

Trade-off between Goals When Making Educational Policy Decision: Providing Equity and Welfare through "IDEA"

Turkish Journal of Special Education
Research and Practice
2023, Volume 5, Number 1, p 18-28
<https://dergipark.org.tr/trsped>
DOI: 10.37233/TRSPED.2023.0135

Eğitim Politikaları Oluştururken Belirlenen Hedefler Arasında Denge Kurma: IDEA'nın Eşitlik ve Refah Hedefleri

Article History:
Received 30 November 2022
Revised 3 March 2023
Accepted 3 March 2023
Available online 12 March 2023

Mustafa Karnas ¹

Abstract

National policies, federal laws such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, and federal regulations have played an important role in the improvement of special education in the United States (US). Especially, the IDEA (2004) policies have been crucial to achieving the federal government's national disability goals. However, political decision making is not easy and when a law and its policies were intended to meet a goal, they may create a trade-off with another goal. This trade-off may cause conflict or harm for the people who are intended to get benefit from the policy. Therefore, it is important to consider possible trade-offs when making a policy decision. This study first described the goals that individual government policies were designed to meet through the IDEA. Then, emphasized the specific role of the procedural safeguards provisions of the IDEA in meeting government's intended policy goals. Finally, this study discussed equity and welfare, which are particularly intended through procedural safeguards provisions of IDEA, and their trade-offs liberty and security respectively.

Keywords: *Trade-off, policy goals, policy making, special education, IDEA.*

Öz

Ulusal politikalar ve Engelli Bireylerin Eğitim Yasası (IDEA) (2004) gibi federal yasalar, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde (ABD) özel eğitimin gelişmesinde önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Özellikle IDEA'nın kapsamış olduğu eğitim politikaları, federal hükümetin özel gereksinimli bireyler için belirlediği hedeflere ulaşmasında büyük bir öneme sahiptir. Ancak, politik kararlar almak kolay olmamakla birlikte alınan kararlar diğer politik kararlar üzerinde olumsuz etki oluşturabilmektedir. Bu etki, belirlenen politikalardan fayda sağlamayı amaçlayan kişiler veya diğerleri için olumsuz etkilere neden olabilir. Dolayısıyla, bir politika kararı verirken, kararların hedeflenen kişiler veya diğer kişiler üzerindeki olası etkileri göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır. Bu çalışma, öncelikle, ABD federal hükümetinin IDEA yasası aracılığıyla ulaşmak istediği hedefleri açıklamakta, daha sonra IDEA'nın 6 temel ilkesinden biri olan *sürece dayalı yasal güvence* ilkesinin hükümetin belirlediği politika hedeflerini karşılamaadaki rolü üzerinde durmaktadır. Son olarak, *sürece dayalı yasal güvence* ilkesi aracılığıyla amaçlanan eşitlik ve refah hedeflerine ulaşmak için uygulanana politikaların, bu politikalardan faydalanması amaçlanan bireyler veya diğer bireylerin özgürlük ve güvenliği üzerindeki potansiyel etkileri üzerinde durmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *Eğitim politikaları, politik hedefler, özel eğitim, eşitlik, refah, özgürlük, güvenlik.*

Önerilen Atıf Şekli (Suggested Citation): Karnas, M. (2023). Trade-off between Goals When Making Educational Policy Decision: Providing Equity and Welfare through "IDEA". *Turkish Journal of Special Education Research and Practice*, 5(1), 18-28. <https://doi.org/10.37233/TRSPED.2023.0135>

¹ Kilis 7 Aralık University, Faculty of Education, Department of Special Education, Kilis, Türkiye, e-mail: mustafakarnas@kilis.edu.tr.
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0304-1791>

Introduction

Special education in the United States (US) has improved remarkably in the last half century. Especially, advocates for children with disabilities and parents of these children have played an important role in this improvement. From the beginning of 1960s, parents of children with disabilities and their advocates began to use courts to enforce educational authorities to provide equal education opportunities for children with disabilities (Yell et al., 1998). The federal government has not been insensitive to these efforts and court cases, and developed federal policy goals. To achieve these goals, the federal government enacted a landmark special education law Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) of 1975. This law was renamed as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) later in 1990. The national disability policies intended to meet through IDEA have been crucial to achieve federal government's policy goals.

However, making policy decisions to reach intended policy goals is not an easy task. When policy makers make policies they might be in a situation where they make compromise between two decisions. For example, a policy which is intended to provide equity among all children may restrict their liberty. This study argues that there is *equity-liberty* and *welfare-security* trade-offs among the policy goals intended through the IDEA. Particularly, the purpose of this study was threefold. First, this study described the goals that individual government policies were designed to meet through the IDEA and its provisions. Second, the specific roles of the procedural safeguards provisions in meeting the government's intended policy goals are explained. Third, this study discussed equity and liberty, which are intended through procedural safeguards provisions of IDEA, and their trade-offs liberty and security. This study discussed the trade-offs based on Deborah Stone's policy decision making theory in "Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making" (Stone, 2012). Stone is a renowned author of policy whose theory clearly explains the components and challenges of policy making. This study has a potential to alert policy makers regarding to consider possible trade-offs when making a policy decision.

National Disability Policy Goals through IDEA

In the mid-1970s, the US Congress enacted a federal special education law called the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. In 1990, this law was reenacted and renamed as IDEA (Turnbull et al., 2007). The stated purposes of IDEA are (a) to ensure that free appropriate public education is available for all children with disabilities; (b) to protect the rights of children with disabilities and their parents; (c) to assist federal, state, local, and educational agencies for providing education for all children with disabilities; and (d) to ensure and assess whether enough effort is provided to educate children with disabilities (IDEA, 2004). The IDEA is divided into four parts, labeled A, B, C, and D (IDEA, 2004). Part A contains basic foundations of the act. Part B covers services to children ages three to 21. Part C addresses the importance of identifying and reaching newborns, infants, and toddlers from birth to three years of age. Part D authorizes grant programs to develop state and local education agencies' capacities to educate students with disabilities appropriately (IDEA, 2004). These grants are made available for various purposes including personnel development, technical assistance, and parent training (IDEA, 2004). The IDEA operates rules and regulations under six provisions. These provisions and their purposes are briefly described:

- *Zero reject* ensures that full education opportunities are provided for all students with disabilities between ages of three and 21.

- *Nondiscriminatory evaluation* ensures all children are evaluated without bias or discrimination.
- *Individualized and appropriate public education* ensures free, appropriate, and individualized public education (FAPE) is provided to all children with disabilities at the public expense.
- *Least restrictive environment (LRE)* ensures students with disabilities are educated with typically developing students to the maximum extent appropriate.
- *Procedural safeguards provision* ensures all rights of students with disabilities and their parents are protected.
- *Parent participation* ensures students with disabilities and parents collaborate with schools during the determination and implementation of special education services (IDEA, 2004).

These six provisions set out the rights that must be provided by state education agencies (SEA) and local education agencies (LEA) (Turnbull et al., 2007). All these rights guarantee free and appropriate education which aims to ensure *equity* and *welfare* for all children regardless they have disability. Therefore, equity and welfare are two of the main national disability goals that the government intended through IDEA.

Equity through IDEA

Inequity concerns were central to litigation that inspired the enactment of the IDEA in 1975 (Skiba et al., 2008). Before the IDEA, four millions of children with disabilities were denied appropriate access to public education and many children with disabilities were denied entry into public schools where they could get education with their typically developing peers (U.S. Department of Education, 2023). Many children were either placed in segregated classrooms or in regular classrooms with no support for their special needs (U.S. Department of Education, 2023). All these circumstances were the clear sign of inequity that enforced and encouraged federal government acting to provide equity throughout IDEA.

Explaining the word *equity* without mentioning the word *equality* would not be powerful enough to understand what equity really means. Although equity and equality are sometimes used on behalf of each other, they have different meanings. While equity is explained based on the dimensions of distributions, equality is simply uniformity in distribution (Stone, 2012). For example, school staff can place two students, one with disability and one without disability, in the same inclusive classroom. Then, school staff may state that equal education is provided for these two students. In this example, equality may have been provided, because both students were placed in the same classroom. However, placing a child with disability in the same classroom with his or her typically developing peers does not necessarily mean that equity is provided. Equity would only exist when the varying needs of the student with disability are met because meeting these needs is necessary to provide an equal educational opportunity for both students (McLaughlin, 2010). Equity is based on the dimensions of distributions and every distribution having three dimensions including the recipients, the item, and the process (Stone, 2012). The recipients are the target population who get something, the item is what is distributed, and the procedure is the method of distribution (Stone, 2012). When this concept applied to special education, recipients are the students with disabilities and their families, the items are the rights of students with disabilities that were ensured through provisions of IDEA, and the procedure is the services that are implemented through SEAs and LEAs. Skiba et al. (2008) suggests that equity in special

education would be achieved through quality education services based on students' needs.

From the first provision *zero reject* to the final provision *parent participation*, it is clear that equity was intended through IDEA. The zero reject provision ensures equity among the students with disabilities by accepting them all to school regardless of their disability. *Nondiscriminatory evaluation* ensures equity among all students with disabilities through an objective and appropriate evaluation regardless of their race, color, or type of disability. The *free appropriate public education* and *least restrictive environment* provisions ensure that students with disabilities are provided free education with their typically developing peers at LRE to the extent possible so that they could be given equal rights that are given to their typically developing peers. Finally, *procedural safeguards* and *parent participation* provisions allow parents and students to track whether all provisions of the IDEA were implemented with fidelity. If parents think that their rights given through the IDEA is violated, procedural safeguards provision allow them to act some dispute resolution options to defense their rights.

Welfare through IDEA

Welfare has been defined from the perspectives of different disciplines including sociological, economic, and social policy (Greve, 2008). Economic perspective measured welfare in terms of monetary wealth while sociological and social policy measured the welfare in terms of happiness, not living in poverty, and wellbeing (Greve, 2008). Therefore, somebody's welfare depends on factors such as economic resources, wellbeing, and quality of life.

The rights given through all provisions of the IDEA are a clear sign for IDEA's intention for welfare of children with disabilities and their parents at some level. As stated earlier, provisions of IDEA ensure that all students with disabilities must be evaluated objectively and be provided education at least restrictive environment based on their individual needs. These provisions ensure students' academic achievements are met and their personal and social skills are improved (Turnbull, 2005) that ultimately increase students' welfare. IDEA recognize the family as the core unit of society and emphasize the importance of parents by giving them rights and opportunities to actively participate in their children's education process (Turnbull et al., 2007). These given rights increase both parents' and children's welfare by promoting education of children with disabilities based on their individual needs and by involving parents to monitor the education and services that their children receive.

One of the controversial issues in providing welfare is the determination of needs. Sometimes, people who are intended to get benefit from the policies may claim some of their desires as needs. Stone (2012) noted that to provide welfare, the government does not intend to fulfill desires but needs. This explains why IDEA uses the term "appropriate education" rather than "best education." It is important to remember that IDEA does not ensure best education but an appropriate education; the term "best" describes a desire but the term "appropriate" defines a need. The following section explains specifically the role of procedural safeguards provision of the IDEA to meet the policy goals of equity and welfare.

The Role of IDEA's Procedural Safeguards Provision to Meet the Policy Goals of Equity and Welfare

Among all provisions, the *procedural safeguards provision* of IDEA has a special role to ensure other five provisions are implemented appropriately (IDEA, 2004). However, it seems that this provision also makes equity-liberty trade-off and welfare-security trade-off. To understand how these trade-offs were made, it is important to comprehend the original purpose of procedural safeguards provision.

Procedural Safeguards Provision of the IDEA

The procedural safeguards provision of IDEA assures mutual enforcement between education agencies and parents (Turnbull et al., 2007). This provision protects the rights of students with disabilities and their parents against SEAs and LEAs which are responsible for providing free, appropriate, and public education for children with disabilities (Polloway et al., 2008). This provision also protects the rights of SEAs and LEAs against actions by students and their parents (IDEA, 2004; Turnbull et al., 2007). The procedural safeguards were categorized into groups including general safeguards, the appointment of surrogate parents, and dispute resolutions (IDEA, 2004; Turnbull et al., 2007; Yell, 2012).

General safeguards for parents and students are in regard to the notice and consent requirement (Mandic et al., 2012; Yell, 2012). Parental consent must be obtained before a special education placement or replacement occur (IDEA, 2004; Mandic et al., 2012; Yell, 2012). The school must inform the parent before any initiation or change of student identification, evaluation, and placement (IDEA, 2004; Yell, 2012). Additionally, the parent must be informed if the school refuses an initiation or change in identification, evaluation, and placement of the child (IDEA, 2004). Because a person under the age of 18 is considered a minor and incapable of exercising legal rights based on the general rule of law, a parent holds and exercises legal rights on behalf of the child (IDEA, 2004; Turnbull et al., 2007). In cases where there are no parents or a family member for any reason, the agencies must appoint a surrogate to protect the right of the child (IDEA, 2004; Turnbull et al., 2007). When a parent/surrogate or school disagrees with each other on any matters (e.g. identification, placement, evaluation of the child with disability) regarding their rights provided through IDEA, either party may request a due process hearing. Due process hearing request is legal rights to given parents and schools to resolve a conflict through legal settings (IDEA, 2004; Yell, 2012). For example, if a parent refuses to consent for identification or evaluation, the school has a right to request a due process hearing to conduct student identification or evaluation. Similarly, if a parent disagrees with a state or local agency, IDEA requires that the state offer the parent resolution to the issue through mediation first, rather than going through a due process hearing (IDEA, 2004; Yell, 2012).

Furthermore, procedural safeguards provision ensures that independent evaluation of the child is available at public expense upon request of the parents when parents disagree with the evaluation of the school (IDEA, 2004; Yell, 2012). However, if the school believes that the evaluation was appropriate, the school has a right to initiate a due process hearing (IDEA, 2004; Yell, 2012).

The Role of the Procedural Safeguards Provision to Meet the Equity Goal

The procedural safeguards provision of IDEA has a crucial role when issues are faced regarding the rights of students with disabilities and their parents. Under IDEA, parents can file a due process complaint in case they have a conflict with schools and local, and state education agencies related to identification, evaluation, and educational placement of their child (IDEA, 2004). For example: The IQ of two students with disabilities was measured with a measurement tool in English language. It seems that each student was evaluated equally because they both were evaluated with the same measurement tool. However, if one of the students speaks English as a second language with no proficiency, then this student was not evaluated with equity. In this case, items, measurement tools in this example, were distributed equally but not with equity because the items were not distributed based on child's needs according to Stone's concept of distribution in equity. In the same example, the student who speaks English as a second language may need a different measurement (e.g. a measurement in child's first language) to ensure that the evaluation was conducted with equity. Under the protection of procedural safeguards provision, in this case, if a parent thinks that the evaluation of their child was unfair, the parent has a right for due process hearing request (IDEA, 2004). Following court cases explains the importance of due processes in the improvement of special education services ensuring equity between children with disabilities and their typically developing peers.

Larry P. v. Riles (1979) is a discrimination-based court decision which provides a crucial example of how due process protected the right of a child to get nondiscriminatory evaluation. In *Riles (1979)*, six minority school children were placed in a special classroom for the "educable mentally retarded" (EMR) based on results from the state's IQ test. However, the students filed a lawsuit against the city and the city board of education, alleging that their placement was unfair and in violation of both the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America because the IQ test was found to be discriminatory. The courts agreed with the students and ordered state and local education agencies not to place the student in an EMR class solely on the basis of an IQ test (*Larry v. Riles, 1979*). The result of this case not only changed the discriminatory placement of six students but also changed the entire state evaluation process that discriminated against minority students (Turnbull et al., 2007).

Timothy W. v. Rochester (1989) is an important court case regarding a violation of the zero rejects provision of IDEA. Within this court case, the Rochester School District rejected Timothy from special education services claiming that the student was not capable of benefiting education, thus needed medical care rather than special education services. However, considering IDEA's zero reject provision, Timothy's family argued that their child was entitled to free appropriate public education. The court found that the school district's interpretation of the law was wrong. The law was intended to develop a special education service based on student needs. The statement "benefit from" was never intended to deny a student's educational rights. The court ruled that all children with disabilities, no matter how severe their disability, are entitled to free appropriate public education. The court decided that Timothy must be accepted into school and an IEP must be developed (*Timothy v. Rochester, 1989*; Turnbull et al., 2007).

Special education history in the US has many similar court cases that demonstrated how the rights of children and parents are protected through the procedural safeguards provisions of IDEA. All these cases demonstrated that equity is one of the goals that federal government intended to achieve through IDEA. However, equity goal made a

trade-off with liberty. There is a need to understand the term liberty, in its context as a policy goal before explaining the trade-off between equity and liberty.

Liberty. The famous author on the subject of liberty, Isaiah Berlin, discussed the liberty as negative and positive concepts of liberty (Berlin, 2002). These most common concepts have been discussed throughout the history by many philosophers. The negative liberty refers to the absence of obstacles, barriers, or interference from others (Isiktas, 2019). In this concept, the government can restrict the liberty of someone only in a case to prevent harm to others; therefore, people should be free to do what they want unless they harm others (Stone, 2012). The concept of positive liberty refers “having active support from others to ensure health care, education, income, literacy and physical security” (Stone, 2012, p.124). Positive liberty depends on external sphere and provided by external institutions such as government (Isiktas, 2019).

According to applications of the positive liberty, a government has to aim to create conditions necessary for its citizens to make sure their citizens are self-sufficient (Berlin, 2002). If the liberty of someone is constrained by regulations, this would mean to invasion of someone’s liberty (Isiktas, 2019). People should be able to overcome obstacles and eliminate barriers to achieve the liberty (Berlin, 2013). This achievement depends on a person’s access to needs such as health care, education, income, power, and physical security (Stone, 2012). In realistic world, people do not have access to these needs equally. Therefore, the policy makers consider this circumstance when making a policy decision.

The Role of the Procedural Safeguards Provision in the Equity-Liberty Trade-off. Throughout the procedural safeguards provision of IDEA, equity was intended by giving rights both for parents and schools. The IDEA requires that professionals inform parents about their rights and the placement of a child, and use the parents’ knowledge of their child when deciding an appropriate education for the child (Kalyanpur et al., 2000). By doing that, IDEA ensures an important role for parents as collaborators, where families are expected to be an equal and full partner with schools (Kalyanpur, et al., 2000). However, although it seems that both parents and school agencies seem as equal partners, there are some inequalities that restrict parents’ liberty. The procedural differences based on roles and position of both sides cause equity-liberty trade-off that is apparent in dispute resolution options.

In case of conflict with schools, parents defend their rights through following dispute resolution options given through procedural due process provisions of IDEA. First, parents might solve the problem through communication with school. If this option does not work, a mediation can be initiated. A mediation is a voluntary action that gives parents and schools another chance to resolve their disagreements (Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education, 2021). Both parents and schools may request mediation upon request. A mediator helps parents and school to solve the problem as third party. If a mediator cannot solve the problem, the parents may file a written complaint to start a due process that ends with hearing. Final option for parents is filing a complaint with state if parents think the school is violating their rights given through IDEA (Yell, 2012). Although these options seem helping parents to protect their rights, if a parent is less educated, less knowledgeable, fighting against a powerful school, the parent’s liberty to protect their rights is restricted based on Berlin’s positive concept of liberty that emphasize the necessity of power, education, income, and health. US Government Accountability Office examined the dispute resolution activities in 5 states and indicated that high minority districts usually had low dispute resolution activities. Possible legal costs, language barriers, retaliation fears are stated as hurdles that effects

parents' desire to pursue dispute resolution services (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2019).

In some cases, parents may will to go through procedural due process, but may not have enough knowledge in understanding entire dispute resolution process and their position in these cases. A special education advocate may help parents in these circumstances, but they may want to charge for these services, especially those who serve as professionals. Thus, parents need to have economic freedom to have an advocate to defend their rights. If the parent is poor, their liberty to have an advocate is restricted.

The Role of the Procedural Safeguards Provision to Meet the Welfare Goal. Welfare depends on fulfillment of human need, therefore, the needs of someone should be considered in order to provide welfare (Stone, 2012). One of Stone's (2012) conceptualized dimensions of need is identified as *intrinsic vs. instrumental value*, which refers that resources are important not only to meet immediate needs but also to enable people to meet their broader goals. In the previous example, there were two students whose IQs were measured with the same instrument, even though one of the student's primary languages was not English. In this example, based intrinsic vs. instrumental value concept, the evaluation has an intrinsic value to determine the child's placement, which will then fulfill the student's needs. The evaluation also has an instrumental value for the child's ultimate welfare. However, if the child's evaluation is not conducted properly, the student might be placed in a more restrictive environment that may negatively affects the child's ultimate welfare. Therefore, in order to ensure children's ultimate welfare, IDEA ensures nondiscriminatory evaluation and placement in the least restrictive environment.

The procedural safeguards provision of IDEA ensure welfare both for children and parents by giving parents rights to monitor their child's education and take some actions in case they have conflict with school. Parents are often worried about whether their child is educated based on their needs. Procedural safeguards and parent participation provisions seek to fulfill the worries of parents by involving them into dispute resolution processes regarding the procedure of their child's evaluation, placement, and education. Thus, the procedural safeguards provision not only ensures the welfare of the child but also ensures the welfare of the parents. However, this provision also creates a trade-off with another policy goal security. In order to understand the welfare-security trade-off, a discussion of the term security, in this context, must take place.

Security. The meaning of security may vary based on policy areas. Economic security, food security, cyber security, and personal security are different types of securities that are concerned by people (Cavelty, 2020; Grigoreva & Garifova, 2015; Martinez et al., 2018). Economic security has an important role in our daily life because it may indirectly affect other securities such as food security, personal security, and safety. Someone's economic security depends on stable income or other resources needed to cover standard living expenses and essential needs. For example, if someone does not have a job, it is highly probable that the person's food security is at risk as well. People who consider their job as insecure have worse physical and mental health compared to those who feel more secure (Burgard et al., 2009). Thus, if the government intends to provide welfare for individuals with disabilities, it must ensure that those individuals have economic security to afford their needs. However, individuals with disabilities or with other health impairments often have a decreased likelihood of pursuing their education and finding an employment (Myklebust, 2013). Therefore, compared to people without disabilities, people with disabilities are more likely to have economic insecurity.

The Role of Procedural Safeguards Provision in the Welfare-Security Trade-off

Security concerns are available also for educators because they might be worried about losing their job. The governments' policy to meet welfare goal for students with disabilities create welfare and security trade-off against schools and teachers. When addressing the welfare and security trade-off, it is important to mention the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, which holds educators accountable for announcing higher academic standards (Berryhill, et al, 2009; No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2002). NCLB was replaced by Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015. Berryhill et al. (2009) conducted a study to examine teachers' perception of the unintended consequences of accountability policy on their welfare. The study indicated that emotional exhaustion and concern of teachers about low self-efficacy were consequences of accountability policy. The results of the study demonstrated that while accountability policies tend to increase student achievement, these policies also made welfare-security trade-off because they cause job insecurity for teachers. On the contrary, for example, in Türkiye there are no accountability policies for general education classrooms in public schools. It is not a written rule, but when a student fails, usually the student is found responsible from his or her failure, not the teachers. Therefore, when teachers work in a public school, they feel secure because they cannot be terminated based on student performance. Thus, teachers are more secure in their job. However, absence of accountability policies in Türkiye might make a trade-off with student success because there is no obligation enforcing teachers to increase student success.

Furthermore, in the US, schools and educational agencies are held accountable to provide free, appropriate, and public education for students with disabilities (IDEA, 2004). By doing so, immediate and ultimate needs are addressed for the welfare of children with disabilities (Stone, 2012). However, the rights given to children with disabilities and their parents to ensure their welfare may then decrease teachers' psychological security. Teachers know that if they violate a student's rights, the family could begin a legal suit. Therefore, the rights of parents given through the procedural safeguards provisions of IDEA may increase teachers' worries about job security. This situation may then cause harm to the teacher's mental health.

Conclusion

This study explained that government policies are designed to reach intended goals. However, decision making on policies is not an easy task because an act to reach an intended goal may create trade-off with another goal. This study highlighted that, throughout federal law IDEA, the US government intended to provide equal educational opportunities and welfare for all children, regardless they have disability. The US governments' intended policy goals equity and welfare through IDEA are explained with the emphasis in procedural safeguards provision of IDEA. It is highlighted that while the procedural safeguards provisions of IDEA were intended to protect the equity and welfare goals in national disability policy, it also created a trade-off with liberty and security. The procedural differences in regard to roles and position of parents and LEA/SEA causes equity-liberty trade-off because a parent might not have necessary power, education and income to fight against a powerful school. Thus, parents' liberty to protect their children's equity right is restricted. Similarly, accountability policy which holds teachers accountable for announcing higher student performance may makes teachers feel insecure in their job, and it also may harm teachers' metal health. The literature is limited in research exploring the potential trade-offs between special education policy goals.

More research in this context would help special education policy makers on aware of potential trade-offs.

Suggestions for the Policy Makers

This study highlighted that making a policy decision is a critical task that should be considered in all its aspects. Therefore, this study reminds policy makers to consider possible trade-offs between goals. When a policy decision is made for a particular goal, its potential trade-offs with another goal should be considered. In addition, when a policy decision is made for a particular group, policy makers should ensure that these decisions should not trade-off with benefits of other groups.

References

- Berryhill, J., Linney, J. A., & Fromewick, J. (2009). The effects of education accountability on teachers: Are policies too stress provoking for their own good? *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 4(5), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.22230/ijep.2009v4n5a99>
- Berlin, I. (2002). Two concepts of liberty. In H. Hardy (Eds.), *Liberty* (pp. 166-217). Oxford.
- Berlin, I. (2013). *The hedgehog and the fox: An essay on Tolstoy's view of history*. Princeton.
- Burgard, S. A., Brand, J. E., & House, J. S. (2009). Perceived job insecurity and worker health in the United States. *Social Science and Medicine*, 60, 777-785. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.06.029>
- Cavelty, M. D., & Wenger, A. (2020). Cyber security meets security politics: Complex technology, fragmented politics, and networked science. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 4, 5-32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2019.1678855>
- Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (2014). *IDEA special education mediation*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED555856.pdf>
- Greve, B. (Eds.). (2008). *The Routledge handbook of the welfare state*. Routledge.
- Grigoreva, E., & Garifova, L. (2015). The economic security of the state: The intuitional aspect. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 24, 266-273. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00658-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00658-9)
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1975, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).
- Işıқтаç, Y. (2020). Isaiah Berlin: Negative and positive liberty. *Annales de la Faculté de Droit d'Istanbul*, 68, 37-45 . <https://doi.org/10.26650/annaes.2019.68.0003>
- Kalyanpur, M., Harry, B., & Skrtic, T. (2000). Equity and advocacy expectations of culturally diverse families: Participation in special education. *International Journal of Disability, Development, and Education*, 47, 119-136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713671106>
- Larry P. v. Riles, 495 F. Supp. 926 (1979).
- Mandic, C. G., Rudd, R., Hehir, T., & Acevedo-Garcia, D. (2012). Readability of special education procedural safeguards. *The Journal of Special Education*, 45, 195-203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466910362774>

- Martinez, S. M., Frongillo, E. A., Leung, C., & Ritchie, L. (2018). No food for thought: Food insecurity is related to poor mental health and lower academic performance among students in California's public university system. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 25(12), 1930-1939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105318783028>
- McLaughlin, M. J. (2010). Evolving interpretations of educational equity and students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 76(3), 265-278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291007600302>
- Myklebust, J. O. (2013). Disability and adult life: Dependence on social security among former students with special educational needs in their late twenties. *British Journal of Special Education*, 40(1), 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12011>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2002).
- Polloway, E. A., Patton, J. R., & Serna, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Strategies for teaching learners with special needs* (9th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Skiba, R. J., Simmons, A. B., Ritter, S., Gibb, A. C., Rausch, M. K., Cuadrado, J., & Chung C. (2008). Achieving equity in special education: History, status, and current challenges. *Exceptional Children*, 74, 264-288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290807400301>
- Stone, D. (2012). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (3rd ed.). Norton.
- Timothy W. v. Rochester School District, 875 F. 2d 924 (1989).
- Turnbull, H. R. (2005). Individuals with disabilities education act reauthorization: Accountability and personal responsibility. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26(6), 320-326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325050260060201>
- Turnbull, H. R., Stowe, M. J., & Huerta, N. E. (2007). *Free appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities* (7th ed.). Love Pub.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2023, January 11). *A history of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act*. <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/IDEA-History>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2019, December 4). *Special education: IDEA dispute resolution activity in selected states varied based on school districts' characteristics*. <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-20-22>
- Yell, M. L., (2012). *The law and special education*. Pearson.

Yazarın Beyanı

Araştırmacıların katkı oranı beyanı: Araştırmacı çalışmayı tek başına yürütmüştür, tüm katkı yazara aittir.

Etik Kurul Kararı: Bu makalede sunulan çalışmanın bir derleme çalışması olması nedeniyle etik kurul iznine gerek duyulmamaktadır.

Çatışma beyanı: Araştırmada yazarlar arasında ya da diğer kişi/kurum/kuruluşlarla herhangi bir çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.

Destek ve teşekkür: Bu araştırma için herhangi bir kurumdan finansal destek alınmamıştır.