0
Orthopedic impairment	0	0	0	0
Speech or Language Impairment	0	0	0	0
Traumatic Brain Injury	0	0	0	0
Visual impairment	0	0	0	0

5

Did the pre-existing IEPs match the needs of the patients as determined by the FASDPN clinical team?

IEP Matches Needs	FAS and SE/AE (n = 37)		ND/AE (n = 8)		Total (n=45)		Fisher's Exact Test	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Test	p-value
Yes	6	16%	5	62%	11	24%	Fisher's Exact	p = .014
No	31	83%	3	38%	34	76%		

Note: FAS has too few patients to determine significance; FAS and SE/AE were combined to run statistical analysis.

6

Did the 43 children with no pre-existing IEP need an IEP?

Mismatch for patients without IEP	FAS (n = 1)	SE/AE (n = 25)	ND/AE (n = 17)	Total (n = 43)
No - patient does not have an IEP and clinic recommends a 504 Plan		7 (28%)	10 (58%)	17 (40%)
No - child does not have an IEP, has a 504, clinic recommends IEP evaluation for further support		4 (16%)	3 (18%)	7 (16%)
No - child does not have an IEP, clinic recommends comprehensive psychoeducational evaluation/IEP to determine needs	1 (100%)	23 (92%)	10 (59%)	34 (79%)
No - Clinic does not recommend IEP or 504 Plan, "close monitoring"			3 (17%)	3 (7%)

7

KEY TAKE AWAYS

ACCESS

- Nearly half of students had **no preexisting IEP**.
- Students with ND/AE were least likely to have school-based services.

ALIGNMENT

- Majority of IEPs did **not fully match** documented clinical needs.
- Regulation and adaptive functioning were frequently underrepresented.

DIAGNOSTIC PATTERNS

- More visibly affected students (FAS/SE-AE) were more likely to receive services.
- "Less visible" ND/AE students were more likely to be underserved.

OTHER THEMES

- Academic goals prioritized over other areas of need (e.g., occupational therapy)
- ADHD functioned as a partial gateway to services.

8