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Abstract

Public schools are political institutions that have been transforming in recent years and this paper will use “new institutionalism” to understand some of the dynamics motivating this transformation. Vivien Lowndes’ “manipulated institution” provides perspective regarding why this transformation is occurring. Legislators have used the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to maximize their chances of reelection by transferring power from teachers to parents of students with special needs, making them more important actors within the institution, and, in the process, creating a reliable voting bloc that they can use to win future elections. By their actions, legislators have given parents the power to influence the work rules of public education.
Early in his Senate career, Tom Harkin of Iowa made a deal with Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts that landed him on what was then the Education and Labor Committee. In exchange for his services on the committee, Senator Kennedy gave Harkin nearly complete autonomy on a 1987 disability policy subcommittee. For nearly all his political life Harkin worked towards a position from which he could aid the American disabled community which included his deaf older brother, Frank.¹ Harkin’s place on this subcommittee led to both the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Harkin believed that “in the old days, if you had a disability and you were a child…you just were told not to expect a heck of a lot. Barriers were there: educational barriers, work barriers, transportation barriers, attitudinal barriers, some of which still exist. But, you just had lower expectations.”²

Harkin, the sponsor of IDEA is still proud of the work he did with the legislation, because “kids that grew up with [in-school assistance for their disabilities] and with access and support services and things like that are now saying, ‘Wait a minute, I don’t want lowered expectations.’”³ Spending most of his career as “the chairman or ranking member on the largest domestic policy subcommittee at Appropriations,” a position he achieved in 1987 by aiding Senator Fritz Hollings get funding for a cancer center in South Carolina, Harkin was able to fund more than twenty-one educational bills for disabled students.⁴

---
⁴ Roll Call http://www.rollcall.com/news/home/tom-harkin-exit-interview
Public education has undergone its fair share of transformations in recent years, none more so than the institutional restructuring resulting from IDEA. While much legislation aimed at revising public education was passed before and after IDEA, the act stands out as one of the most significant agents of institutional change in American education. This change occurred not as a contingency of IDEA, but indeed, as its fundamental goal. IDEA served to transform public education into the institution that now exists. In doing so, it changed the inherent institutional power relations, making parents, rather than teachers, the dominant actors in public education.

To fully understand this, one must appreciate that public schools are political institutions that some argue are at the core of American democracy. IDEA was proposed, written and passed into law with the utmost benevolence with Senator Harkin at the helm. Indeed, when Congress amended a previous act and created IDEA, it “sought to improve educational equity by helping children with disabilities” and today “virtually no child with a disability is excluded from public school.”\(^5\) However, since politicians and bureaucrats are utility maximizers, IDEA has been implemented in a way that serves these individuals’ private interests. As a result of IDEA, legislators empowered parents to “call the shots” and as the new dominant actors they have directed a profound rewriting of work rules.

Teachers used to be the primary decision makers regarding how best to serve students with special needs. Backed by this federal legislation, politicians and bureaucrats now determine how teachers will work with special needs students by enforcing new

work rules. The old rule that puts the power to decide what is the best educational course for a special needs student was rewritten due to IDEA, and with this change a new set of motivating dynamics has emerged. To understand the dynamics motivating this transformation in the nation’s education system, “new institutionalism”—and more specifically the “manipulated institution” perspective of “new institutionalism”—will be employed in this paper.

Definitions of New Institutionalism – Rational Choice, Historical, and Sociological

Institutions that intend to survive in their environment can only do so by achieving legitimacy. Only by “[incorporating] the practices and procedures defined by prevailing rationalized concepts of organizational work” can institutions “increase their legitimacy and their survival prospects.” Traditionally, scholars regarded institutions as collectives where individual actions are aggregated in accordance with predetermined arrangements. These actions are designed to foster and maintain legitimacy for the
institutions. Institutions that intend to survive in their environment can only do so by achieving legitimacy. By contrast, “new institutionalism” is far less concerned with investigating institutions’ formal structures and constitutions but, rather, is focused on identifying the deeper structures that create, maintain and change the work rules both in and around institutions.  

In 1996 Vivien Lowndes provided a baseline definition of an institution based on its slippery and nebulous connotation and nature. “Institution” is used to “refer to social phenomena at many different levels—informal codes of behavior, written contracts, even complex organizations,” but it also can be used to evaluate these phenomena and encompasses more than just a simple definition. Lowndes divides “institution” into three main elements and defines each element as explained in Table 1.1

10 Lowndes 183.
11 Lowndes 182
12 Lowndes 182
Institutions have a legitimacy and show stability over time. Institutions have a legitimacy beyond the preferences of individual actors. They are valued in themselves and not simply for their immediate purposes and outputs. Institutions may gain their legitimacy because of their relative stability over time, or because of their link with a ‘sense of place.’

Table 1.1

One can find the three traditionally recognized “new institutionalisms” of political science in Lowndes definition: (1) rational choice institutionalism, (2) historical institutionalism, and (3) sociological institutionalism. Proponents of rational choice institutionalism would agree that institutions provide opportunities while imposing constraints, forcing rational actors “who pursue their preferences by following a ‘logic of calculation’ within political institutions, defined as structures of incentives.” These rational actors maximize their benefits working within the confines of their specific institution. Historical institutionalists argue that the emphasis on the “development of political institutions [through] regularized patterns and routinized practices subject to a logic of path-dependence” legitimizes and stabilizes institutions over time. The supporters of sociological institutionalism would agree with Lowndes that institutions have formal and informal sociological norms and customs, forcing “social agents who act according to a ‘logic of appropriateness’ within political institutions, defined as socially constituted and culturally framed rules and norms.”

---

13 Lowndes 182.  
14 Schmidt 1.  
15 Schmidt 2.  
16 Schmidt 2.  
17 Schmidt 2.
institutionalism” a bit further is vital to correctly view public education as a manipulated
institution.

No matter which theory of “new institutionalism” one adopts, all proponents of
the field are “less interested in describing formal structures and constitutions, and more in
unearthing the deep structure and ‘rules of the game’” which influence institutional
behavior. Rational choice institutionalists concern themselves with trying to understand
why rational actors make the choices they do when the specific constraints of their
respective institution are placed upon them. Historical institutionalists seek to understand
why actors in an institution are so devout to carrying out their roles due to sense of duty.
Sociological institutionalists believe that actors do what they do because it is the way it
has always been done, and they seek to understand these routines. With so many
variations, pinpointing what can profoundly change an institution and transform it into
something that is quite different than what was previously known to exist is difficult. It
is helpful to imagine the environment that a specific institution operates in and the work
rules that it follows during operation. Institutions are not “things but processes” that must
be sustained over time to add stability to a specific institution. Institutions begin to
change when processes are interrupted or new rules are established.\textsuperscript{18} When work rules
change, the environment of the specific institution changes as well. Work rules “may be
de-institutionalized because they no longer confer legitimacy, or cease to ‘fit’ with a
changing environment.”\textsuperscript{19} A changing environment leads to “manipulated” and changing
work rules and ends with an altered institution.

\textsuperscript{18} Lowndes 194.
\textsuperscript{19} Lowndes 194.
How or why these processes change and rules are rewritten is where new institutionalism theories come into play. Was some type of rational choice made? Was action taken due to a perceived sense of duty or routine? When an institution changes, there is a scramble to discover why such a change took place. Indeed, this is all part of the institutional “lifecycle, whereby rules and norms develop, become recognized and adhered to, and then fall into disuse, to be replaced by new arrangements. Change and stability are stages in an institutional lifecycle.”

The Manipulated Institution

Lowndes further clarifies how one can identify changes in an institution by providing six vignettes that “pick up the ‘baseline’ elements of a definition of institutions, [while] also highlighting more contested variables. The vignettes provide a ‘tool box’ of ideas and concepts from which to build propositions about institutional change.” Classic institutionalism used economic success as the barometer to determine whether a specific institution would remain stable, but new institutionalism emphasizes the need for institutions to be legitimate within a larger environment in which many are operating at one time. Legitimacy breeds stability and thus brings economic success. One of Lowndes’ vignettes described what she calls the “manipulated institution” and it is defined as a political institution that is a hindrance to effective interaction and exchange rather than an assistance to these goals. These institutions are manipulated by politicians and bureaucrats, seeking to serve individual, private interests.

---

20 Lowndes 194.
21 Lowndes 184.
22 Lowndes 188.
Such legislators seek to heighten their status and gain wealth by increasing the budgets that they control while also maximizing the number of votes they will receive in the next election. To increase their budgets and maximize votes, legislators will promise benefits to their constituents that they cannot fully deliver, creating “waste and oversupply of government services.” Operating under the model of the manipulated institution, there is no rhyme or reason as to what facet of public life politicians and bureaucrats will try to change to maximize their benefits and thus manipulate the institution. Once a suitable institution has presented itself as one that can be manipulated to create benefits for legislators, the process will begin quite quickly. Through manipulation, these legislators will begin to redesign the institution in question.

The easiest method for manipulation is to change the work rules for the individuals who operate in that institution. Rules, routines, norms, and identities can be both instruments of stability and arenas of change. Work rules can be manipulated, through legislation, by legislators who seek to fulfill promises made in order to increase their wealth and maximize their votes. Once work rules have been changed, the susceptible institution that has been targeted has now been manipulated and can serve to meet the ends that legislators have in mind. The methods employed to do this differ. Work rules can be changed through “illegitimate but technically efficient means, as well as legitimate but inefficient means” depending on what route legislators are able and choose to take.

---

23 Lowndes 188.
24 March and Olsen 13.
25 March and Olsen 13.
New institutionalism emphasizes the need for institutional legitimacy, not economic power, for an institution to be considered stable. This “legitimacy depends not only on showing that actions accomplish appropriate objectives, but also that actors behave in accordance with legitimate procedures ingrained in a culture.”

It is possible to connect these new institutionalist theories, particularly the idea of the manipulated institution, by focusing on the work rules that have changed for public educators under IDEA.

**Manipulating the Work Rules of Public Education**

Why would legislators want to change the work rules for public educators? To maximize their benefits, legislators need to be reelected. Through legislation like IDEA, legislators can appeal to public sentiment by proclaiming that they are doing everything they can to assist those American youths who are deprived of a good education. Parents of students with special needs are politically nuanced and active constituents. Legislators want their votes, and supporting special needs legislation is a simple and rational way to garner them. Indeed, “the learning disability community has been the chief lobbying force for this [legislation’s] continued funding” and often is a bi-partisan effort. While Republican legislators are often suspicious of federal education spending, funding for special needs students has a “decades-long history of widespread cross-party support.”

This precedent provides legislators of any ideology, belonging to either party, expectations of increased constituent support when their efforts are aimed at increasing special education funding. Bi-partisanship “reflects the benefits of IDEA to families who

---

27 Colker 14.
have a lot of political capital and can take advantage of the parent-centric nature of IDEA advocacy.”

Indeed, what legislator would want to speak out against helping children who are less fortunate due to a physical and/or mental disability that they were born with or developed later?

This is the gateway through which manipulation occurs. Legislators will continually support statutes that increases funding for special education, and will receive support from the special education community. This increased financial support strengthens the laws presented in IDEA and subsequent legislation, further changing the work rules and institution of public education. Indeed, “an institutional framework may collapse because rules no longer serve the interests of dominant actors—in the context of changing interests and/or shifting power relations between actors.”

The institutional framework that existed before IDEA was much different than the one that exists now. Teachers used to be the dominant actors in the institution, but through legislation, the power shifted to the parents—specifically the parents of special needs students. Due to this, the old rules no longer applied and change was inevitable. Parents of special needs students, as the new dominant actors, changed the institution of public education with the power given to them by legislators.

Through IDEA’s strict language and guidelines legislators have rewritten many of the work rules for teachers. Teachers are no longer the quintessential experts determining what is best for their special needs students. IDEA puts much more of that power in the hands of a subset of parents. Would most teachers truly risk their employment by speaking out against IDEA and its mission to provide a free and appropriate education to

---

28 Colker 106.
29 Lowndes 194.
special needs students?\textsuperscript{30} School districts, administrators, and teachers who go down this path can face discipline for noncompliance and end up in court.\textsuperscript{31} Now through the sweeping legislation of IDEA, legislators can request more and more federal funds for their district or state, ballooning their prestige and helping their cause to be reelected.

Legislators are the facilitators of the shifting power relationship between teachers (the former, dominant actors of public education) and parents of special needs students (the new dominant actors) through statutes like IDEA. These laws have succeeded, intentionally or not, in changing the environment of public education, by granting power to the special education community. The courts have continually ruled in favor of special needs parents, solidifying the shift in power.\textsuperscript{32} There is no incentive for legislators to intervene and manipulate the institution any further, as they have already garnered what they need from the votes of the special needs community. These legislators do not want to alienate a reliable voting base and suffer disastrous political expenses. Therefore, teachers have little hope of regaining their status as dominant actors in this institution. This begs the question: why did teachers not try and use their power as a voting bloc to stop this shift in power? If they did try and fight back, why were they unsuccessful?

\textsuperscript{30} See \textit{Cleveland Board of Education v. Loudermill} (http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/470/532.html) for U.S. Supreme Court precedent that tenured teachers must be afforded due process before termination. Attaining tenure guarantees that a teacher can request a hearing within seventeen calendar days of the written termination notice, but the mediator at this hearing can make an independent decision based on the facts of the case. This “hearing officer” cannot live in the school district and must be able to render a decision within thirty days. The teacher enacting due process can allow the school board to choose this hearing officer with or without the input of the teacher. See P.A. 97-008 (SB 7) for further clarification on termination process for tenured teachers (http://ssl.csg.org/dockets/2013cycle/2013sslvolume/2013volumeoriginalbills/2033a05ileducation.pdf)


\textsuperscript{32} See cases in footnote 31
In 1992, high school history teacher Michael Withers attempted to stop this shift in power on his own. The Grafton High School teacher refused to read his exams orally to special needs student D.D. Doe (an alias was used to protect the student’s identity) despite being legally bound to do so by the education plan of the student. The request violated Withers’ set of work rules and his refusal prompted a lawsuit from the parents of Doe, who sought monetary damages. A jury found in favor of Doe’s parents and awarded them damages against Withers, who was required to pay $5000 in compensatory damages and $10,000 in punitive damages. This case set a precedent for future lawsuits in which individual teachers refused to follow accommodations that they themselves did not create for their students. Parents, the dominant actors in this area of policy, now had legal recourse to ensure accommodations they desired for their child were enacted by institutional professionals. Doe v. Withers was a constant reminder of this.33

Surely teachers could rely on their unions and education associations to fight back against the shifting power dynamics and work rule changes. In reality, teacher unions are on the side of the legislators and direct their membership to adhere to the changing work rule conditions in exchange for more political clout. The United Federation of Teachers tells its members that “if the rights of special education students in your school are being violated, take prompt action” and to speak to union leadership if other members are not following the legislation.34 Not only are unions not supporting their members to maintain power in this institution, they are actively working to further strip power from teachers.

33 Doe v. Withers, Civil Action 92-C-92 (West Virginia Circuit Court, Taylor County, 1993).
The payoff for these actions is evident, as the “rights of hundreds of thousands of teachers and other public employees are being trampled upon by powerful, highly partisan and deceptive unions” which are using dues to fund political action committees that support candidates who are primarily focused on increasing wages and keeping benefits for teachers. Increasing wages and keeping a solid benefit package for teachers will ensure continued interest in the field, despite the shifting power dynamics, and continue the influx of cash through dues for teachers’ unions. It will also go a long to placating union members directing union influence to support higher wages for teachers.

Legislators support parents of special needs students’ wishes regarding the treatment of their children and teachers’ desire for greater pay and benefits at the expense of teachers’ control over their classrooms.

The Tool of “Manipulation” – A History of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

1975’s Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA) had been a valiant effort by Congress to assuage much of the anger directed at public education; particularly public education’s lack of adequate special education. EHA was designed to improve educational offerings for all students labelled “disabled.” The decisions of federal, state, and many lower courts reflected that the federal government never considered that these disabilities varied so greatly that a universal approach to aiding disabled students was

---

impossible. The significance of these disabilities and how they affected each special needs student differed as well, further strengthening the need for legislation like IDEA.\textsuperscript{36}

EHA retained much of the power to implement changes in schools in the hands of teachers and their immediate administrators. Indeed, teachers were considered the experts and thus were presumed to be in the best position to decide what methods would work with disabled students. Teachers were free to decide what rules they wanted to follow in terms of their teaching methods, if they were following the legitimizing force of the EHA. Teachers began teaching students with disabilities at the same time using the same methods, because it was less taxing. Admittedly, a “one size fits all approach” to this did not work and immediately the shortcomings of EHA began to come to the surface. EHA affected poor and minority children as well as the middle-class; indeed, it did not discern socioeconomic background in its affect, creating tremendous problems for all families involved.\textsuperscript{37} Public education could have rallied to fix the problems with EHA internally, but the institution’s lack of action raised the stakes for parents of special needs children and provided legislators with a potential payoff if they were willing to intervene.

IDEA was designed to remedy that and, as Senator Simon stated, recognize the individual and not the disability. At the same time, IDEA would change the rules that teachers had created for themselves, forcing public education to become an institution that encouraged “collective interpretation through social processes of interaction, deliberation and reasoning.”\textsuperscript{38} Teachers lost much of their individual autonomy once IDEA was passed. The growing concern about special needs students from their parents

\textsuperscript{36} Colker 224.
\textsuperscript{37} Colker 42-43.
\textsuperscript{38} March and Olsen 12.
motivated their respective legislators in Washington and opened the door for “manipulation” of America’s public education system. Legislators could now “pursue a single course of utility-maximizing action” upon which the “manipulated institution” demands by giving quarter to embattled parents of special needs students in the fight for education equality while at the same time receiving economic benefits from Congress and the votes of constituents who saw their actions as noble; particularly from parents of special needs students.39 Evidence will be presented later showing that parents of special need students have become the greatest influence on changing work rules for teachers.

The stated goals of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act are numerous and traverse ideological barriers. Congress argued that “improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities.”40 IDEA found widespread support from the public purporting, as it did, to help a particularly sympathetic group like special needs students, and it took only a year from its introduction until it was signed into law. It passed the United States Senate needing only a voice vote and faced no objections in the House of Representatives. Before IDEA’s passage, all children with disabilities did not receive appropriate educational services, were not taught in the same classroom as their able peers, and many were enrolled in districts that did not have the resources necessary to meet their needs which forced parents to look elsewhere.41

39 Lowndes 188.
40 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.
41 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.
The expectations of the families of students with special needs were that IDEA would remedy many of the components of public education that were not serving the best interests of all special needs students. The Senate emphasized that special needs students receiving no education should immediately be placed into the best educational environment possible but “nowhere in its formula was consideration of the financial resources of the local school district to meet the needs of children with disabilities.”  

As the “manipulated institution” perspective predicts, legislators overpromised in order to maximize their benefits by deflecting funding the programs back to the state education agencies.

Congress believed that “states should be thankful that Congress was willing to fund any of the costs associated with special education because those are local school district expenses, not federal expenses.”  

But without as much federal money as was promised, parents of special needs students turned to state and local governments, where funding was even more scarce. Since these state-level agencies could not deliver on the federal promise, parents turned to teachers to implement the necessary changes in their classrooms for special needs students. Parents found many teachers unwilling to alter the way they planned and taught students with special needs, hesitant to change the established work rules.

This created the need for legislation, which forced teachers to change the institutional work rules and gave parents the right to due process if these changes were not implemented. Parents can highlight procedural and/or substantive violations of the

---

42 Colker 37.
43 Colker 37.
They can call teachers on the carpet for their refusal to adhere to the new work rules as required by law. This gives parents the dominance to force teachers to do as required less they face disciplinary action.

As Lowndes argued, “institutions change when [their] processes are either interrupted suddenly, or evolve to the extent that they produce quite different rules.” That parents did not see the work rules for public educators changing at a fast-enough pace, as evident by their criticisms of EHA resulted in their pressuring legislators to promote the “sudden interruption” of IDEA through which legislators overpromised benefits in order to maximize their own. This legislation would codify the work rule changes in federal law and shift power dynamics to the parents of special needs students. These parents now had the authority to enforce the changes they wanted.

IDEA has undergone many revisions since its initial implementation, but all manifestations have kept the requirement from EHA that states provide a free and appropriate education (FAPE) for all students including those with disabilities. Each state is obligated to provide FAPE to each eligible child no later than the child’s third birthday. The two major foundations of each state’s FAPE requirement is the development of an individualized education program (IEP) for every student with a disability and that these students are educated in the least restrictive environment (LRE). Both statutes were implemented to ensure that students with disabilities receive an education tailored to their needs in an environment that does not highlight or augment their disability. The implementation of IEPs in a LRE has been part of federal regulations

---

44 Colker 138.
45 Lowndes 194
46 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Regulations, 34 C.F.R. §300 et seq.
well before IDEA, most notable in EHA, but the 1990 act served to revitalize their use in public schools. The ability of legislators to include the IEP and LRE in IDEA, the “gateway” of “manipulation”, caused some of the most severe changes to work rules in public education.

The requirement that each state’s education system offer an IEP for students in an environment that is non-intrusive and least restrictive has unintentionally opened doors for parents of special needs students to influence and change the status quo. Both statutes continue to provide openings for legislators to continue their manipulation of public education by continually creating more legislation that increases regulation, decreases teacher autonomy and provides payoffs for certain of their constituents in the form of increasing power over teachers. IDEA’s own ambiguous language about how to effectively teach students with disabilities offers general solutions using educational buzzwords like “whole-school approaches, scientifically-based early reading programs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and early intervening services to reduce the need to label children as disabled in order to address the learning and behavioral needs of such children.”

There are no clearly stated interventions in the bill; indeed legislators left those to the experts to create and implement. The laws “were elegant and relatively straightforward” but the implementation of the regulations remained extremely complex. If no one can clearly understand what the new work rules should look like, then legislators would be the ones who could define what these rules should be in

---

accordance with the wishes of their constituents. If the exact work rules are kept vague, there is less chance for opposition. Legislators’ definition of these new work rules can create a payoff for parents of students with special needs, who have become the dominant actors in this institution and have gained the upper-hand in the institutional power struggle.

**Shortcomings of Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975)**

IDEA stated explicitly that the EHA had been impeded by numerous oversights when it was crafted in 1975, and it sought to remedy these one by one. The crux of these remedies focused on improving the entirety of special education by improving each individual special education student through an education plan specifically designed to work within the boundaries of and with the limitations of each individual student’s disabilities. In a sense, lawmakers saw EHA as hampered by low expectations and lacking research; indeed, IDEA stated that “30 years of research and experience [had] demonstrated that the education of students can be made more effective.”

It also kept too much autonomy in the hands of individual teachers, allowing them to maintain their current set of work rules. This retained teachers’ power, keeping it out of the hands of parents.

IDEA made explicit recommendations to help change these processes: providing access to the regular education classroom curriculum for students labeled disabled, giving parents more power to ensure quality education for their disabled children, ensure special education provides services for disabled children and does not just warehouse them in a

---

49 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.
special needs classroom away from the rest of the student population, increasing aids and supports for disabled students in the regular education classroom, providing more education and training for professionals working with disabled students, giving schools incentives to provide programs that could help reduce the number of students labeled disabled, “focusing resources on teaching and learning while reducing paperwork and requirements that do not assist in improving educational results,” and increasing the use of technology to assist disabled students and “maximize accessibility.”

Key to this feature is the provision of more education and training for professionals. Using required professional development programs, legislators could now force public employees to be trained to better serve in the “manipulated institution” under new work rules that deliver power into the hands of parents. This satisfies legislators desires for maximized votes. Coincidentally, parents often influence the “experts” that provide professional development or take the role as “experts” themselves as effective advocates to ensure that their children receive adequate educational programs. Teachers are often given professional development by outside agencies whose instructors may have ideologies that are supportive of maintaining the role of parents as the dominant actors.

EHA emphasized that schools which received government funding were doing their part to ensure that special needs students received access to education appropriate for their cognitive level and at least one nutritious meal a day. This broad definition of equal access to education lacked scope and direction for many school districts. Districts

---

50 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.
51 Lowndes 188.
52 Colker 107.
interpreted the requirement that special needs students have access to regular education classroom curriculum as a “separate but equal” type of statute; one that could be accomplished by teaching special needs students the regular education curriculum in a special education classroom apart from regular education students in a regular education setting. Any student that had been identified as having special needs could be removed from the regular education classroom for all of or part of the day and placed in a special education classroom with other special education students. Throughout the day it was possible that these special needs students did not interact with regular education students, nor were they taught by a regular education teacher.

EHA was designed to force schools to create education plans tailored to each individual special needs student, but the written law treats special needs students as a collective, thus creating a loophole that school districts exploited. This was an aspect of the bill that, admittedly, many institutions of public education did not implement to a level that was beneficial for every student. It was misinterpretations like this that further opened the door for legislators to begin their “manipulation” of the institution and underscored the fact that the locus of power in public education was changing from local school officials to parents.

IDEA made these types of practices illegal. Outlined in its purpose, IDEA was designed to “ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education that emphasized special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living.” Special needs students being educated as a collective was in

---

54 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.
violation of this nebulous purpose, giving an advantage to students and parents to ensure that school districts were creating educational plans that suited each individual student. IDEA’s empowerment of parents was key for legislators that supported its passage. First, it makes voting parents happy and ensured that they would most likely cast a ballot for that public official in the next election. Second, it created a need for more federal funding to be added to state budgets to provide training for school districts to create adequate educational plans. This satisfied both needs of legislators. It also satisfied parents due to their new status as the dominant actors of the institution.

**IDEA – Congressional Findings & Purpose**

The Congressional findings of one of Senator Harkin’s landmark achievements echo his sentiments about growing up in an educational world absent IDEA. Disabilities were “a natural part of the human experience and in no way diminishes the right of the individuals to participate or contribute to society” and it was the most appropriate of goals that Congress “[improve] educational results for children with disabilities [in line with their] national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities.”

Congress’ findings stated in IDEA highlight the shortcomings of its predecessor, EHA, for not providing appropriate educational services to special needs children, excluding them from the public school system and from being educated with their peers, and for forcing families to look outside of the public school system for services that were not provided due to a lack of adequate resources. EHA did introduce the concept of a free

---

56 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.
and appropriate education for many special needs students to be enacted in the least restrictive environment, but Congress admits that EHA was “impeded by low expectations, and an insufficient focus on applying replicable research on proven methods of teaching and learning for children with disabilities.”57 It did not empower parents to the level that they desired. The findings in IDEA are pure Harkin; one who was always pushing for wider implementation and an increased budget to aid students with special needs. This noble pursuit also provided an opening for parents to shift the power dynamic, which was not necessarily what Senator Harkin intended.

IDEA proposed a series of changes to EHA, based on 30 years of research and experience, to make the education of children with disabilities more effective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Goals of IDEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Having high expectations for such children and ensuring their access to the general education curriculum in the regular classroom, to the maximum extent possible, in order to meet developmental goals and, to the maximum extent possible, the challenging expectations that have been established for all children and be prepared to lead productive and independent adult lives, to the maximum extent possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Strengthening the role and responsibility of parents and ensuring that families of such children have meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children at school and at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Coordinating this title with other local, educational service agency, State, and Federal school improvement efforts, including improvement efforts under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in order to ensure that such children benefit from such efforts and that special education can become a service for such children rather than a place where such children are sent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Providing appropriate special education and related services, and aids and supports in the regular education classroom, to such children, whenever appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Supporting high-quality, intensive preservice preparation and professional development for all personnel who work with children with disabilities in order to ensure that such personnel have the skills and knowledge necessary to improve the academic achievement and functional performance of children with disabilities, including the use of scientifically based instructional practices, to the maximum extent possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(F) Providing incentives for whole-school approaches, scientifically based early reading programs, positive behavioral interventions and supports, and early intervening services to reduce the need to label children as disabled in order to address the learning and behavioral needs of such children.

(G) Focusing resources on teaching and learning while reducing paperwork and requirements that do not assist in improving educational results.

(H) Supporting the development and use of technology, including assistive technology devices and assistive technology services, to maximize accessibility for children with disabilities.

Table 1.2

IDEA recognized that the states and local education agencies (LEA; public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a state to control a school district) are responsible for providing education to students with special needs, but clearly defined the role of the federal government as the last line of defense of the equal protection and due process clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment as it relates to education. Indeed, it is “in the national interest that the Federal Government have a supporting role in assisting State and local efforts to educate children with disabilities to improve results for such children and ensure equal protection of the law.”

It is noticeable here as well how work rules were changed to allow “manipulation” to continue. The LEAs functioned as the authoritative arm of legislators to implement the statute, force work rule changes on teachers, and put power in the hands of parents to ensure that special needs laws were being implemented. This rallied parents to keep voting for legislators who enacted the laws in the first place.

Two seminal court cases in interpreting the Fourteenth Amendment’s role in special education were 1971’s Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and 1972’s Mills v. Board of Education. PARC
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“contested a state law that specifically allowed public schools to deny services to children ‘who have not attained a mental age of five years’ at the time they would ordinarily enroll in first grade.” The Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania found, due to protections inherent in the Fourteenth Amendment, that schools could not deny educational services to students with severe disabilities. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania finally consented to provide mentally retarded children a free public education up to the age of 21. PARC also established “the standard of appropriateness,” which guarantees an education appropriate to a student’s learning capacity.

Mills was filed against the District of Columbia public schools for refusing to enroll and/or expelling a total of 12,340 students with disabilities. The U.S. District Court ruled that “school districts were constitutionally prohibited from deciding that they had inadequate resources to serve children with disabilities because the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment would not allow the burden of insufficient funding to fall more heavily on children with disabilities than on other children.” Parents of special needs children now had the right to due process if they felt their child’s education was underfunded. Due to the Mills ruling, special needs students, and more importantly their parents, now had the right to determine whether they were receiving a “meaningful” public education. Since the definition of “meaningful” was set by parents, they could also determine if this right was violated. If the parental definition of “meaningful public education” was not met, special needs students were “entitled to full procedural

---

62 Martin, Martin, and Terman 28.
63 Martin, Martin, and Terman 28.
protections…access to school records, a right to be heard and represented by legal
counsel at hearings…and regularly scheduled status reviews.” 64 Parents, not teachers,
now had the power to determine the value of the education their special needs child was
receiving and invoke a legal challenge when the education plan was unsatisfactory.

The statutory rights that PARC and Mills created moved the balance of power to
make decisions on who should receive special services away from school districts and
towards parents of special needs students. 65 Students, and their parents, were now
afforded “full procedural protections” if any school district considered a change in their
educational status. The precedents set in PARC and Mills withstood more than thirty
federal court decisions to remain a pivotal part of IDEA. With more and more lawsuits
resulting in favorable outcomes for parents, the ability of teachers to fight back against
these changes became nearly impossible the longer IDEA remained law. 66

While IDEA does ensure state and LEA’s will keep much of their autonomy in
deciding what is best for special needs students in their respective jurisdictions, the
Federal Government’s claim that it will remain only to assist these agencies in education
is specious at best based on even a cursory reading of IDEA. Indeed, most IDEA dictates
federal statute after federal statute to ensure that special needs students receive an
appropriate public education. State and LEA’s risk important funding and grants if they
deny the federal intervention into their special education programs. Though it appears
that the state and the LEA’s residing therein can make many of their own decisions, the
federal government’s ability to provide funding to individual states in compliance with

64 Martin, Martin, and Terman 28.
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IDEA serves as a powerful motivator to tow the federal line when it comes to educational policy. Parents, now in a position to be a whistleblower if proper procedures are not followed, provide a powerful check on local and state educational authorities to ensure compliance with IDEA.67

IDEA’s purpose is laid out in four succinct goals. First, IDEA ensures that all children with disabilities have access to FAPE, that their rights and the rights of their parents are protected, and that federal, state, and local education agencies will provide necessary education to these students. Second, IDEA assists states in developing early intervention systems for infants and toddlers who may have disabilities. Parents now are the driving force to identify these disabilities in their children with the assistance of doctors.68 Third, IDEA puts into place programs that ensure the necessary tools are available to parents to improve educational results for children with disabilities. Last, IDEA assesses the effectiveness of federal, state, and local agencies efforts to educate children with disabilities.69

IDEA defines a disabled child as one “with intellectual disabilities, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance, orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities who needs special education and related services.”70 Due to the ambiguous and general nature of some of the categories, the framers of IDEA unknowingly opened the door for many instances of litigation once it was passed, which only seeks to further change work rules
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no matter the outcome. This continues to increase the role of parents as dominant actors because any work rule changes will diminish the power of teachers.

**Dissemination of IDEA**

![Diagram of IDEA dissemination](image)

Figure 1.1

There are two entities responsible to ensure that schools accomplish these four goals. First is the previously mentioned LEA which is usually represented by an elected public board of education. Working in conjunction with the LEA are the educational service agencies (ESA) who are authorized by state law to “develop, manage, and provide services or programs to local educational agencies” and act as “an administrative agency for purposes of the provision of special education and related services.” ESA’s are made up of independently run entities that usually serve many schools under the jurisdiction of different LEA’s. Intermediate units are the most common example of ESA’s and are staffed with individuals that are usually utilized as professional development instructors to teachers in each subsequent LEA that their ESA serves. Figure 1.1 provides an organized illustration of this relationship, but a fictional scenario might be easier to understand.
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In this scenario, Senator A proposes and succeeds in getting passed an amendment to IDEA that changes one of its provisions. Since the goal of Senator A is to empower parents by changing work rules, any revision that creates such a change is effective. Such revisions have occurred numerous times in the form of amendments to IDEA: No Child Left Behind Amendment in 2001 and Every Student Succeeds in 2015. Responsible for ensuring that this revision is put into place, state education departments decide how they want to implement these changes into their school districts.

Most American public school districts are administered by an elected school board, which approves curricular decisions and oversees the functioning of its schools—secondary schools, intermediate schools, and elementary. State departments of education will direct its LEAs to implement the revisions to IDEA by going through each district’s central administrative body: the superintendent, assistant superintendent(s), and the director of special education. These entities are responsible for training the teachers in their district’s schools so that they understand and can implement the decisions.

At the same time, ESAs are brought in by the LEAs to provide even more training to the school district staff. This same process is repeatedly followed and the result is as expected: work rules are changed, teacher opposition is minimized, and “manipulation” continues. Teachers that desire to speak out against these changes hold back due to fear of losing their job or other repercussions. Even with tenure, teachers face a defined albeit slow dismissal process if they refuse to honor the legislator-granted rights in IDEA: teachers can be placed on an improvement plan and then terminated if they fail to meet the benchmarks of those plans. Parents have the power to force this discipline through due process.
Was this the intention of legislators all along? Did they seek to change the work rules of teachers in order to appease parents and thus maximize votes (as well as increase their budgets to ensure the change in work rules)? Due to the bi-partisan support of special needs laws, legislators know that they can “[pursue] utility-maximizing action” and have the support from constituents no matter their ideology. Legislators have no fear of political repercussions because these laws are universally supported by a majority of constituents. This illustrates the “manipulated” nature of public education; it does not continue to follow the same structure as “classic institutionalism” would imply. Instead, it is an organism that responds constantly to internal and external pressures and changing power dynamics. Legislators could not have known how the institution of public education would look once their manipulation of the institution began. Looking at public education and IDEA through the lens of “new institutionalism,” the consequences of the legislation put forth is that power has been transferred from teacher to parent. The work rules of public education now reflect this change in power dynamics.

Change to Work Rules - Free Appropriate Public Education

One of the major hallmarks of IDEA is the continued emphasis on free appropriate public education (FAPE) that started in EHA. IDEA’s general definition of FAPE encompassed “special education and related services that have been provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge, meet the standards of the State educational agency, include an appropriate preschool, elementary school, or secondary school education in the State involved. And are provided in
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conformity with the individualized education program required” by later statutes in IDEA. FAPE was Congress’ answer to the number of school districts that educated their special needs students as a collective instead of a case-by-case basis. Parents of special needs students pursued specialized education for their children less those students’ school district be in violation of FAPE and subject to legal action.

One of the Supreme Court’s first major interpretations of FAPE was their 1982 decision in Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley. Amy Rowley was a deaf child who was placed in a regular education first grade classroom, given a hearing aid, tutored individually one hour per day, and given speech therapy classes three hours each week. Rowley’s parents also demanded that she be provided a qualified sign language interpreter for all her academic classes. When the school district denied this request based on the opinion of an interpreter that Amy Rowley had while in kindergarten, her parents sued the school district claiming she was not being provided FAPE. Both the district court and the U.S. Court of Appeals sided with the Rowley family and the district court argued that Amy was not receiving FAPE because she did not have an “opportunity to achieve her potential commensurate with the opportunity provided to other children.” The Supreme Court agreed to hear the appeal of the Court of Appeal’s decision. The Court overturned the decision of the Appeals Court and defined FAPE in the following manner:

“Insofar as a State is required to provide a handicapped child with a “free appropriate public education,” we hold that it satisfies this requirement by providing personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit the child to benefit educationally from that instruction. Such
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instruction and services must be provided at public expense, must meet the State’s educational standards, must approximate the grade levels used in the State’s regular education, and must comport with the child’s IEP (individualized education program). In addition, the IEP, and there the personalized instruction, should be formulated in accordance with the requirements of the Act and, if the child is being educated in the regular classrooms of the public education system, should be reasonably calculated to enable the child to achieve passing marks and advance from grade to grade.\textsuperscript{76}

The Supreme Court’s decision in \textit{Rowley} emphasized the term “reasonably calculated” in terms of how personalized instruction should be implemented into a special needs students IEP.

\textbf{Change to Work Rules - Individualized Education Program}

There is no greater agent of change found in IDEA than one if its keystones, the individualized education program. Remembering Lowndes’ claim about the maximizing behavior of legislators: “they seek to augment their status and material well-being through increases in budgets under their control while maximizing votes with promises of benefits and service enhancements,” one will find that nothing in IDEA satisfies these behaviors, while bringing about the necessary change in work rules to appease parents, quite like the IEP.\textsuperscript{77} If an IEP is implemented correctly and every step is followed to the letter, it will cost school districts money and cost teachers their autonomy in the classroom due to the scripted nature of the IEP. It will inform the teacher how he/she must legally teach the individual student whose IEP it is. A teacher can no longer create the pedagogical rules in their classroom, but it can be manipulated or influenced by

\begin{itemize}
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outside forces. If the teacher does not comply with the IEP, parents can pursue due process.

“The keystone of the FAPE requirement [found in IDEA] was that all eligible students with disabilities would receive a special education provided in conformity with his or her Individualized Education Program.”78 The individualized education program is used in IDEA to denote “a statement of the child’s present level of academic achievement and functional performance including how the child’s disability affects the child’s involvement and progress in the general education curriculum” and “a statement of measurable annual goals including academic and functional goals.”79 The IEP is meant to function as a roadmap that helps a disabled student find success in a general education classroom. Once implemented however, many educators have found them burdensome to the point of directly interfering with classroom teaching. The development of IEPs consume large amounts of time and “could diminish the real purpose of teaching.”80 Indeed, teachers who truly implemented IEPs as they are stated in IDEA would need to implement precision planning of their lessons, each specifically tailored to their students with disabilities. If such planning is not undertaken, “effective teaching is less likely to occur and cannot be documented.”81 It would also lead to teachers being accused of noncompliance with IDEA.

Before IDEA, schools did not have to allow parents to provide input on their children whenever an IEP was being written or revised. The new legislation forced
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schools to allow parental input in all IEPs with no limit imposed and allowed parents to
voice their concerns/opinions during IEP meetings. Parents could now demand additions
to their special needs child’s education plan and call for modifications if they believed it
was necessary. Teachers, by law, now are powerless to stop these revisions if parents are
determined.82

One of the key components of every IEP is a section known as Program
Modifications and Specially-Designed Instruction (SDI). The purpose of the SDI is to
“include adaptations, accommodations, or modifications to the general education
curriculum, as appropriate for a student with a disability.”83 The SDI is where the IEP
truey earns its “individualized” title because it is responsible for creating a tailor-made
style of teaching to benefit each student that has been identified as having a disability.
These modifications do not simply help the student overcome their disability and thus
learn required curriculum in an effective fashion; indeed, it alters the way a teacher must
teach that curriculum in line with the wishes of the parents. This changes work rules as
parents have the power to say what SDIs should be included and which should be
removed. Only through approval of the parents can this be accomplished by teachers.

Every educator must adhere to the SDIs as they are listed, because the IEP
represents a legal document that cannot be ignored or overlooked.84 With the SDIs
providing a strict script that every teacher must follow, there is little room left for any
teacher autonomy in the classroom as their work rules have been changed. Parents now
have the power as the dominant actors and know the leverage they possess by adding or
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removing SDIs found in their IEP. The changing institutional work rules are evident in the power possessed by parents to determine how their special needs child should be taught.

Special needs students benefit from their IEPs and SDIs because they have debilitating learning disabilities that can be aided with proper accommodations. While some legislators may have imagined that this legislation would ensure that every special needs child was having their needs met by their IEP, each teacher is simply trying to adhere to the new work rules set forth by the parents empowered by the legislation. The fear of parental reprisal is a key facet of the change in institutional power dynamics.

There is an expectation that special educators have been effectively trained to tailor IEPs to individual students at a level that will be acceptable to parents of these children, but with an educational landscape that is constantly changing barometers of student achievement, many educators find their methods hopelessly obsolete only a few years into their profession. All educators are required to be trained and retrained in the newest methods of individualized education. Not only are educational trends changing frequently, both those crafting an IEP must properly address its inherent procedural and substantive requirements.85

One of IDEA’s main tenets is the guarantee that schools will offer IEPs for its disabled students or face litigation for violation of the federal law. The procedural requirements of every IEP “compel schools to follow the structures of the law when developing an IEP [because] major procedural errors on the part of a school district may
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render an IEP inappropriate in the eyes of a hearing officer or court.”

IEPs need to lead to meaningful educational benefit for students. However, with so many teachers worried about parental reprisals, many place “process above results, and bureaucratic compliance above student achievement, excellence, and outcomes.” The rationale for this mindset is simple: an unfollowed procedure is a glaring error that will be discovered by a parent or legal advocate quickly resulting in litigation, whereas an incorrect educational goal might take some time to be uncovered.

IDEA has made IEPs crucial to all students with disabilities and thus every IEPs inherent requirement that they confer meaningful educational benefit is just as crucial to its success. But with a barometer for educational benefit that is deeply rooted in evidence of every student’s individual educational progress, emphasis on appropriate educational goals is paramount. It would then be logical to assume that every educator tasked with creating IEPs is skilled in crafting appropriate educational goals, but this is often incorrect. “Too often the pre-service and in-service education of special education teachers stress the procedural requirements of IEPs but do not include professional development in the substantive development of IEPs.” This results in perfectly crafted procedural IEPs that lack any type of substantive merit.

Work rules will change no matter how an IEP is implemented. This will provide parents with the ability to “manipulate” the institution of public education by crafting more and more legislation that seeks to “improve” special education under IDEA. As
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more and more “manipulation” occurs in public education thanks to IDEA public education will degenerate over time as less skilled professionals will want to enter the teaching profession because of the lack of autonomy found there. Legislators that want to maintain their “manipulation” of the institution of public education are not bothered by this, as it will create even more opportunities for them to increase their budgets to “save” their constituents affected by the lack of educational progress.

Conclusion

Vivien Lowndes’ three institutional elements now take on a different meaning due to the continued “manipulation” of public education.\textsuperscript{90} Lowndes’ first element described institutions as a middle-level concept, where individuals devise institutions as part of society where “day-to-day decisions and actions are taken” while also controlling human action by providing opportunities and imposing constraints.\textsuperscript{91} Before IDEA, teachers were charged with this task. All daily routines in the school were devised by administrators, in conjunction with teachers, and all procedures were determined by individual classroom teachers. Parents now have the power to weigh-in and changed these routines, with the backing of the courts. Not only do parents control the routines of public education, but they have also “manipulated” the second element that Lowndes’ described: the formal and informal procedures, or work rules, of the institution.

Teachers no longer possess the autonomy to create, maintain, and revise their own work rules because of the “manipulation” of the institution. Despite their formal training and the attainment of a professional degree and/or certificate, teachers can no longer

\textsuperscript{90} See Lowndes’ elements on page 5. 
\textsuperscript{91} Lowndes 182.
determine the environment in which they work. In an effort to gain more and more votes, legislators have handed this power to their constituents, who have changed work rules to maximize their benefits. The courts have played a role in this “manipulation” as well by consistently ruling in favor of parents to maintain their status as the dominant actors of this institution. With more and more constraints put on teacher autonomy, the power of parents as dominant actors is only increasing. Using the evidence of past court cases, one can reasonably predict that there is no end in sight to this trend.

There are only a few tools that teachers to possess to attempt and reverse this change in work rules: they can fight for it individually or use the collective power of their union. In *Doe v. Withers*, an individual effort to circumvent the change in work rules resulted in an individual teacher paying thousands of dollars in damages to the family of a special needs student. Teacher unions have repeatedly showed their inclination to side with legislators and actively instruct their membership to accept the change in work rules through this legislation. These legislators have now maximized their benefits as the “manipulated institution” perspective demands; they have appeased the motivated parental voting bloc and continue to receive electoral funding from teachers’ unions. Legislators get reelected, parents become the dominant actors in public education, and teachers’ unions maintain their political clout.

What does this mean to public education as an institution? Evidence points to a continued weakening of teacher autonomy and an increased role of parents in the education of all children. Legislators, in a bi-partisan effort, seem content with this change because it ensures that they will maximize their benefits and keep constituent support high. There is only a small benefit for legislators if they decide to reverse course
and support teachers to return to their status as the dominant actors, so why would utility-maximizing legislators even take that chance? It is good for their careers to continue to support the strong IDEA advocacy groups in exchange for votes and increases in funding. Now that these trends are becoming more and more clear, will professionals seek to enter public education knowing that their autonomy is limited in this “manipulated institution?” Parents may find themselves lacking professionals to implement the work rule changes they continue to foster, leading to larger issues in the future.
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