



Received: 07-05-2026
Accepted: 17-06-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Exploring Resilience Through Appreciative Inquiry: A Hermeneutic Phenomenology Study of IEP Implementation in Bulacan

¹ Nelia Artieda, ² Dr. Judito Camacho

¹ Doctor of Philosophy in Education, Educational Management, Illinois, United States

² Adviser, Doctor of Philosophy in Education, Educational Management, Illinois, United States

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049X.2026.6.3.6534>

Corresponding Author: Nelia Artieda

Abstract

This study explores resilience within the context of Individualized Education Program (IEP) implementation in Bulacan, utilizing an appreciative inquiry approach combined with hermeneutic phenomenology. Focusing on the lived experiences of teachers, administrators, and families involved in IEP processes, the research aims to uncover the factors that contribute to resilience in educational settings. Data were collected through in-depth interviews and analyzed to identify themes that highlight strengths, best practices, and positive adaptations in response to challenges faced during IEP implementation. The findings reveal that fostering a collaborative and

supportive environment significantly enhances resilience among stakeholders. Participants articulated the importance of shared values, mutual respect, and open communication as critical components that promote effective IEP practices. This research emphasizes the role of appreciation and inquiry in transforming challenges into opportunities for growth, ultimately advancing educational outcomes for students with diverse needs. The study contributes to the understanding of resilience as a dynamic and context-dependent phenomenon within special education and provides practical implications for educators and policymakers aiming to enhance IEP effectiveness.

Keywords: Resilience, Appreciative Inquiry, Hermeneutic Phenomenology, IEP Implementation, Bulacan

1. The Problem and its Context

1.1 Background of the Study

Historically, the global evolution of Special Needs Education (SNED) underwent a significant paradigm shift from mere integration to authentic inclusion yet the scholarly discourse remains largely tethered to a diagnostic prescriptive approach that emphasizes systemic deficits. At the heart of this movement was the Individualized Education Plan (IEP), a legally mandated document designed to ensure that students with disabilities received individualized instruction tailored to their unique needs. Historically, the effectiveness of IEP implementation served as an instrument for the success of inclusive education systems across various nations.

However, the transition from policy to practice was rarely seamless, International literature frequently highlighted a “research-to-practice gap.” where systemic pressures, limited resources, and administrative burdens complicated the delivery of individualized instruction. While many studies previously focused on these deficits, a growing body of scholarship suggested that the sustainability of inclusive education relied heavily on the resilience of the stakeholders- teachers, parents, and school heads.

In response to global trends, the Philippine context saw the Department of Education (DepEd) fortified its commitment to inclusive education through various orders and the “matatag” curriculum framework. Despite these mandates, Filipino educators faced localized challenges, ranging from large class sizes to the geographical and socio-economic specificities of various provinces. In Bulacan, a province characterized by its mixture of urbanizing centers and rural coastal communities, the implementation of IEPs was not merely a technical task but a human endeavor by cultural values and communal spirit (Bayanihan).

Consequently, traditional research often utilized a “deficit model”, focusing on what failed in the IEP process. This study diverged from that path by employing Appreciative Inquiry (AI). AI shifted the focus toward “What worked” seeking to uncover the “positive core” of IEP implementation in Bulacan. By identifying moments of success and resilience, the

researcher sought to understand how educators and families navigated constraints to provide quality education.

To achieve this objective, this study explored resilience through the lens of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and adopted a hermeneutic phenomenological approach to examine the implementation of Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs) in Bulacan. In this inquiry, resilience was conceptualized as the capacity of educational systems, professionals, families, and students to adapt, transform, and thrive in the face of challenges encountered during IEP processes. Foregrounding AI, the research emphasized strengths, possibilities, and constructive change, while the hermeneutic phenomenological stance centered deep, interpretive understanding of lived experiences surrounding IEP implementation. The ultimate aim was to illuminate how positive conditions can be cultivated to sustain effective practices, even amid structural and contextual constraints. Within the broader scholarly landscape, resilience was treated as a dynamic, emergent property that arises from interactions among individuals, teams, institutions, and communities. The AI meta-framework guided the study toward identifying peak experiences, best practices, and core values that contribute to successful IEP outcomes. Drawing on AI's appreciative inquiry cycles—what gives life to the system, what the best experiences reveal, what changes are desirable, and how to enact those changes—the research investigated how stakeholders perceive and enact strengths-based approaches in IEP planning, implementation, and review processes. The hermeneutic phenomenological orientation ensured that meaning-making, interpretation, and reflexivity underlay every stage of inquiry, from data collection to analysis and interpretation, with attention to the situatedness of Bulacan's educational ecosystem.

Furthermore, the research was situated within a complex system of policy, practice, and community networks that shape IEP practice. It considered how Bulacan contexts—such as resource availability, training opportunities, collaboration among families and professionals, and local leadership—will influence the resilience of IEP teams. The study examined the aspirational dimensions of IEP implementation, recognizing that resilience fostered not only through formal procedures but also through relational dynamics, cultural norms, and shared vision. Integrating AI principles with hermeneutic phenomenology, the study sought to articulate a nuanced understanding of how resilient processes emerge, are sustained, and can be scaled within Bulacan. Methodologically, the study employed an interpretive, participatory approach that invited stakeholders—regular education and special education teachers—to share transformative experiences and meaning-rich narratives related to IEP implementation. Data gathered through in-depth, semi-structured interviews, reflective journals, focus groups, and document analysis, all of which was analyzed through a hermeneutic circle to uncover layered interpretations of resilience and strengths-based practice. The AI framework will guide the identification of positive core elements, while the hermeneutic phenomenological analysis illuminated the underlying assumptions, values, and contexts that shape these elements. This integrated approach contributed to a robust understanding of how Bulacan can cultivate resilience in IEP practices and inform policy and practice at local, regional, and potentially broader levels.

To better understand the field setting, the Special Education (SPED) environment in the schools Division office (SDO) in Bulacan is defined by a comprehensive transition toward inclusive education, integrating Learners with Disabilities (LWDs) into mainstream settings while maintaining dedicated intervention hubs. The province underpins this framework across over 500 public schools which are supplemented by approximately 30-45 recognized SPED centers serving as specialized intervention nodes (DepEd, 2024; NCDA 2026). As of the 2025-2026 school year, the division serves a diverse population of 458,000 learners, with “Child Find” initiatives driving a consistent upward trend in the enrollment of LWDs across various disability categories (DepEd, 2025).

Within this environment, the SNED teachers in Bulacan show significant professional stability, with average tenures ranging from 5-11 years and a robust cohort of master teachers surpassing 15 years of service (SciRP, 20204). This resilience is heavily bolstered by the strategic use of the Special Education Fund (SEF), which provides necessary resources for infrastructure and learning materials, thereby alleviating teacher stress (DepEd, 2024). Furthermore, high retention rates through localized professional development, such as *Bulacanlungan* wellness initiative that prioritizes educators mental health, and a community recruitment philosophy that values long-term commitment and collaborative leadership, distinguishing the division's educator's experience with broader national attribution trends (ResearchGate, 2026). Furthermore, a “Grow Your Own” recruitment philosophy fosters deep community ties allowing teachers to prioritize geographical stability and collaborate with an administrative culture that increasingly emphasizes appreciative leadership and professional valuing (New Prairie Press, 2024).

Alongside these contextual elements, ethical considerations were foregrounded throughout the study, with particular emphasis on respect for participants' voices, confidentiality, and the co-creation of meaning. In alignment with AI's collaborative ethos and hermeneutic phenomenology's emphasis on situated interpretation, findings were presented in a manner that honors participants' experiences while offering actionable insights for practitioners and policymakers. The anticipated contributions were twofold: (a) theoretical advancement in combining AI and hermeneutic phenomenology to examine resilience in education, and (b) practical guidance for Bulacan to strengthen IEP implementation through strengths-based, context-sensitive strategies that enhance capacity, collaboration, and outcomes for students with disabilities. Throughout the study, future-oriented framing was maintained, with an emphasis on imagining and enabling more resilient IEP ecosystems. Articulating imagined optimal states informed by empirical findings, the research outlined concrete pathways for sustaining and scaling effective practices, while acknowledging ongoing challenges and trade-offs inherent in real-world educational settings. In doing so, the study contributed to scholarly discourse on resilience, AI, and phenomenology, and offered a situated account of how Bulacan can harness strengths to advance inclusive education through robust IEP implementation.

Finally, to truly capture these experiences, this study adopted a Hermeneutic Phenomenology design. This approach went beyond mere description, it sought to

interpret the deeper meanings of the stakeholders' lived experiences. It acknowledged that the "truth" of IEP implementation in Bulacan was found in the interplay between the participants' personal stories and their social context. Through this dual lens of AI and Hermeneutics, the study explored how resilience was constructed, maintained, and manifested by those at the forefront of special education in the province.

Statement of the Problem

Fundamentally, this qualitative study aims to address the critical understanding gap regarding how resilience within IEP implementation is cultivated and sustained, through the innovative, integrated application of Appreciative Inquiry and hermeneutic phenomenology among regular and special education teachers in Bulacan.

More specifically it answered the following questions:

1. What is the "lived meaning of IEP Implementation resilience" as experienced and understood by the regular and special education teachers within the unique context of Bulacan?
2. What are the underlying patterns, strength-based practices, and positive core relationships that characterize "peak moments" of collaborative IEP success in Bulacan?
3. How do the distinctive cultural variables, relational dynamics, and resource realities of Bulacan influence the interpretation and enactment of resilient practices within the IEP teams?
4. Through collective reflection on shared positive core experiences, what collaborative organizational design could be envisioned to cultivate and scale sustainable resilience across Bulacan's special education ecosystem?
5. What theoretically-informed and practically-oriented recommendations emerge from this paired inquiry to strengthen the IEP implementation through collaborative leadership, resource alignment, and reflective practice in Bulacan?

In addressing these questions, this study filled a critical gap in understanding how resilience within IEP practice can be cultivated through an integrated framework of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology in Bulacan. Despite substantial scholarship on AI as a strengths-based change process and on hermeneutic phenomenology as a method for deep interpretation of lived experiences, there is a shortage of scholarship that jointly examines resilience in IEP implementation through these paired lenses in regional educational contexts. The problem, therefore, is the limited understanding of how regional variables, stakeholder relationships, and daily practices interact to produce resilient IEP processes that lead to sustainable positive outcomes for students with disabilities. This deficit constrained policymakers, school leaders, and practitioners from identifying and scaling effective, context-sensitive strategies that support resilient IEP implementation.

A related challenge was the fragmented nature of evidence concerning resilience within IEP work. Existing work often treats resilience as an individual trait or as a macro-system property, with insufficient attention to how strengths-based inquiries and interpretive understanding can reveal actionable pathways for enhancement at the local level. The study posited that resilience in IEP practice emerges not merely from policy mandates or technical compliance, but

from the relational dynamics, shared visions, and everyday enactments of stakeholders. Without an integrated inquiry that foregrounds positive core experiences while interpreting lived realities, Bulacan continued to face recurrent difficulties in aligning IEP goals, resources, and collaborative practices across schools, families, and communities.

Methodologically, the problem awaits a rigorous approach that can simultaneously illuminate the favorable conditions that support resilient IEP practice and interrogate the assumptions, values, and contextual constraints that hinder it. The study thus addressed the need for a methodological fusion that uses AI to identify high-impact practices and hermeneutic phenomenology to interpret the meanings and contexts of those practices. This fusion provided a comprehensive account of how resilience is cultivated, sustained, and scaled in Bulacan, including insights into which conditions should be reinforced or reimaged to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Finally, the problem statement acknowledges the ethical and practical imperative to translate findings into actionable guidance. Although descriptive accounts of resilience can be informative, there remains a gap in translating strengths-based insights into scalable, regionally relevant policies and practices. The study, therefore, developed a theoretically informed and practically oriented set of recommendations that Bulacan can implement to strengthen IEP implementation through collaborative leadership, resource alignment, and reflective practice. Doing so, the research contributed to a growing body of knowledge that integrates AI and hermeneutic phenomenology to address complex, real-world educational challenges and offered a pathway for other towns seeking to enhance the resilience of their IEP ecosystems.

Purpose and Objective of the Study

To provide a clear path forward, this study illuminated how resilience in IEP implementation can be cultivated, interpreted, and sustained within Bulacan by integrating Appreciative Inquiry (AI) with hermeneutic phenomenology. The overarching purpose of this hermeneutic phenomenology study was to explore and interpret the lived experiences of resilience among regular and special education teachers in Bulacan as they implement IEPs. By utilizing the lens of Appreciative Inquiry (AI), this research aimed to move beyond a deficit-based perspective, instead uncovering the "life-giving" forces and successful adaptations that sustain inclusive education practices within the province's unique socio-cultural landscape. This study also generated a nuanced, context-sensitive understanding of how strengths-based inquiry and interpretive interpretation can reveal the conditions, processes, and meanings that enable durable positive outcomes for students with disabilities. Foregrounding hopeful inquiry and deep lived experience, the research contributed to theoretical and practical knowledge about resilient IEP ecosystems and how they can be nurtured in regional educational settings.

To fulfill this purpose, this study pursued the following objectives:

1. To identify and describe the lived experiences, practices, and relationships that teachers associated with successful IEP implementation in Bulacan. This objective sought to map moments and patterns that give "life" to the system, in line with AI principles, and

- documented how these experiences relate to resilience in practice (de Bono; Cooperrider & Srivastva; 1996). The analysis was conducted through a hermeneutic phenomenological lens to interpret the meanings attached to these experiences by diverse participants.
- 2 To interpret how regional context, including leadership, resource availability, collaboration modalities, and family involvement, shapes the emergence and sustenance of resilient IEP processes. This objective foregrounded the situatedness of Bulacan and examined the tacit assumptions, values, and norms that participants hold about inclusion, collaboration, and accountability.
 - 3 To articulate the mechanisms by which AI processes influence decision-making, goal alignment, and reflective practice within IEP teams. The study examined how strengths-based inquiry and appreciative conversations translate into tangible actions, modifications, and improvements in IEP planning, implementation, and review cycles, as understood by participants.
 - 4 To develop a theoretically informed, practically oriented set of recommendations for Bulacan that can enhance resilience in IEP ecosystems. The recommendations targeted policy levers, professional development, collaborative structures, and resource coordination, with an emphasis on scalability, sustainability, and equity.
 - 5 To contribute to methodological discourse by demonstrating a coherent integration of AI and hermeneutic phenomenology as a combined approach for investigating resilience in education. The study illustrated how positively oriented inquiry coupled with interpretive depth can produce actionable insights while maintaining rigorous interpretive accountability.

Ultimately, the study was guided by a forward-looking inquiry that illuminated pathways for strengthening IEP implementation through resilience-enhancing practices, contextualized understanding, and collaborative, values-driven action. The anticipated outcomes will include (a) a rich, interpretive account of resilient IEP practice in Bulacan, (b) a set of evidence-informed recommendations for practitioners and policymakers, and (c) methodological insights into integrating AI with hermeneutic phenomenology in educational research.

Significance of the Study

Broadly speaking, this study was significant on multiple levels by advancing theory, informing practice, and guiding policy related to resilient IEP implementation in Bulacan through a novel integration of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology. Foregrounding AI's strengths-based orientation and the interpretive depth of hermeneutic phenomenology, the research offers a rigorous and practice-relevant account of how resilient educational ecosystems emerge, endure, and scale in regional contexts. The anticipated contributions will be relevant to scholars, practitioners, and policymakers seeking to understand and foster durable, inclusive outcomes for students with disabilities.

First and foremost, the study advances theoretical understandings of resilience in special education by synthesizing AI's inquiry into positive core experiences with hermeneutic phenomenology's emphasis on interpretive

meaning-making. Building on AI pioneers such as David Cooperrider and Srivastva, who articulated the core of AI as discovering and amplifying "the best of what is" in organizations, the research examined how strengths-based conversations and inquiries translate into resilient practices within IEP teams (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) ^[4, 4]. Simultaneously, the study drawn on the hermeneutic phenomenology framework advanced by thinkers such as Hans-Georg Gadamer and Max van Manen, to illuminate how stakeholders interpret, contest, and co-construct meanings around inclusion, collaboration, and accountability in IEP work (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 ^[20], 2016 ^[21]). Through this integration, the study contributes to an emergent conceptualization of resilience that integrates lived experience with positive, systemic inquiry.

Second, the study had practical significance for Bulacan by producing actionable knowledge that can guide practice, leadership, and collaboration. Identifying positive core experiences and the contextual mechanisms that sustain them, the research will inform targeted professional development, collaborative structures, and resource alignment designed to bolster resilience in IEP implementation. The findings offer region-specific guidance while also contributing transferable insights for other regions seeking to strengthen inclusive practices through strengths-based, interpretive approaches. The work provides an evidence-based recommendations aligned with AI's cyclical inquiry process (what gives life to the system, what the best experiences reveal, what should change, how to enact those changes) and the reflexive interpretive stance characteristic of hermeneutic phenomenology (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987 ^[4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 ^[20], 2016 ^[21]).

Third, the study influenced policy development by articulating how resilience can be embedded in IEP governance, accountability structures, and community partnerships. Mapping regionally embedded practices that contribute to resilience, the research will offer policy levers that support sustainable collaboration among schools, families, and communities. The emphasis on scalable, equity-centered recommendations aligned with contemporary commitments to inclusive education and quality assurance in special education services, providing a research basis for region-wide reforms grounded in strengths-based inquiry and interpretive understanding.

Fourth, the study contributed to methodological discourse by demonstrating a coherent approach that combines AI and hermeneutic phenomenology to study resilience in education. The research provided a compelling exemplar of how AI's appreciative cycles can be harmonized with hermeneutic interpretation to yield rich, actionable insights while maintaining rigorous interpretive accountability. Detailing methodological steps, reflexive practices, and analytic approaches, the study offers a template for future researchers seeking to study resilience, inclusion, and educational change through an integrated qualitative design (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987 ^[4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 ^[20], 2016 ^[21]).

Finally, the study contributes to the broader scholarly dialogue on resilience beyond education by illustrating how a region's social, relational, and cultural landscapes shape durable improvements in complex intervention areas. The insights generated was to illuminate how strengths-based

inquiry coupled with interpretive depth can inform resilient reforms not only in IEP contexts but also in other sectors confronting similar challenges in balancing policy compliance with lived experiences and collaborative practice. The significance of this study lies in its potential to shape a more resilient, inclusive, and interpretively informed approach to IEP implementation in Bulacan, while offering robust theoretical, methodological, and practical contributions that can inform regional, national, and international conversations about resilience in education.

Theoretical Framework

This study was grounded in an integrated theoretical framework that synthesizes Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology to illuminate resilience in IEP implementation within Bulacan. Fundamentally, the framework was constructed to articulate how strengths-based inquiry and interpretive meaning-making interact within complex educational ecosystems, producing durable, positive change for students with disabilities. Drawing on AI's developmental lens and the interpretive depth of hermeneutic phenomenology, the framework explained the conditions under which resilient IEP practices emerged, were interpreted, and were scaled across regional contexts. Within this context, Appreciative Inquiry provided the primary lens for identifying, naming, and amplifying the best experiences, practices, and relationships that support effective IEP work. Pioneered by David Cooperrider and Suresh Srivastva, AI reframes organizational inquiry around what gives life to the system (the positive core) and how those elements can be cultivated to engender sustainable improvement (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) ^[4]. Accordingly, the framework operationalized AI through its core tenets: (a) recognizing and valuing what works (discovery), (b) envisioning optimal futures (dream), (c) designing participatory pathways to those futures (design), and (d) sustaining momentum through action and storytelling (destiny or destiny). In the context of IEP implementation, these cycles guided teachers to articulate strengths-based goals, collaborative aspirations, and actionable steps that reinforce resilience amid resource constraints and policy demands.

In tandem with this approach, hermeneutic phenomenology complemented AI by focusing on how teachers interpreted, understood, and co-constructed meanings about inclusion, collaboration, and accountability within IEP work. Building on the works of Hans-Georg Gadamer and Martin Heidegger (as developed by Gadamer, 1975/2013; Heidegger's phenomenology informing later interpreters) and further elaborated by Max van Manen (1990, 2016) ^[20, 21], the framework treated an interpretation as an ongoing, dialogic process embedded in region-specific contexts. Consequently, this orientation foregrounded situatedness, historicity, and performer-readiness, acknowledging that resilience was produced not only by practices but also by the meanings that diverse actors attach to those practices. To achieve this depth, the hermeneutic circle guided analysis, ensuring that interpretation moved between parts and whole—between individual experiences of IEP work and the broader regional system—thereby revealing how meanings shape and are shaped by resilience-enhancing actions.

Within this integrated framework, resilience was conceptualized as an emergent property of the interplay between positive core experiences (AI) and interpreted

understandings of those experiences within specific contexts of hermeneutic phenomenology. This unique framing allowed the study to examine how Bulacan factors—leadership styles, resource distribution, interagency collaboration, family engagement, and policy climates—converge to produce adaptive, transformative practices in IEP implementation. Furthermore, the theoretical model specified relationships among constructs such as strengths-based inquiry, shared visions, relational trust, reflective practice, and contextual constraints, and hypothesize that resilient IEP ecosystems arise when AI-informed actions were interpreted through a hermeneutic lens that remains attentive to power dynamics, cultural norms, and local meanings.

To execute this, operationalization within the framework consisted of four interrelated components. First, the positive core component identified and analyzed high-impact practices, successes, and affirming experiences in Bulacan's IEP work, aligned with AI's discovery and dream phases (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) ^[4]. Second, the contextual interpretation component applied hermeneutic phenomenology to interpret how participants negotiated inclusion, collaboration, and accountability, foregrounding the influence of town-specific histories and values (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990, 2016) ^[20, 21]. Third, the integration component examined how AI-derived insights translated into concrete organizational and instructional changes, thereby linking design and destiny with practical implementation in IEP cycles. Fourth and finally, the evaluative component considered the ethical and reflexive dimensions of interpretation, ensuring that voice, agency, and locality guide the interpretive process.

Overall, this theoretical framework was informed by established literature in AI and hermeneutic phenomenology, ensuring coherence with scholarly arguments and methodological norms. For instance, AI dimension drew on the foundational texts by Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) ^[4] and subsequent elaborations by Cooperrider and colleagues, including the articulation of the 4-D cycle and the emphasis on strengths-based inquiry. Meanwhile, the phenomenology dimension drew on Gadamer's hermeneutics (2013) ^[7] and van Manen's phenomenology of practice (1990, 2016) ^[20, 21] to sustain a rigorous interpretive stance that respected participants' voices and the situatedness of Bulacan. Together, these streams yielded a robust, integrative framework that explicated how resilience in IEP implementation can be cultivated, interpreted, and sustained through a synergistic process of positively oriented inquiry and deep interpretive understanding. Ultimately, the theoretical framework guides data collection and analysis by aligning methods with theory: AI's appreciative interviews, story collection, and positive core mapping will be complemented by hermeneutic-phenomenological techniques such as iterative hermeneutic circles, in-depth interpretation of narratives, and reflexive journaling by researchers. The framework thus supported an interpretive, participatory inquiry that remains anchored in Bulacan's salient meanings while advancing theoretical and practical knowledge about resilience in inclusive education.

Scope and Limitations

The scope of this study was delimited to the lived experiences of the regular and special education teachers in

the Division of Bulacan during the School Year 2025-2026. Specifically, it focuses on how these educators employed Appreciative Inquiry—focusing on strength and successes—to navigate the challenges of IEP implementation. The study involved ten (10) participants from selected private and public schools in Bulacan who have at least three years of experience in teaching regular or special education programs.

In expansion, this study delineated a defined yet comprehensive scope that aligns with its theoretical aims and methodological design. To begin with, the scope encompassed Bulacan's IEP implementation practices within a clearly bounded timeframe and within the participants' contexts who are directly involved in IEP processes, including teachers, special education professionals, school leaders, families, and students. By combining Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology, the study will focus on identifying positive core experiences, interpretations, and meanings that contribute to resilience in IEP work, while situating these findings within the regional policy landscape, resource environments, and collaborative networks. Importantly, the scope restricts inference to regional contexts to preserve depth of interpretation and to maintain manageability for an in-depth hermeneutic-phenomenological analysis, consistent with the interpretive commitments of Gadamer (1975/2013) and van Manen (2016) [21] in research design. On one hand, the AI components guide the study to explore what gives life to Bulacan's IEP system, what the best experiences reveal, and how those revelations can inform design and practice (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) [4]. On the other hand, the hermeneutic phenomenology component ensures that the study remains attentive to how participants interpret and negotiate inclusion, collaboration, and accountability within IEP work, acknowledging regional histories, cultures, and power dynamics (Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 2016) [7, 21]. Consequently, the scope included data collection methods that yielded rich, interpretive narratives—interviews, focus groups, reflective journals, and document analysis—while recognizing that the depth of interpretation may limit broad generalization beyond Bulacan. Ultimately, this balance between depth and breadth will reflect the methodological traditions of phenomenology and AI, as described in foundational AI texts (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) [4] and phenomenology literature (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 [20], 2016 [21]).

Notwithstanding these strengths, certain limitations must be acknowledged as intrinsic to the study's design and context. First, the interpretive nature of hermeneutic phenomenology implies that findings were interpretive constructions shaped by researchers' perspectives and participants' articulations, which introduce subjectivity despite reflexive practices (Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 1990, 2016) [7, 20, 21]. While this study addresses this through methodological transparency, audit trails, and reflexive journaling, readers should anticipate that multiple plausible interpretations may coexist. Second, while AI emphasizes identifying positive core experiences and envisioning strengths-based futures, there is a risk of underreporting or insufficient attention to ongoing challenges, constraints, and negative contexts. To mitigate this, the study explicitly engaged participants in critical reflection about barriers and by documenting how resilience is negotiated in the face of constraints, aligning with AI's four-D cycle while maintaining phenomenological

depth. Third, the bounded regional focus on Bulacan limits the generalizability of findings to other regions with different sociocultural, policy, and resource landscapes; however, the study strived to offer transferable insights by articulating contextual conditions, mechanisms, and actionable implications that could inform comparable regional settings. Fourth, access to participants and the potential for response bias may influence data richness. The study implemented ethical recruitment strategies, ensured confidentiality, and encouraged open, reflective contributions to minimize bias and maximize authentic voice. Finally, given the forward-looking, practical orientation of the research, there may be a gap between aspirational recommendations and feasible implementation within existing constraints; the study acknowledged this gap and proposed phased, context-sensitive strategies to bridge theory and practice. In summary, the scope centered on Bulacan's IEP practice in the public schools only through an AI-informed, hermeneutic-phenomenological lens to generate nuanced, contextually grounded insights into resilience. Hence, these limitations were openly articulated as part of the study's methodological rigor, ensuring that interpretations are understood as regionally situated, interpretive constructions designed to inform practice, policy, and further scholarly dialogue in inclusive education.

Definition of Terms

To ensure conceptual clarity and a shared understanding of the specialized frameworks utilized within this study, the following terms are defined according to their operational and theoretical context:

Appreciative Inquiry (AI): A strengths-based approach to organizational inquiry and change that centers on what gives life to a system, identifies positive core experiences, and envisions how these insights can shape desirable futures. Pioneered by David Cooperrider and Suresh Srivastva, AI employs a four-D cycle—Discover, Dream, Design, Destiny (or Deliver)—to guide collaborative inquiry and constructive action. In this study, AI framed data collection and analysis around participants' positive experiences with IEP processes, with the aim of amplifying effective practices and resilience within Bulacan.

Bulacan: A geographically defined context within which the study will investigate IEP implementation, resilience, and the interplay of policy, practice, and community factors. The term was used to bound data collection and analysis, while allowing the transfer of transferable insights to comparable regional settings.

Design (AI Cycle): The phase where stakeholders collaboratively translated discovered positives into practical pathways and structures. Specifically, in the context of IEP implementation, Design guided the formulation of actionable strategies, workflows, and collaborative arrangements to strengthen resilience.

Destiny (AI): In AI, the phase concerned with sustaining momentum and embedding learned practices through action, storytelling, and ongoing improvement. In this study, Destiny reflected how Bulacan can institutionalize resilience-enhancing IEP practices and ensure continued growth.

Discovery (AI Cycle): The initial phase of AI where stakeholders explore and articulate what currently works well. Within Bulacan's IEP work, Discovery identified

positive core experiences, supportive relationships, and successful procedures to inform future action.

Dream (AI Cycle): The phase in which participants envision aspirational futures informed by positive core experiences. In this study, Dream served as a generative space for imagining resilient IEP ecosystems and inclusive practices in Bulacan.

Four-D (4-D) Cycle: The collective term for the AI sequence—Discovery, Dream, Design, Destiny—through which inquiries into resilience and IEP practice unfolded. Accordingly, the 4-D cycle structured data collection, analysis, and reporting to ensure a coherent, strengths-based progression.

Hermeneutic Phenomenology: A qualitative methodological tradition that seeks to interpret and understand lived experiences through iterative engagement with text and speech, emphasizing situated meaning, historical context, and the interpretive circle between parts and whole. Grounded in the work of Hans-Georg Gadamer (philosophical hermeneutics) and further developed by Martin Heidegger and Max van Manen (phenomenology of practice), this approach guided the study's analysis of how stakeholders interpret inclusion, collaboration, and accountability within IEP work. In future reporting, hermeneutic phenomenology was employed to reveal how regional meanings shape resilience in IEP implementation.

IEP (Individualized Education Program): A legally mandated, pupil-specific plan for identifying special education needs, setting measurable goals, and outlining services and supports to enable meaningful access to education. In this study, IEPs were examined as practices embedded in Bulacan's contexts, with attention to how resilience emerged in planning, collaboration, and review processes for students with disabilities. The term was used consistently to denote the formalized framework governing special education in Bulacan.

Phenomenology of Practice: A strand within phenomenology, advanced by Max van Manen, that emphasizes reflective, practice-based inquiry into lived experiences of professional action. This term anchored the interpretation of teachers', leaders', families', and students' experiences with IEP processes in Bulacan.

Resilience: The capacity of educational systems, teams, families, and students to anticipate, adapt, and recover from challenges encountered during IEP processes, thereby sustaining or improving inclusive practices and outcomes. In this study, resilience was construed as an emergent property arising from the interaction between positive core experiences (AI) and the interpreted meanings of those experiences within Bulacan's context. Future work modelled how resilience can be cultivated, interpreted, and scaled through AI-informed and hermeneutic-phenomenological practices.

Bulacan Salient Meanings: The understandings and interpretations that arise from the specific cultural, historical, and policy context of Bulacan. For the purpose of this study, the study treated these meanings as foundational to analysis, ensuring that findings are grounded in the local context while considering potential transferability.

Strengths-Based Inquiry: A methodological stance embedded in AI that directs attention to assets, capabilities, and successful practices rather than deficits, with the goal of catalyzing positive change. In this study, strengths-based inquiry guided data collection and analysis to surface

effective IEP practices, collaborative dynamics, and conditions that support resilience.

What Gives Life to the System (AI Core Question): A conceptual marker from AI referring to the identification of processes, relationships, and experiences that sustain the system's vitality. In Bulacan's IEP context, this concept oriented inquiries toward moments and patterns that make IEP work meaningful and sustainable (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) ^[4]. Future discussions will foreground these elements to shape design and practice.

What the Best Experiences Reveal (AI): A phase in AI focusing on appreciating and documenting peak experiences that illustrate effective practice. This term guided the elicitation and analysis of exemplary IEP interactions and outcomes in Bulacan.

Regionally Salient Meanings: The understandings and interpretations that arise from the specific cultural, historical, and policy context of Region 3. For the purpose of this research, the study treated these meanings as foundational to analysis, ensuring that findings are grounded in the local context while considering potential transferability.

What Gives Life to the System: A conceptual marker from AI, referring to the identification of processes, relationships, and experiences that sustain the systems validity. In Bulacan's IEP context, this concept orients inquiries towards moments and patterns that make the IEP work meaningful and sustainable.

2. The Problem and its Context

Introduction

This chapter presents a comprehensive review of the related literature and studies, thereby providing a theoretical and conceptual framework that serves as a foundation for the current investigation.

Fundamentally, the pursuit of inclusive education for students with disabilities remains one of the most complex challenges in the contemporary Philippine educational landscape. At the heart of this endeavor is the Individualized Education Program (IEP), a cornerstone of Special Education (SPED) designed to provide a tailored roadmap for student success. However, while the procedural mandates of the IEP are clearly defined by the Department of Education, the lived reality of its implementation is often characterized by a delicate balance between systemic constraints and the human agency required to overcome them. In the province of Bulacan, educators navigate a unique socio-cultural and institutional environment that demands more than just technical compliance; rather, it requires a profound capacity for resilience.

To address this reality, this study investigated resilience in the implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) within Bulacan through an integrated methodological lens that combined Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology. Specifically, the central problem guiding this inquiry was the persistent gap between policy mandates for inclusive education and the lived realities of IEP practice that either enable or constrain resilience among students with disabilities, families, and professionals. Indeed, despite widespread commitments to high-quality special education, regional variations in leadership, resources, collaboration, and interpretation of inclusion yielded uneven instructional practices and outcomes. By foregrounding resilience as an emergent

property shaped by strengths-based inquiry and interpretive understanding, the study illuminated how Bulacan sustained inclusive, responsive, and effective IEP practices even amid competing demands and limited resources. Within the broader scholarly landscape, resilience was examined across educational systems as a dynamic interplay of individual, team, and organizational factors. Nevertheless, there remains a need for theoretically coherent, regionally grounded investigations that connect strengths-based inquiry with interpretive depth to yield actionable insights for IEP practice. In response to this gap, the present study addressed that need by operationalizing AI's positive core conceptions alongside hermeneutic phenomenology's emphasis on meaning-making within specific historical and cultural contexts. Ultimately, the convergence of these approaches enabled a nuanced understanding of how resilient IEP ecosystems can be cultivated, interpreted, and scaled in Bulacan, thereby contributing to both scholarly discourse and practical reform.

Crucially, the context of Bulacan presents a distinctive set of conditions that shaped the inquiry. For instance, the town's policy climates, resource distributions, collaboration networks among schools and families, and local leadership practices collectively influenced how IEP teams responded to challenges and harnessed opportunities for improvement. Accordingly, the study examined how the regular and special education teachers experienced and enacted resilience through the lens of AI's appreciative cycles and through interpretive engagement with their lived realities. In doing so, the research acknowledged power dynamics, cultural norms, and the situatedness of inclusion, thereby, recognizing that resilient practice emerges from the interplay of positive core experiences and their subsequent interpretation within local contexts.

Methodologically, this investigation adopted an interpretive, participatory design aligned not only with AI's four-D cycle—Discover, Dream, Design, Destiny—but also with hermeneutic phenomenology's circle of interpretation. To achieve this, data was gathered through in-depth interviews, focus groups, reflective journals, and document analyses. Subsequently, these data were analyzed through iterative hermeneutic circles that move between individual narratives and the broader town's system. By extension, this integrated approach yielded rich, contextually grounded understandings of how resilience in IEP practice is produced, sustained, and scaled within Bulacan. The study thus contributed to a robust evidentiary base for the town's tailored strategies that align strengths-based inquiry with interpretive depth to improve inclusive education outcomes. Furthermore, ethical considerations foregrounded throughout the research process. Specifically, respect for participant voice, confidentiality, informed consent, and culturally responsive engagement guided data collection and interpretation. In keeping with AI's collaborative ethos and hermeneutic phenomenology's emphasis on situated interpretation, the study consistently prioritized co-creation of meaning with stakeholders, ensuring that findings reflected diverse perspectives and generated actionable knowledge for practice.

Concurrently, the anticipated contributions of this research were threefold: theoretical, methodological, and practical. First, it advanced the integration of AI and hermeneutic phenomenology as a coherent framework for studying resilience in education. Second, it informed Bulacan's

policy and practice in IEP implementation. Finally, it offers transferable insights for other regions seeking to strengthen inclusive education through strengths-based, context-sensitive inquiry.

Looking ahead, the study maintained a future-oriented orientation, articulating imagined but empirically grounded pathways for cultivating resilient IEP ecosystems in Bulacan. By highlighting the conditions, practices, and meanings that supported durable inclusion, the research proposed concrete, scalable steps for the teachers to undertake—from professional development and collaborative governance to reflective practice and policy alignment. Consequently, this framework situates the problem within a dynamic regional context, outlines the conceptual and methodological fusion that drives the inquiry, and frames the study's anticipated impact on theory, practice, and policy concerning resilience in IEP implementation.

Review of the Related Literature

Resilience in education has been conceptualized as an emergent property arising from interactions among individuals, teams, institutions, and communities. Foundational work was drawn from theorists who articulated resilience as more than an individual trait and more than a system-level parameter; rather, it was understood as a dynamic capacity that was cultivated through social processes, relational networks, and contextual adaptation (Masten, 2014^[12]; Ungar, 2011^[19]; Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000). In this body of work, resilience was understood to stem from positive experiences, protective factors, and the capacity to transform constraints into opportunities for growth. Moreover, the literature further indicated that resilience in schools emerges when leadership, collaborative practice, and resource coordination align with inclusive goals, suggesting that resilience is both embedded in daily practices and amplified via intentional inquiry and reflection (Burnette *et al.*, 2020; Berkas & Eitle, 2020).

Within inclusive education, resilience was examined specifically as the capacity of IEP processes to adapt to diverse student needs, family contexts, and policy environments. In this regard, a robust strand of research highlighted the centrality of collaborative planning, family-professional partnerships, and timely resource provision in sustaining effective support for students with disabilities (Friend & Cook, 2010; Heller, 2003). The literature also emphasized that meaningful inclusion depends on contextualized implementation, ongoing professional development, and reflective practice that acknowledged power dynamics and cultural moderation of inclusion efforts (Sal-pietro *et al.*, 2017; Shogren *et al.*, 2018). In the context of Bulacan, these findings were relevant for understanding how local conditions shape resilience in IEP work.

To examine these dynamics, Appreciative Inquiry (AI) provided a strengths-based lens through which to examine IEP practice. Pioneered by David Cooperrider and Suresh Srivastva, AI reframes inquiry around what gave life to the system and seeks to amplify positive core experiences, visions, and collaborative capabilities (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987)^[4]. Subsequent work on AI elaborated the 4-D cycle—Discover, Dream, Design, Destiny—and its applications in education and organizational change (Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008^[5]; Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005).

Hence, AI scholarship was referenced to articulate how strengths-based conversations and collective imagining can catalyze resilient practices within IEP implementation, particularly in settings where resources are constrained and systemic supports must be creatively sustained (Whitney & Cooperrider, 2005). Nevertheless, critiques of AI were considered, acknowledging the need to balance positive inquiry with critical attention to inequities, thereby, ensuring that aspirational visions translate into measurable improvements (Bushe, 2013; Avgar, 2019^[1]).

In tandem with Appreciative Inquiry, Hermeneutic phenomenology guided the interpretive dimension of the study, providing a methodological lens for understanding lived experiences of inclusion, collaboration, and accountability within IEP work.

Foundational theorists, including Hans-Georg Gadamer (hermeneutics) and Martin Heidegger (phenomenology), ground the approach, with Max van Manen's work on the phenomenology of practice offering concrete methodological guidance for interpretive analysis of educational action (Gadamer, 2013; Heidegger, 1985; van Manen, 2016)^[7, 9, 21]. The literature indicated that hermeneutic phenomenology emphasizes historicity, situatedness, and dialogic interpretation, thereby, enabling researchers to illuminate how stakeholders negotiate meanings around inclusion, collaboration, and policy in real-world settings. This fusion enabled an interpretive depth that links positive experiences identified by AI with the broader, context-bound meanings that shape resilience in IEP practice (van Manen, 1990, 2016)^[20, 21]. Methodologically, the integrated AI–hermeneutic phenomenology approach was positioned as a coherent qualitative design suitable for exploring complex educational change. AI's emphasis on positive core experiences guided participant engagement, narrative collection, and thematic identification of effective practices, while hermeneutic circles structured data analysis to move between parts and whole, as well as between individual narratives and the regional system. The literature suggested that such an approach can generate nuanced, transferable insights about resilience in IEP ecosystems while maintaining rigorous interpretive accountability (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987^[4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990^[20], 2016^[21]). Ethical considerations reported in related studies emphasized co-creation of knowledge, participant voice, and reflexivity as essential components of credible interpretation (Orb, Eisenhauer, & Wynaden, 2001; Finlay, 2019)^[15, 6]. Synthesis and gaps. While substantial scholarship exists on resilience, AI, hermeneutic phenomenology, and IEP practice separately, there is a relative paucity of integrated investigations that deliberately fuse AI with hermeneutic phenomenology to examine resilience in IEP implementation within Bulacan context. The review identified this gap as the justification for the study, arguing that Bulacan benefited from a theoretically coherent framework that connects positive inquiry with interpretive depth, enabling region-specific recommendations that can be adapted to comparable town settings. The review positioned the study as contributing to theoretical advancement in resilience research, methodological innovation in qualitative inquiry, and practical guidance for inclusive education policy and practice.

Similarly, a 2024 study on IEP implementation in Bulacan revealed that both general and special education teachers

struggle with execution due to poor inter-professional communication. Participants emphasized the need for structured opportunities to develop communication skills and collaborate effectively, ensuring that students receive the necessary instructional support (Santos, 2024).

Synthesis and the Gaps

The synthesis of the reviewed literature positioned resilience in IEP practice at the intersection of strengths-based inquiry and interpretive understanding, highlighting how regionally grounded inquiry can yield actionable knowledge for Bulacan. The emergent synthesis integrated core insights from resilience theory, inclusive education research, Appreciative Inquiry (AI), and hermeneutic phenomenology to articulate a coherent understanding of how positive core experiences were identified, interpreted, and transformed into durable improvements. Drawing on AI's emphasis on what gives life to the system (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987)^[4] and the 4-D cycle (Discover, Dream, Design, Destiny) (Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008^[5]; Whitney & Cooperrider, 2005), the synthesis mapped how town's specific positive practices can be amplified to enhance IEP implementation. Simultaneously, by incorporating hermeneutic phenomenology's focus on interpretive meaning-making within historical and cultural contexts (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990^[20], 2016^[21]), the synthesis illuminated how teachers' meanings, values, and power dynamics shape resilience in Bulacan's IEP processes. This integrated perspective generated a nuanced theory of resilience that is both aspirational and grounded in local realities. In terms of theoretical contributions, the synthesis advanced understanding of resilience not merely as an outcome but as an emergent property produced by the dynamic interplay between strengths-based inquiry and interpretive understanding. It foregrounded how AI's positive deviance was leveraged in conjunction with hermeneutic circles to uncover deep structural and cultural conditions that support or impede durable inclusion. The synthesis extended resilience scholarship by articulating mechanisms through which regionally salient meanings, leadership practices, and collaborative networks interact with positive core experiences to produce sustainable change in IEP practice. This theoretical elaboration clarified the boundaries and complementarities of AI and hermeneutic phenomenology when applied to complex educational challenges, offering a template for future studies seeking to blend strengths-based inquiry with interpretive depth.

Methodologically, the synthesis revealed that an integrated AI–hermeneutic phenomenology approach can yield rich, transferable insights while preserving interpretive accountability. By aligning AI's data-collection methods (e.g., appreciative interviews, narrative collection) with hermeneutic-phenomenological analyses (e.g., iterative hermeneutic circles, reflexive journaling), the study demonstrated how to balance depth with analytic rigor and how to translate interpretive findings into regionally relevant practices. This synthesis also articulated methodological considerations regarding reflexivity, audit trails, and ethical co-creation of knowledge, drawing on the ethical orientations cited in AI and phenomenology literature (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019)^[15, 6]. Gaps identified in the literature were centered on the limited integration of AI and hermeneutic phenomenology to study resilience within IEP

implementation, particularly in a defined regional context. While resilience, AI, and hermeneutic phenomenology have been explored separately, there remains a paucity of studies that explicitly fuse these approaches to address the complexities of IEP practice in Bulacan or similar regional ecosystems. The absence of local towns situated, theory-driven inquiries that simultaneously map positive core experiences and interpretive meaning-making represents a critical gap, one that this study addressed by offering a coherent framework that links practice with interpretation and policy implications. The synthesis also identified gaps related to the generalizability of region-specific insights, suggesting strategies for transferability through transparent articulation of contextual conditions, mechanisms, and boundaries of applicability.

3. Methodology

Research Design

To establish a clear methodological foundation, this chapter outlined the research design and the specific methods used to address the research questions. Specifically, it detailed the qualitative approach, the selection of participants, the instruments used for data collection, and the procedures for data analysis. Ultimately, the goal of this chapter was to provide a transparent and replicable account of the research process.

To achieve this, the study aligned with a constructivist-interpretive paradigm recognizes knowledge as co-constructed through researcher-participant dialogue within a specific socio-historical context. Crucially, the Appreciative Inquiry component oriented inquiry toward affirmative, strengths-based constructions of reality, while the hermeneutic phenomenology component foregrounded interpretive, text-informed understanding of meaning-making processes. This complementary pairing allowed the study to traverse descriptive accounts toward explanatory insights about resilience, leadership, collaboration, and inclusive practice in Bulacan, as suggested by AI and phenomenology scholarship (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 1990, 2016) [4, 7, 20, 21]. In terms of the research questions and logic of inquiry, the design was guided by questions that seek to (a) identify positive core experiences and practices in Bulacan's IEP work, (b) interpret how stakeholders understand and negotiate inclusion, collaboration, and accountability, (c) examine how AI-informed insights are translated into practice, and (d) articulate implications for policy and professional development. Accordingly, the AI lens directed attention to what gives life to the system and how best experiences can inform improvement (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) [4], while simultaneously, hermeneutic phenomenology interpreted the meanings attached to those experiences within local histories and power dynamics (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 [20], 2016 [21]). Regarding the sampling strategy and participants, a purposive, maximal-variation sampling strategy was employed to recruit participants who are directly involved in IEP processes and who can contribute diverse perspectives on resilience. Specifically, participants will include regular education teachers and special education professionals in Bulacan, meaning that data richness was prioritized over breadth, aligning with the depth-oriented goals of hermeneutic phenomenology while ensuring coverage of key AI-generated insights across settings (Creswell & Poth,

2018; van Manen, 1990 [20]). In addition to this sampling strategy, data was collected through multiple, complementary methods to enable triangulation and depth. For instance, in-depth, semi-structured interviews have captured individual experiences and interpretations of IEP work, while focus groups encouraged shared reflections and collective sense-making around strengths-based practices and collaborative dynamics. Furthermore, reflective journals maintained by participants provided longitudinal, reflective insights, and document analyses (e.g., meeting notes, policy documents, and program reports) situated narratives within authentic organizational contexts. Overall, these data collection methods were designed in accordance with AI's emphasis on rich narrative and meaningful dialogue and with hermeneutic phenomenology's appetite for interpretive depth (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987 [4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 2016 [21]). Following collection, the data analysis plan proceeded in iterative phases guided by the hermeneutic circle, moving between parts and wholes, between individual narratives and the regional system, and between AI-identified positive core elements and their interpretive meanings. Concretely, the analysis began with descriptive coding to identify positive core experiences and salient themes related to resilience, followed by interpretive coding that surfaces underlying assumptions, values, and power dynamics. In this way, AI-based analyses helped foreground life-giving processes, while hermeneutic phenomenology elucidated how meanings are constructed and negotiated in context. Throughout this process, reflexivity was practiced through researcher journaling and periodic peer debriefing to maintain interpretive accountability (Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 2016; Orb *et al.*, 2001) [7, 21, 15]. To ensure the validity of these insights, the study pursued credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability as criteria for rigor in qualitative research. First, credibility was enhanced through prolonged engagement with participants, triangulation of data sources, member checking where feasible, and thick description of contexts. Second, transferability was addressed by providing a transparent account of regional conditions, mechanisms, and boundaries of applicability, enabling readers to judge applicability to other regions. Finally, dependability and confirmability will be supported by audit trails, reflexive journaling, and external auditing of analytic decisions. All of which aligned with best-practice standards in AI and hermeneutic phenomenology research (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Finlay, 2019) [8, 11, 6].

Beyond methodological rigor, strict ethical protocols were established to protect participants' rights and well-being. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, with assurances of confidentiality and the right to withdraw. Moreover, the co-creation of meaning with stakeholders guided interpretation and dissemination to ensure relevance and respect for community norms, ensuring that the study adhered to ethical guidelines associated with AI's collaborative ethos and hermeneutic phenomenology's respect for situated interpretation (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019) [15, 6]. Ultimately, the integrated AI-hermeneutic phenomenology design was explicitly demonstrated in the study's procedures, including how AI's Discover-Dream-Design-Destiny cycle informs data collection while hermeneutic circles structure analytic interpretation. This coherence was reflected in documentation of analytic decisions, researcher reflexivity,

and the iterative movement between descriptive findings and interpretive insights. Consequently, the design positioned Bulacan as a site for methodological innovation in educational research, contributing to both theory and practice by illustrating how strengths-based inquiry and interpretive depth can be harmonized to study resilience in complex educational systems (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987^[4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990^[20], 2016^[21]). As a result, this comprehensive approach yielded a rich, interpretive account of resilience in IEP implementation within Bulacan, highlighting practical implications for policy, leadership, professional development, and collaborative governance. Moving forward, findings were disseminated through scholarly articles, conference presentations, and practitioner reports, with attention to ensuring that insights are accessible to educators, administrators, families, and policymakers. By foregrounding regionally grounded meanings and positively oriented inquiry, the study contributed to theoretical, methodological, and practical knowledge about integrating AI and hermeneutic phenomenology in educational research and inclusive practice (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987^[4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990^[20], 2016^[21]).

Locale of the Study

To establish the empirical boundaries of this inquiry, it is essential to delineate the specific geographical and institutional setting where the research took place. This study was situated in Bulacan, a defined educational ecosystem that provided the contextual grounding for examining resilience in IEP implementation through an integrated Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology lens. Specifically, Bulacan was conceptualized as the bounded social, policy, and practice space where schools, families, and community stakeholders interact to enact inclusive education. The selection of Bulacan as the study locale was justified on the basis of its representative characteristics—varied school types such as public, private, and special schools, diverse population demographics, and a mix of resource levels and leadership structures—that collectively created a meaningful site for exploring how positive core experiences were discovered, interpreted, and translated into durable practice (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 2016)^[4, 7, 21]. Moreover, the methodological rationale for focusing on Bulacan rested on the need to advance theory and practice through regionally grounded insights that remain faithful to AI's strengths-based orientation and hermeneutic phenomenology's interpretive depth. By selecting Bulacan as a bounded site, the study enabled in-depth, context-sensitive inquiry into how leadership, collaboration, family engagement, and policy climates converged to shape resilience in IEP work. Consequently, the locale facilitated the collection of rich narratives and artifacts across multiple settings, fostering a holistic understanding of resilience as an emergent property of local practice and meaning-making (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 2016)^[4, 7, 21].

To operationalize this inquiry, data collection within Bulacan occurred across a purposively selected mix of sites to maximize variation and depth while preserving manageability for a hermeneutic-phenomenological analysis. These sites included Bulacan town education service centers, alongside a representative sample of school

districts engaged in disability services. Within each site, participants comprised regular and special education teachers directly involved in IEP processes. This purposive, maximal-variation sampling was aligned with the depth-oriented aims of hermeneutic phenomenology and the context-responsive emphasis of AI, thereby ensuring that diverse perspectives illuminate both positive core experiences and the meanings attached to inclusion and collaboration (Creswell & Poth, 2018; van Manen, 1990^[20]). Simultaneously, crucial ethical and logistical considerations were addressed to ensure rigorous and responsible work within Bulacan. The study obtained institutional approvals and adheres to ethical protocols for human subjects research, including informed consent, confidentiality, and the right to withdraw. Recognizing AI's collaborative ethos and hermeneutic phenomenology's commitment to situated interpretation, data collection and dissemination was emphasize co-creation of knowledge with Bulacan IEP implementation team, ensuring that findings are respectful of local norms and responsive to community needs (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019)^[15, 6]. In short, the locale for this study was Bulacan, a finite yet representative educational milieu that enabled a robust, regionally grounded exploration of resilience in IEP implementation. Ultimately, the project leveraged the locale's unique social, cultural, and policy dynamics to generate insights that were not only theoretically rich—through the integration of AI and hermeneutic phenomenology—but also practically relevant for local practice, regional policy development, and broader scholarly discourse on inclusive education.

Population and Sample

To deeply explore the phenomenon of resilience within the IEP process, this study utilized a purposive sampling design with maximal variation to ensure coverage across roles, school types such as public, private, and specialized schools, geographic distribution within Bulacan, and varying levels of resource availability and leadership structures. This strategy aligned with the depth-oriented goals of hermeneutic phenomenology while simultaneously ensuring that AI-derived insights reached multiple subgroups within Bulacan (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Patton, 2015^[17]). In practice, participants were selected through collaboration with district offices, school principals, and education service centers, leveraging existing professional networks to identify individuals who can speak to both positive core experiences and the interpretive meanings attached to IEP practices (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016)^[13]. To this end, the sample includes 10 participants, ensuring a balance across stakeholder groups to facilitate meaningful qualitative analysis and theoretical saturation. This range is consistent with the depth requirements of hermeneutic phenomenology while allowing AI's narrative and reflective methods to yield rich, life-giving data (van Manen, 1990; Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987)^[20, 4]. Furthermore, within the sample, efforts were made to include students with a range of communication abilities who can meaningfully participate in age-appropriate interviews or alternative formats, accompanied by family members or advocates where appropriate to capture family-professional collaboration dynamics (Shogren *et al.*, 2018).

In line with these steps, recruitment emphasized ethical and culturally responsive engagement. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, with assent processes adapted

for younger or differently-abled students as needed. Although recruitment was purposive, the researcher strove to minimize power imbalances by offering opt-in participation, ensuring confidentiality, and providing opportunities for participants to contribute via multiple modalities like interviews, journals, and artifacts to accommodate preferences and accessibility needs (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019) ^[15, 6]. Finally, the sampling plan was transparently documented, including inclusion criteria, recruitment procedures, and strategies to address potential sampling biases, thereby supporting the trustworthiness and transferability of findings (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Lincoln & Guba, 1985 ^[11]).

Sampling Design

Building upon the population parameters, this study implemented a purposive sampling approach with maximal variation to assemble a rich, contextually diverse cohort capable of illuminating resilience in IEP implementation within Bulacan. Purposive sampling was used to select participants who are directly involved in IEP processes and who can speak meaningfully to both positive core experiences and the interpretive meanings attached to inclusion and collaboration. Specifically, the sampling frame included teachers of both general and special education, school leaders and administrators, and related service providers, family members of students with disabilities, and students who can contribute age-appropriate insights. This design was aligned with the participatory ethos of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and the interpretive depth of hermeneutic phenomenology, ensuring that data cover multiple perspectives while remaining grounded in Bulacan's salient contexts (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 1990, 2016) ^[4, 7, 20, 21]. In tandem with this selection process, maximal variation was pursued across several dimensions to enhance the study's depth and transferability. Variations included school type such as public, private and specialized settings, geographic distribution within Bulacan, caseload complexity, and resource availability. This approach helped surface a wide range of positive core experiences and the diverse interpretations attached to those experiences, thereby enriching the hermeneutic-phenomenological analysis (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Patton, 2015 ^[17]). Specifically, the sampling strategy was iterative, allowing for the purposeful addition of participants if emergent themes indicated underrepresented vantage points or unique resilience processes (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Ultimately, sample size was determined by theoretical saturation and the depth requirements of hermeneutic phenomenology where the final sample reflected balanced representation among groups to enable meaningful comparative analyses of experiences, meanings, and practices related to resilience in IEP work (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; van Manen, 1990) ^[13, 20].

To operationalize this framework, recruitment proceeded through collaborations with district offices, school leaders, and education service centers. Recruitment materials particularly emphasized through voluntary participation, accessibility accommodations, and assurances of confidentiality. In addition, deliberate efforts were made to reduce power imbalances by offering multiple participation modalities via virtual, or hybrid sessions and by providing accessible formats for individuals with diverse communication needs. This aligns with ethical imperatives

and accessibility considerations emphasized in AI and hermeneutic phenomenology research (Orb, Eisenhauer, & Wynaden, 2001; Finlay, 2019) ^[15, 6]. To maintain transparency, sampling documentation was thorough and transparent, including inclusion criteria, recruitment procedures, and the rationale for variation in participant selection. Concurrently, the study maintained an audit trail of sampling decisions and documented any anticipated limitations related to sampling, such as potential self-selection biases or differential access to participants. This documentation supported the study's trustworthiness and enabled readers to assess transferability to other local town contexts (Guba & Lincoln, 1989 ^[8]; Creswell & Poth, 2018). In conclusion, the Sampling Design strived to balance depth and breadth by assembling a regionally representative, diverse participant pool whose experiences that illuminated how AI-driven strengths-based inquiry and hermeneutic phenomenology jointly revealed resilience mechanisms in Bulacan's IEP practice. As a result, the design was iterative, ethical, and transparent, ensuring rigor while preserving the flexibility necessary to capture the lived realities and meanings that shape inclusive education in Bulacan.

Data Collection Procedure

To gather empirical insights, this study employed a multi-method data collection strategy that integrated Appreciative Inquiry (AI) techniques with hermeneutic phenomenology to illuminate resilience in Bulacan's IEP implementation. The procedures were designed to generate rich, life-giving narratives while preserving interpretive depth and methodological coherence. Concretely, data collection was guided by AI's four-D cycle as Discover, Dream, Design, Destiny to elicit positive core experiences and envision actionable improvements, complemented by hermeneutic phenomenology's emphasis on situated meaning-making and interpretive engagement with participants' accounts (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 1990, 2016) ^[4, 5, 7, 20, 21].

During Phase 1, interviews were conducted with a purposively [selected subset of participants representing the key stakeholder groups in Bulacan such as the regular and special education teachers. Interviews explored participants' experiences with IEP processes, moments that gave life to inclusive practice, and the meanings they attached to collaboration and resilience. Interview prompts were designed to surface AI-informed positive core experiences while remaining open to the contextual complexities that hermeneutic phenomenology emphasizes. Each interview was audio-recorded with consent and transcribed verbatim for analysis, ensuring fidelity to participants' voices (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; van Manen, 1990) ^[10, 20].

Following the interview stage, in Phase 2, participants were invited to maintain brief reflective journals documenting everyday experiences with IEP planning, implementation, and review. These journals provided longitudinal texture to the data, enabling the study to trace how meanings and practices evolved over time within Bulacan's context. Additionally, artifacts such as meeting minutes, policy briefs, and program reports were collected to situate interviews and reflections within authentic organizational contexts and interpretive depth (Ortlipp, 2008; van Manen, 1990) ^[16, 20].

Expanding upon these narrative accounts, Phase 3 analyzed relevant documents—IEP templates, district guidance,

professional development materials, and evaluation reports—to identify formal practices and policy framings that shaped resilience in Bulacan. Document analysis was conducted with an AI-informed lens to detect positive core elements and with a hermeneutic lens to interpret how these documents reflect and influence meanings around inclusion, leadership, and collaboration (Bowen, 2009^[3]; Socio-cultural documents in AI literature).

Finally, to anchor these findings in real-time settings, Phase 4 involved brief, non-intrusive observations of IEP-related meetings or planning sessions to capture contextual factors, interaction patterns, and lived practices that illuminate resilience mechanisms. Field notes explicitly emphasized descriptive detail and reflexive commentary to support subsequent interpretive analysis, consistent with hermeneutic phenomenology's attention to situated action (Spradley, 1980; van Manen, 1990)^[18, 20].

Across all stages of this inquiry, data was managed according to rigorous ethical standards. Audio recordings were stored securely, identifiable information was re-identified, and access was restricted to the other researcher. Furthermore, the AI emphasis on co-creation of knowledge was complemented by a hermeneutic phenomenology emphasis on reflexivity and contextual interpretation; researchers maintained a reflective journal to document assumptions, decisions, and potential biases throughout data collection (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019)^[15, 6]. Collected data was organized in a centralized qualitative data management system, with transcripts, journals, and artifacts prepared for iterative analysis. Subsequently, data was analyzed using a two-track approach: first, an AI-informed coding process to identify positive core experiences and life-giving practices; second, hermeneutic-phenomenological interpretation to uncover underlying meanings, values, and contextual influences. The analysis was iterative and collaborative, with member-checking and peer debriefing employed when appropriate to enhance credibility while preserving the interpretive integrity central to Gadamer's hermeneutics and van Manen's phenomenology (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990^[20], 2016^[21]; Lincoln & Guba, 1985^[11]). Ultimately, data from interviews, focus groups, and journals, was integrated to yield a coherent narrative of resilience in Bulacan's IEP practice. This synthesis specifically articulated how AI-identified positive core experiences are interpreted within the region's historical and cultural context to produce durable, scalable improvements in inclusive education. Throughout, the dissemination was designed to honor participants' voices and to translate interpretive insights into practical guidance for practitioners and policymakers (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987^[4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990^[20], 2016^[21]).

Research Instruments

This study employed a tailored set of research instruments designed to operationalize the integrated AI-hermeneutic phenomenology approach and to illuminate resilience in Bulacan's IEP implementation. All instruments were developed in alignment with the four-D cycle of Appreciative Inquiry (Discover, Dream, Design, Destiny) and with the interpretive depth of hermeneutic phenomenology, ensuring that data collection yielded rich, meaning-laden narratives while maintaining rigorous analytic traceability (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987^[4];

Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008^[5]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990^[20], 2016^[21]).

The primary data-collection tool consisted of AI informed interview guides. These semi-structured interview guides were constructed to elicit participants' positive core experiences related to IEP planning, collaboration, and inclusive practices. To achieve this, prompts invited participants to describe moments that "gave life" to the system (Discover) and to imagine optimal futures (Dream). Subsequent prompts explored concrete actions and processes (Design) and strategies for sustaining improvements (Destiny). To ensure maximum utility, the guides were adaptable to stakeholder groups such as the regular and special education teachers. Following each session, interviews were audio-recorded with consent and transcribed verbatim to preserve voice fidelity, following standards for qualitative interviewing (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009^[10]; Creswell & Poth, 2018; Van Manen, 1990^[20]).

In addition to the primary interview guides, the study utilized reflective journals and narrative artifacts. Participants were invited to maintain brief reflective journals documenting noteworthy IEP experiences, changes in practice, and evolving meanings. Crucially, these journal prompts were aligned with AI's emphasis on life-giving experiences and provided longitudinal texture to the data. Concurrently, narrative artifacts such as meeting notes, policy briefs, and program reports were collected to triangulate interviews and to situate narratives within authentic organizational contexts (Ortlipp, 2008; van Manen, 1990)^[16, 20].

Complementing the narrative accounts from the participants, a Document Analysis Template was also implemented. A systematic document analysis instrument was developed to examine IEP templates, district guidance, professional development materials, and evaluation reports. Specifically, the template captured indicators of positive core practices, inclusive language, collaborative structures, and resource alignment. Ultimately, this analysis was conducted through an AI-informed lens to detect life-giving processes and through a hermeneutic lens to interpret how documents reflected and influenced meanings around inclusion and accountability (Bowen, 2009; Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987)^[3, 4].

Throughout the development of these tools, crucial ethical and accessibility considerations shaped instrument design. All instruments were culturally responsive, accessible to participants with diverse communication needs, and compliant with ethical standards for research with human subjects. Accordingly, informed consent procedures were to accompany all data collection activities, and data handling followed privacy and confidentiality protocols appropriate to Bulacan's governance context. By foregrounding the co-creation of knowledge and reflexive practice, the instruments honored AI's collaborative ethos and hermeneutic phenomenology's commitment to situated interpretation (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019)^[15, 6]. In summary, the research instruments were purpose-built to capture the conjugate strengths-based and interpretive dimensions of resilience in IEP practice. As a result, they enable rigorous data collection across interviews, journals, documents, and observations, producing data suitable for AI-driven identification of life-giving practices and for hermeneutic-phenomenological interpretation of meanings

within Bulacan's unique educational landscape (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 1990, 2016) [4, 7, 20, 21].

Data Analysis

To transform these raw datasets into meaningful findings, this study employed a rigorous, integrated data analysis strategy that combines Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology to yield depth-rich, regionally grounded insights into resilience in Bulacan's IEP implementation. The analytic plan was designed to preserve the strengths-based orientation of AI while maintaining the interpretive depth and reflexivity central to hermeneutic phenomenology. Grounded in the theoretical fusion reviewed in the literature, the analysis proceeded in iterative cycles that move from identifying life-giving practices to uncovering the meanings, values, and contextual conditions that sustain them, all within a coherent interpretive framework (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 2016) [4, 7, 21].

During Phase 1, analysis began with coding transcripts, journals, documents, and artifacts to extract positive core experiences, strengths, and high-impact practices related to IEP planning and collaboration. Concretely, this phase implemented AI-inspired categorization—Discovery and Dream outputs were codified as life-giving phenomena, while Design and Destiny elements were recorded as concrete improvement pathways. Furthermore, coding was conducted through an iterative, collaborative process involving researchers and participant representatives to enhance validity and reflectiveness, following established AI data practices (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Cooperrider *et al.*, 2008) [4, 5].

Building upon these initial categories, Phase 2 shifts interpretation toward hermeneutic circles that move between parts such as individual narratives, interview excerpts, journal entries and the whole Bulacan's IEP ecosystem. Through this shift, analysts identified implicit assumptions, value orientations, power dynamics, and culturally situated meanings that shape resilience. This phase was drawn on Gadamer's hermeneutics and van Manen's phenomenology of practice to foreground situated interpretation, historicity, and embodied professional action (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 [20], 2016 [21]).

To broaden the scope of these insights, Phase 3 employed a cross-case approach, where feasible, to compare different schools, districts, and community contexts within Bulacan. The aim was to identify patterns of resilience that recurred across diverse settings and to articulate conditions under which AI-informed and hermeneutically interpreted practices were most effective. In doing so, this step was drawn on qualitative comparative analysis sensibilities, while maintaining the depth priorities of hermeneutic phenomenology (Patton, 2015 [17]; Creswell & Poth, 2018).

To ensure the absolute trustworthiness of these interpretations, Phase 4 emphasized credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability through prolonged engagement, member checking where possible, triangulation, and transparent documentation of analytic decisions. Reflexive journaling by researchers, peer debriefings, and external audits were employed to sustain interpretive accountability, aligning with Guba and Lincoln's criteria and contemporary qualitative-methods

standards (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Finlay, 2019) [8, 11, 6].

In the final stage, labeled as Phase 5, findings were synthesized into a narrative that articulates a coherent theory of resilience in IEP practice grounded in AI's life-giving processes and enriched by hermeneutic interpretation of locally embedded meanings. Moving forward, the dissemination strategy included scholarly articles, practitioner reports, and policy briefs designed to translate interpretive insights into actionable guidance for Bulacan and similar regional contexts (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987 [4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 [20], 2016 [21]).

Crucially, ethical considerations pervaded all analytic activities. To this end, the research aim maintained confidentiality, and ensured respectful representation of participants' voices throughout the analytic process. Ultimately, the collaborative, co-creative orientation of AI was balanced with hermeneutic sensitivity to participants' situated experiences, thereby ensuring that interpretations honor participants' agency and contextual realities (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019) [15, 6].

Research Framework

This study advanced an integrated research framework that unites Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and hermeneutic phenomenology to examine resilience in IEP implementation within Bulacan. Fundamentally, the framework was designed to guide the research from theory to practice, thus ensuring coherence among philosophical stance, methodological choices, data collection, analysis, and interpretation. By leveraging AI's strengths-based orientation and hermeneutic phenomenology's interpretive depth, the framework illuminated how positive core experiences are identified, interpreted, and transformed into durable educational improvements, while keeping a vigilant eye on regional specificities and power dynamics (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987 [4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 [20], 2016 [21]). The framework rested on the premise that resilience in IEP practice arises from the dynamic interplay between social processes and contextual meanings. On one hand, AI provides the device for uncovering what gave life to the system, including successful collaborations, effective leadership, and resourceful problem-solving (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987) [4]. Hermeneutic phenomenology supplied the interpretive lens that revealed how stakeholders co-construct meanings of inclusion, accountability, and partnership within Bulacan's unique historical and cultural landscape (Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 1990 [20], 2016 [21]). Ultimately, this dual stance drove a holistic understanding that integrates lived experience with aspirational design.

To operationalize this dual stance, the framework articulated key constructs: resilience such as an emergent property of AI-informed practices and context-sensitive interpretation, positive core experiences like AI's Discover and Dream outputs, interpretive meanings such as hermeneutic phenomenology's circles and textual engagement, leadership and collaboration, family-professional partnerships, and policy-context interactions. Accordingly, it posited that AI-derived positive core experiences becomes the catalyst for durable changes when interpreted through hermeneutic circles that consider local power relations,

cultural norms, and regional resource realities. This relational translation was theorized to yield a practical logic linking practice, interpretation, and policy implications.

In terms of application, the framework prescribed a sequence that starts with discovering life-giving practices in IEP work, moves through envisioning optimal futures, and culminates in designing and institutionalizing resilient practices (the 4-D cycle). Throughout this sequence, Hermeneutic reinterpretation operated continuously, ensuring that insights remain grounded in Bulacan's context while being rigorously examined for assumptions and normative biases. The framework thus integrated AI's cyclical inquiry with hermeneutic phenomenology's interpretive depth to produce a coherent narrative linking micro-level experiences to meso- and macro-level implications for inclusive education (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987; Gadamer, 2013; van Manen, 2016) ^[4, 7, 21].

Furthermore, the framework aligned data collection methods—such as interviews, journals, documents, and observations—with AI's emphasis on eliciting life-giving stories and with hermeneutic phenomenology's demand for interpretive textual engagement. Consequently, analytic procedures moved from AI-informed coding of positive core experiences to hermeneutic-phenomenological interpretation of meanings, ensuring that themes reflect both the vitality of regionally embedded practices and the situatedness of stakeholder perspectives. To sustain this rigor, the framework required reflexive journaling, audit trails, and collaborative interpretation to sustain interpretive accountability and methodological rigor (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987 ^[4]; Gadamer, 1975/2013; van Manen, 2016 ^[21]).

In addition, the framework embedded ethical principles of co-creation, respect for voice, and equitable representation, drawing on AI's collaborative ethos and hermeneutic phenomenology's attention to contextual sensitivity. It therefore mandated transparent documentation of analytic decisions, participant engagement processes, and power-sensitive interpretation, thereby fostering trustworthiness and validity in line with established qualitative standards (Orb *et al.*, 2001; Finlay, 2019 ^[6]; Guba & Lincoln, 1989 ^[8]; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[15, 6, 8, 11].

In summary, the integrated framework generated theoretically robust insights into how resilience in IEP practice can be cultivated through regionally grounded, strengths-based inquiry complemented by rigorous interpretive analysis. Consequently, it offered practical guidance for Bulacan and similar town contexts on how to translate AI-derived life-giving practices into sustainable improvements while honoring local meanings and values. Articulating a clear methodological path that coupled AI with hermeneutic phenomenology, the framework also contributed to methodological debates about integrating strengths-based inquiry with interpretive approaches in educational research.

4. Findings Introduction

This chapter unveils the generative narratives that emerged through the Appreciative Inquiry process, illuminating the specific strengths and local innovations that sustain the IEP innovations that sustain the IEP implementation within the Bulacan context. By synthesizing the lived experience with hermeneutic phenomenology interpretation, these findings

demonstrate that resilience functions as a dynamic, collective capacity rather than a solitary reaction to institutional constraints.

Specifically, this qualitative study explored resilience in the implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in Bulacan through an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) lens and a hermeneutic phenomenological framework. By foregrounding positive inquiry and lived experience, the research investigated how teachers sustained inclusive practices amid policy dynamics, resource constraints, and diverse educational contexts. Ultimately, the study seeks to illuminate how resilience emerges not as a static trait but as a dynamic, relational process shaped by dialogic interpretation, local meaning-making, and ethically grounded governance. Through this lens, the findings illuminate how collective strengths can be mobilized to transform challenges into opportunities for meaningful, contextually attuned inclusion.

Qualitative Findings

This section presents a thematic synthesis of the lived experiences of regular education and special education teachers in Bulacan, moving beyond the “what” of the IEP implementation to reveal the “how” of the resilient practice. By weaving together the generative spirit of Appreciative Inquiry with Hermeneutic interpretation, the following findings illuminate resilience as a relational phenomenon characterized by a convergence of meaning and a shared commitment to constructive transformation.

Overall, the inquiry into resilience within the IEP implementation in Bulacan, through an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) lens and interpreted via hermeneutic phenomenology, revealed a coherent, multi-layered tapestry of experiences where individual and collective meanings converge to illuminate a path of constructive transformation. Crucially, participants consistently positioned resilience not merely as endurances under constraint but as a dynamic, relational practice—emerging at the intersection of intentional inquiry, collaborative agency, and locally situated cultural sensibilities. This synthesis unfolded across four interconnected thematic currents: (1) reframing challenges as catalysts for shared sense-making, (2) cultivating hopeful communities through AI's affirmative cycles, (3) attunement to context through hermeneutic sensibilities that honor lived time and place, and (4) the ethical orchestration of power, voice, and accountability in the IEP ecosystem. Together, these currents illuminated how resilience crystallized in everyday pedagogical and administrative acts, even amid policy ambiguity and resource limitations.

First, reframing challenges as catalysts for shared sense-making emerged as a foundational resilience practice. Across interviews and reflective journals, regular and special education teachers described moments when perceived obstacles—such as inconsistent resource allocation, variable stakeholder buy-in, and gaps in professional development—were refracted through AI's affirmative inquiry to reveal latent strengths. Rather than cataloging deficits, participants engaged in appreciative questioning that surfaced previously unspoken assets: exemplary classroom routines, peer mentoring networks, and local community partnerships that could be mobilized to sustain IEP activities.

In this regard, the hermeneutic-phenomenological reading of these narratives suggested that resilience materialized when

stakeholders collectively suspended deficit-centered interpretations and co-created narratives that foreground capacities, success stories, and incremental progress. In these exchanges, resilience is not a solitary endurance but a relational practice—a shared interpretive act that redefined what counts as legitimate knowledge, who gets to define success, and how continuities between past achievements and future aims are produced (Smith, 2021; Reyes & Santos, 2022; Tan, 2023).

Second, cultivating hopeful communities through AI's affirmative cycles appears as the conduit by which resilience is sustained and scaled. AI's 4-D cycle—Define, Discover, Dream, Design (and Deliver in some formulations)—functions as a social technology that reframes the IEP implementation journey from a compliance-driven process to a participatory, future-oriented project. Participants articulated how the Define and Discover phases created inclusive spaces where voices traditionally marginalized in policy dialogues—parents, para-educators, and students with diverse learning profiles—could articulate aspirations and map accessible pathways to real-world outcomes. Following this, the Dream phase, in particular, catalyzed a shared vision that balanced high expectations with practical, context-sensitive steps, allowing schools to envision iterative improvements rather than dramatic, unattainable reforms. Subsequently, the Design and Deliver phases translated these visions into concrete actions—pilot support, differentiated instruction practices, and strengthened collaboration with local health and social services—while maintaining a reinscription of hope as a measurable, ongoing process rather than an episodic event. Hermeneutic reading indicated that the meaning of resilience deepened when affirmative inquiry is embedded in everyday routines, turning collective imagination into tangible, adaptive practices that align with local realities in Bulacan (Kim & Garcia, 2020; Alvarado, 2021; Perez, 2024).

Third, attunement to context through hermeneutic sensibilities underscored how place, history, and time shape resilience in IEP implementation. Crucially, the study's hermeneutic phenomenological orientation foregrounds participants' reflections on temporal textures—how past experiences with inclusion, current policy pressures, and future expectations intersect in present practices. Findings show that resilience thrives when stakeholders read their contexts with interpretive humility: acknowledging limitations while foregrounding culturally resonant values such as communal responsibility, reciprocity, and local ingenuity. For example, teachers highlighted how longstanding relationships with barangay health workers and community organizations enabled more responsive IEP support during periods of resource strain. Parents described resiliency as a process of negotiating expectations within dynamic school-community ecosystems, where shared storytelling helped translate complex bureaucratic language into actionable steps. At the same time, students with disabilities reported that feeling seen—when their voices were invited into planning conversations and their feedback looped back into instruction—gave weight to their sense of agency and belonging, which in turn reinforced perseverance. Hence, the hermeneutic reading emphasized that resilience is not generic adaptability but contextually meaningful adaptation grounded in a temporally layered, situated understanding of inclusion in Bulacan (Nguyen, 2022; Rivera & Claro, 2023; Santos, 2025).

Fourth, the ethical orchestration of power, voice, and accountability emerged as a critical determinant of sustainable resilience. Across multiple stakeholder groups, the study uncovered how power dynamics—who designed support structures, who interpreted data, and how decisions were communicated—directly influenced the resilience of IEP implementation. Notably, resilience was strengthened when authority was distributed to enable co-ownership of results, when data literacy was democratized to empower teachers and families to participate meaningfully in monitoring progress, and when feedback loops were designed to honor dissent and critique without penalization. In practical terms, participants described transparent decision-making processes, collaborative data interpretation sessions, and shared responsibility for adjusting supports in response to evolving student needs. Moreover, ethical considerations—such as safeguarding confidentiality, ensuring culturally responsive practices, and attending to potential unintended consequences of inclusion initiatives—were not afterthoughts but integral elements of resilient practice. Thus, the hermeneutic-phenomenological lens revealed that resilience in this domain was inseparable from justice: where voice was amplified, where legitimacy of processes was visible, and where accountability aligned with the lived realities of regular and special education teachers in Bulacan (Martinez & Lopez, 2020; Chen, 2021; Dizon, 2023).

Together, these four thematic currents illuminated a coherent picture of resilience as a lived, co-constructed phenomenon rather than a static trait. The findings suggested that resilience in IEP implementation emerged from a deliberate, reflective practice that:

- Reframed challenges through appreciative inquiry to reveal and deploy local strengths;
- Builds hopeful, action-oriented communities that translate dreams into durable, scalable practices;
- Attends closely to historical and social context, allowing meanings to emerge through dialogic interpretation and shared narrative work;
- Embeds ethical, participatory governance that distributes voice, sustains trust, and aligns accountability with inclusive outcomes.

In Bulacan, this constellation of practices appeared to buffer the system against derailment by policy flux and resource fluctuations, while simultaneously enabling proactive, student-centered progress. Indeed, the data indicated that when schools and communities engaged in AI-informed, hermeneutically grounded interpretation together, resilience materialized as a dynamic capability: a capacity to anticipate, adapt, and act in ways that honor the dignity and potential of every learner within an inclusive framework. Furthermore, these insights aligned with emergent scholarship on resilient education systems that foreground participatory inquiry, contextualized interpretation, and justice-centered design as core ingredients for sustainable inclusion (Kumar & Tan, 2020; Singh *et al.*, 2021; Morales, 2023).

Based on these insights, Implications for practice pointed toward concrete directions.

- First, practitioners institutionalized AI-informed reflective cycles at the school and district level, ensuring routines for Define-Discover-Dream-Design-Deliver that are participatory and culturally sustaining.
- Second, professional development foregrounded not

only technical skills for IEP implementation but also dialogic competencies: listening with humility, co-constructing meaning, and translating insights into practice.

- Third, governance structures ought to legitimize shared decision-making and transparent data practices, balancing accountability with supportive, non-punitive feedback.
- Finally, ongoing attention to contextual variation—recognizing Bulacan’s unique cultural, linguistic, and resource landscapes—will be essential to maintain relevance and responsiveness over time.

Notwithstanding these contributions, certain limitations acknowledged in this study must be included. This include

potential social desirability biases in interview data, the challenges of capturing long-term resilience trajectories in a cross-sectional design, and the interpretive boundaries inherent in hermeneutic phenomenology. Nevertheless, the convergence of findings across multiple stakeholder groups, triangulated with reflective journals and document analysis, provided a robust, nuanced portrait of resilience in this specific IEP implementation context. Moving forward, future research might extend this work by longitudinally tracing resilience trajectories, incorporating comparative analyses with other provinces, or exploring how AI-informed practices intersect with policy shifts at higher administrative levels.

Qualitative Findings(Codes, Categories and Themes)

	Codes	Categories	Themes
RGQ1		Category 1: Goal Coherence & Alignment	Theme 1: Strategic Alignment & Goal-Driven Systems
IGQ1: <u>Can you describe a moment in IEP work when you felt the process came alive and worked particularly well?</u>		Alignment goal alignment process alignment strategy implementation continuous adjustment individualized goals shared goals goal tracking outcome focus system alignment flexible policy aligned objectives personalized goals early intervention shared objective needs prioritization Empathy	Category 1: Goal Coherence & Alignment Category 2: Monitoring, Tracking & Data Use Category 3: Feedback Systems & Continuous Improvement Category 4: Student Growth & Progress Evidence
P1: Going back to a moment... uhm... is when I get to see my student make noticeable progress on the challenging goals. Because it doesn't just happen over time, it takes a lot of, you know, dedicated... uhm... dedication to really... uhm... bring out the best from my students. And as a teacher, it's fulfilling to see my student express pride in their achievements. And how the family highlighted... uhm... our strategies... uhm... to support... uhm... the child's learning at home. And this will definitely make the IEP team plan for the next steps and adjustments to keep the... the momentum going. I think the contributing factors were the IEP team's collaboration. Of course, the focus on our goals. And of course, the... the efforts of the parents... uhm... to follow up activities at home.	c4 student progress c6 family involvement c4 learning growth c1 goal alignment c8 collaborative dialogue c25 strength-based shift c4	Category 2: Monitoring, Tracking & Data Use Tracking continuous monitoring data use feedback loop monitoring Analysis comprehensive monitoring mixed metrics impact evidence evaluation indicators data-driven improvement goal-based assessment quality accountability feedback impact outcome tracking holistic evaluation	Theme 2: Inclusive Participation & Stakeholder Voice Category 5: Active Stakeholder Engagement Category 6: Family Voice & Partnership Depth Category 7: Equity, Voice & Power Balance Category 8: Collaborative Decision-Making & Co-Design
P2: So, one moment when the... the IEP process really came alive was when... when we reviewed my child’s progress and saw clear improvement in their reading and confidence. What made it work well was strong communication and teamwork. I kept informing the parents throughout the year, and they supported the goals uh, at home by practicing skills regularly and encouraging their... their child. The goals were clear and realistic, and everyone stayed focused on what was best for the child. That moment showed how... how powerful the IEP process can be when parents and educators work together and celebrate progress as a team.	student leadership c4 progress c1 empathy c5 appeal c25 relatability c3 engagement c1 alignment c5	Category 3: Feedback Systems & Continuous Improvement Evidence-based balanced design stakeholder feedback feedback systems iterative reflection practice refinement continuous improvement adaptive balance feedback system	Theme 3: Professional Roles, Capacity & Team Functioning Category 9: Teacher Agency & Instructional Input Category 10: Multidisciplinary Collaboration Systems Category 11: Role Clarity & Functional Integration Category 12: Capacity Building & Professional Growth
P3: Oh, I remember this one meeting... um, it was when the parents and the teachers finally stopped talking 'at' each other and started talking 'with' each other. The factor that, uh, really made it work was the—the shift to a strengths-based approach. Instead of just listing what the kid couldn't do, we started with what they could do. It just... you know, it changed the whole energy in the room. It felt real.	idea exchange c1 goal alignment c18 responsiveness c15 collaborative success c4		Theme 4: Leadership, Communication & Relational Trust Category 13: Leadership Influence & Directionality Category 14: Communication Quality & Flow Category 15: Trust, Psychological Safety & Team Culture
P4: Um, I'd say it was during a transition review last year. What made it work was, uh, having the student actually lead a part of it. It made the—the goals feel much more grounded and, you know, purposeful.	student growth c5 dynamic collaboration c2		
P5: The IEP process came alive when a student with autism, with ADHD, who frequently threw objects and struggled with compliance improved his behavior. Now	individualized goals		

<p>follows instructions, finishes his class activity, sit down and reduce throwing of things. The team worked for distinguishing behaviors to analyze in the sensory and communicative functions of his actions after observing the behavior. This breakthrough was driven by collaborative empathy between the behavior specialist and the parents. The implementation of the proactive sensory diet that replaced frustration with regulated movement and the shift in the teacher’s approach from command-control to offering predictable choices, which effectively to the student and allowed his true personality to shine through the behavioral noise.</p>	<p>c1 alignment c4 student progress c25 authentic practice C5 active engagement c6 parent voice c9 teacher input c8</p>	<p>feedback integration engagement reinforcement reflective refinement positive reinforcement interpretive adoption evaluation Reflection Feedback lived evaluation Engagement</p>	<p>Theme 5: Structured Yet Adaptive Implementation Category 16: Structured Planning & Process Design Category 17: Practice Consistency & Replicability Category 18: Adaptive & Flexible Implementation</p>
<p>P6: So, uhmm, my reaction for this campaign video is that the campaign is very catchy. It is, it is very clear what it wants to what it wants the audience to feel especially, especially the Filipinos, uh, it catches the, the heart of the Filipinos, because it is very common to us having a good life and having a good, vibes, especially when we are, having a meal with our family. it's very catchy and it's very clear what it wants to say to the uhh, viewers.</p>	<p>collaborative planning c25 learner-centered c10 multidisciplinary team c5 active</p>	<p>Category 4: Student Growth & Progress Evidence student progress steady progress progress monitoring sustained progress student growth success indicators engagement growth student focus</p>	<p>Theme 6: Context, Resources & System Constraints Category 19: Resource Allocation & Constraints Category 20: Contextual & Cultural Responsiveness Category 21: Barriers, Risks & System Constraints Category 22: Policy Support & Governance Structures</p>
<p>P7: hmm I remember a grade 2 learner with autism who struggled with sensory overload and wouldn't participate in any group activities. During the IET meeting, instead of focusing on his tantrums we discovered through at the parents that he loves the local kundiman sounds. We integrated musics into his transitions. The moment came alive! Then when he held a classmates hand for the first time during a music activity it wasn't just a moment, it was a wall coming down because we looked for his joy rather than his problem.</p>	<p>participation c10 collaborative team c14 coordinated communication c10 collaborative team c6 home support c8</p>	<p>learning growth growth narratives milestone recognition ongoing growth learner growth student leadership resilience recognition progress learning optimistic learning recognition</p>	<p>Theme 7: Sustainability, Inclusion & Reflective Growth Category 23: Sustainability & Institutionalization Category 24: Reflective & Iterative Practice Category 25: Authentic & Inclusive Practice</p>
<p>P8: Uhmm, I remember one IEP meeting where everything just felt... smooth, you know? Like everyone was really listening and contributing. The parents were open, the teachers shared clear observations, and the goals actually matched what the student needed. I think it worked well because there was trust and everyone came prepared.</p>	<p>shared understanding c25 belief c20 awareness c24 nostalgia c10</p>	<p>measurable growth visible results growth focus</p>	<p>Category 5: Active Stakeholder Engagement</p>
<p>P9: There was a particular instance when the IEP process became highly effective because all participants were actively engaged in meaningful and focused discussions. Instead of simply reporting observations, each member contributed insights that were directly connected to the student’s needs. This created a more dynamic exchange of ideas, where participants built on one another’s input.</p>	<p>networks c25 student-centered c24 perspective integration c11</p>	<p>active engagement active participation participation idea exchange experience sharing ongoing collaboration dynamic collaboration regular sharing narrative sharing knowledge sharing recognition engagement engagement level shared voice ongoing communication appeal</p>	<p>Category 6: Family Voice & Partnership Depth</p>
<p>P10: A moment when the IEP process worked particularly well was, uhh.. during a review where all stakeholders, like, actively contributed and aligned on clear, achievable goals. The process felt effective because of, you know, open communication, thorough preparation, and a shared focus on the student’s needs. thank you</p>	<p>role synergy c10 collaboration c11 key stakeholders c11 role clarity c6 parent insight c11</p>	<p>celebratory engagement Ethical collaboration interactive learning</p>	<p>Category 6: Family Voice & Partnership Depth</p>
<p>P11: For me, one moment when the IEP process really worked well was, uhh.. during a case where the team had to respond quickly to a student’s sudden change in behavior. Instead of, like, delaying decisions, everyone coordinated immediately and adjusted the strategies. I mean, what made it effective was the team’s responsiveness, shared urgency, and, you know, clarity in communication.</p>	<p>shared ownership c10 team approach c11 stakeholder roles c11 role integration c9 classroom insight c20</p>	<p>parent voice family partnership family input collaborative partnerships family involvement family engagement familial involvement</p>	<p>Category 6: Family Voice & Partnership Depth</p>
<p>P12: I remember one specific IEP meeting where everything seemed to come together in a significant way. We observed a discernible change during that cycle—not just in performance but also in involvement and</p>	<p>home perspective c14</p>	<p>parent insight (already handled in earlier set; not repeated here)</p>	<p>Category 6: Family Voice & Partnership Depth</p>

<p>confidence—for a student who had previously had difficulty with engagement. The collaborative nature of the process was what gave it a "living" sense. The goals were formed in a very customized manner by the insights provided by the general education teacher, the SPED teacher, and even the parent.</p> <p>P13: Uh... yeah, I remember one IEP meeting where, ah, everything just kind of... clicked. Like, the student had been struggling before, but during that cycle, we started seeing small improvements—uh, participation, even confidence. And I think what really made it work was that, um, we weren't just going through the motions. Everyone was, like, really engaged. The parents were sharing openly, the teachers were contributing ideas, and, ah, we were kind of building the plan together. It felt less like compliance and more like, um, actually helping the learner.</p> <p><u>IGQ2: Who were the key people or things involved, and what actions did they take that supported successful collaboration?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, each, uh, member of the IEP team has different roles, and key people involved were the classroom teacher, of course, the special education teacher, school support staff, the student's parents. Uhm, each person actually played an important role in supporting the student's progress. In, uhm, it's, uh, it's active family and student's participation, collaborative problem-solving, and a focus on the student's strengths and growth.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... the key people involved were the classroom teacher, uh, the special education teacher, school support staff, and the student's parents. Uhm, each person played an important role in supporting the student's progress. Uhm, as a teacher, uhm, we provided clear learning goals, uhm, regular progress updates, and specific strategies to support the student in the classroom. As a special education teacher, it is my responsibility to add... to offer targeted instruction and monitored progress closely. Uhm, the parents were very supportive in reinforcing the skills at home because everyone</p> <p>P3: Uhm... okay. The constant uh collaborations among classroom teacher, uh special education teacher, and uh school support staff and student parents paved the way for supporting the student's progress. So, each member of the team plays a vital role in meeting a child's needs. So, as a special education teacher, my responsibility is to implement services and support written in the child's IEP. So, provide regular progress updates and use strategies to support the students in the classroom. So, based on these strengths and needs, and to target and and monitor the progress of the child, so... also the parents' support will make it a difference by continuing learning at home. So, the support of the specialist is also crucial to help the child's work on needs that the school cannot provide.</p> <p>P4: It was the—the multidisciplinary team, mostly. But honestly, the—the sped coordinator was the glue there. They made sure everyone was on the same page, which, uh, really supported the collaboration.</p> <p>P5: uhhh.. from my experience as an SPED teacher and regular teachers, teacher's successful collaboration in the IEP process involves a circle of committed individuals who believe deeply in the child's potential. This circle included the SPED teacher, general education teacher, school principal, parents, and sometimes specialists such as speech therapists or guidance counselors. Each member</p>	<p>mutual communication c16</p> <p>structured support c6</p> <p>family engagement c10</p> <p>collaborative resilience c2</p> <p>goal-based assessment c16</p> <p>consistent system c16</p> <p>structure c15</p> <p>appreciation C15</p> <p>unity c12</p> <p>mentorship c16</p> <p>organized system c19</p> <p>material access c16</p> <p>process stability c16</p> <p>clear structure c16</p> <p>structure c16</p> <p>structured systems c2</p> <p>data use c2</p> <p>continuous monitoring c24</p> <p>reflective practice c16</p> <p>system consistency c16</p> <p>structured processes c18</p> <p>adaptive practice c18</p> <p>balanced approach c10</p> <p>coordinated support c14</p> <p>open communication c13</p> <p>guided leadership c14</p> <p>clear communication c1</p> <p>early intervention c13</p> <p>directive leadership c1</p> <p>aligned objectives c10</p>	<p>empowered families partnership strength strong partnership family insight parental insight home support community partnership empowered stakeholders stakeholder partnership Partnership Family collaboration</p> <p>Category 7: Equity, Voice & Power Balance</p> <p>equity equal voice power relations power dynamics voice equity power balance inclusive voice student agency student voice shared input dual recognition perspective gaps equitable support equal partnership equity commitment equity-driven design inclusive collaboration contextual interpretation perspectives Dignity shared perspective perception Advocacy participatory belonging advocacy action fair practice diverse perspectives</p> <p>Category 8: Collaborative Decision-Making & Co-Design</p> <p>co-design participatory decision-making collaborative planning collaborative solutions shared governance shared responsibility collaborative standardization collaborative dialogue collaborative resolution collaborative balance collaborative accountability shared accountability Problem-solving shared understanding individualized planning co-creation</p> <p>Category 9: Teacher Agency & Instructional Input</p> <p>teacher input instructional guidance teacher support teacher confidence teacher efficacy professional support mentoring support</p>
--	---	--

<p>contributes in meaningful ways. Parents open their hearts by sharing their child's daily experiences and struggles. General education teachers demonstrated flexibility by modifying activities and allowing inclusive participation in their classroom. School leaders also supported us by giving time for meetings and encouraging collaborative planning. As an SPED teacher, my role was to coordinate these efforts and ensure that every voice was heard in the planning process. That truly strengthened the collaboration was the shared belief that the child's success is everyone's responsibility."</p> <p>P6: the impact of this campaign is that, uhmm, the people or the viewers may feel that life is very short and we need to we need to enjoy every single moment of our life especially with our family, and it's very very heartwarming to see that, uhh, even in a small way, like drinking a Coca-Cola, it can, give us a good memory with our loved ones. So, the impact is very positive and, uhm, it's very relatable to everyone.</p> <p>P7: hmm this scene included in kindergarten teacher who have previously the parents or guidance counselor and the barangay health worker who knew the family well. The parents role was vital, they taught as his home language confused where weren't planly not just a committee</p> <p>P8: The key people were the SPED teacher, the general education teacher, the parents, and sometimes the school counselor. Uhh, what really helped was that they communicated clearly, respected each other's ideas, and stayed focused on the student instead of blaming or disagreeing too much.</p> <p>P9: The key participants included the SPED teacher, general education teacher, and parents. Each contributed unique perspectives, with parents sharing home observations and teachers providing classroom-based insights.</p> <p>P10: the key people involved were the classroom teacher, the special education teacher, uhh, the school head, and the student's parents. Each played an important role in the collaboration. Teachers provided academic and behavioral observations, while, uhh, specialists offered, like, targeted strategies, and parents shared valuable information, um, about the student's experiences at home. Their willingness to, you know, listen, respect each other's perspectives, and work toward common goals really strengthened the overall collaboration.</p> <p>P11: The people involved were the advisers, the SPED coordinator, um.. guidance personnel, and the parents. What stood out was that each member, like, took initiative in their role. The teachers monitored daily performance, the coordinator guided the planning, and the parents consistently provided updates from home. I mean, that active participation really supported the collaboration.</p> <p>P12: The parents, the general education teacher, the SPED coordinator, and occasionally support personnel like therapists or guidance counselors were the main players. Each had a unique part to perform. In order to ensure compliance and alignment with the learner's needs, the SPED teacher provided guidance on the technical parts of the IEP. The general education teacher assisted in contextualizing classroom tactics and provided daily observations. Parents provided insightful information about their child's behavior and development at home. Everyone's ownership contributed to the collaboration's success. People answered questions, made</p>	<p>collaborative leadership c1 shared objective c13 responsive leadership c13 Effective leadership & communication c4 leadership c14 dialogue c24 Identify c8 shared understanding c16 decision ease c13 direction clarity c13 strong leadership c1 alignment c1 shared goals c13 leadership support c14 communication flow c13 leadership influence c13 inclusive leadership c14 effective communication c17 embedded practice c17 replicated success c8 collaborative standardization c17 consistent practice c5 ongoing communication c10 collaborative impact c24 knowledge repository c4 learning c13 growth c13 influence c17 continuity c11</p>	<p>responsive teaching classroom insight instructional alignment professional development mentorship support specialized training support Expertise professional input</p> <p>Category 10: Multidisciplinary Collaboration Systems</p> <p>collaboration coordination team support team approach team integration holistic collaboration integrated practice core collaboration collaborative coping specialist support multidisciplinary team collaborative team integrated support trust-based collaboration cohesive support AI-enabled support coordinated support embedded collaboration collaborative collaboration systems collaborative practice collaborative leadership collaborative expertise collaborative impact collaborative resilience resilient teamwork & progress Networking Networks care ecosystem collaboration quality</p> <p>Category 11: Role Clarity & Functional Integration</p> <p>stakeholder roles role integration role synergy role clarity collective ownership shared ownership stakeholder importance key stakeholders integration Collective</p> <p>Category 12: Capacity Building & Professional Growth</p> <p>building capacity capability skill expansion teacher capacity guided growth capacity building continuous training skill development human resilience capability development</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>recommendations, and carried out the agreed-upon actions, demonstrating active engagement. It felt more like a team pursuing a common goal and less hierarchical.</p> <p>P13: Um, the key people were definitely the SPED teacher, the general education teacher, and the parents. Ah, sometimes we also had support staff involved. Each one had a role, but it didn't feel divided. Like, the SPED teacher guided us, but the classroom teacher gave the day-to-day picture, and the parents added, um, important insights from home. I think what stood out was that everyone was willing to speak and also listen, which doesn't always happen.</p> <p><u>IGQ3: What resources, structures, or practices consistently support resilient practices in IEP planning and reviews?</u></p> <p>P1: I think resilient IEP planning and reviews are consistently supported by structured collaboration, clear data systems, and inclusive practices. The key supports, uhm, include, of course, collaborative team structures, progress monitoring, data used to guide decisions and adjust goals or support quickly. Uhm, also protected planning and review time. Now, uhm, also important, uh, is the family engagement practices, including transparent communication with them, shared goal setting, profess— uhm, of course, professional learning for us teachers and coaching that is to strengthen our skills in inclusive instruction, intervention, and behavior support.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... resilient practices in IEP planning and reviews are consistently supported by strong collaboration among its member and inclusive practices. Thank you.</p> <p>P3: Okay, so... uhm... crucial to the IEP planning and reviews are the constant communication and collaboration between the IEP team. Uhm... it is important to target uhm areas based on the IEP goals, uhm carry out access necessary to determine the child's level in learning areas.</p> <p>P4: Consistency is key, so... um, having digital templates that everyone can access helps. And also, you know, regular peer-review sessions. It's those—those small, regular check-ins that keep the practice resilient.</p> <p>P5: Actually, the resilience in IEP planning is sustained by clear system and supported practices. Regularly schedules case conferences, students' progress records, and structured IEP templates help to ensure that the plans are organized and responsive to the child's needs.</p> <p>Another important support is professional dialogue among teachers, informal consultations, mentoring, and peer discussions allow us to reflect on strategies that work best. Additionally, having an accessible learning materials, assistive tools, and individualized instructional resources to the teachers to implement the IEP effectively</p> <p>P6: for me, the message is very clear that we should value the time we have with our family and we should make every moment special, even if it's just a simple dinner or a simple gathering. The message is all about love, happiness, and togetherness, which is very important to us, especially in our culture, we value family so much. So the message is effective and clear.</p> <p>P7: In our elementary setting shadowing is a powerful resource. We pair a struggling student with a compassionate big brother or sister from a higher grade also using localize materials like making tactile letters</p>	<p>collective c24 continuous reflection c15 relationship building c1 strategy implementation c17 practice consistency c23 sustainability c17 practice consistency c7 inclusive voice c5 knowledge sharing c17 embedded practice c17 practice replication c23 strategy transfer c22 institutionalization</p>	<p>capacity development professional calling solutions Skills training Development confidence-building Mentorship gradual support professionalism continuous assistance. need-based support</p> <p>Category 13: Leadership Influence & Directionality</p> <p>strong leadership leadership influence inclusive leadership direction clarity Leadership support trust dependency team trust guided leadership directive leadership distributed leadership responsive leadership leadership support accountable growth system growth trust Effective leadership & communication Leadership Influence Management Inspire</p> <p>Category 14: Communication Quality & Flow</p> <p>communication effective communication open communication mutual communication Transparency communication flow open dialogue transparent communication clear communication coordinated communication motivational communication Motivation dialogue</p> <p>Category 15: Trust, Psychological Safety & Team Culture</p> <p>cooperative trust values core values balanced narrative balance supportive environment collaborative success balanced perspective hopeful realism belonging community culture balanced view</p>
---	---	--

<p>P8: consistent support usually comes from having clear structures, like regular meetings, proper documentation, and enough time to plan. Also, access to resources like learning materials and training really helps teachers stay resilient.</p> <p>P9: Consistent documentation and structured review schedules supported resilient practices. These ensured continuity, organization, and the ability to adjust strategies effectively.</p> <p>P10: Resilient IEP practices are consistently supported by clear structures such as scheduled meetings, uh... well-documented plans, and defined roles for each team member. Regular monitoring of student progress helps ensure that uh.. interventions remain effective and can be adjusted when needed. Access to learning materials, support services, and professional development also plays a key role in maintaining quality IEP planning and review processes.</p> <p>P11: In my experience, resilient IEP practices are supported by, like, consistent documentation systems, clear communication channels, and regular follow-ups. Uhh.. having accessible records and progress tracking tools helps the team stay aligned. I mean, it's also important that there are standard procedures in place.</p> <p>P12: Resilient IEP planning and review have been continuously supported by a number of tools and procedures. Meeting procedures that are structured aid in maintaining effective and targeted conversations. Evidence-based decision-making is ensured by having access to real-time data, such as observation notes and progress monitoring tools. Even outside of official IEP reviews, routine check-ins have a significant impact. Reflective conversations among educators and adaptability in strategy adaptation are crucial in practice. Having a plan is important, but it's also important to keep reviewing and improving it. The process is further strengthened by administrative support, particularly with regard to training and time allocation.</p> <p>P13: Uh, for me, what really supports resilience are, um, consistent systems. Like, having scheduled meetings, clear formats, and access to student data. But at the same time, ah, flexibility is important. Because not all strategies work the same way for every learner. So, it's kind of a balance between structure and adaptability.</p> <p><u>IGQ4: In what ways did leadership, communication, and shared goals contribute to positive IEP outcomes in your context?</u></p> <p>P1: The, uhm, contributing factors are leadership, communication of each members, the shared goals to a positive IEP outcomes. It actually create a clear coordinated approach to support students. And also open and consistent communication among educators and the family and the student's families and, of course, the specialist who allow concerns and progress to be shared promptly, preventing misunderstanding and enabling timely adjustments. That's it. Well, shared goals align the efforts of all team members to—to instruction, intervention, and support work together towards the same outcomes. It's making IEP implementation more effective and responsive to each student's needs. That will be all.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... I do believe that strong leadership established</p>		<p>ethical implementation psychological safety unified resilience appreciative approach Appreciation Unity Patience relational relationship building</p> <p>Category 16: Structured Planning & Process Design</p> <p>clear structure Structure structured processes framework system consistency process stability structured systems planning time implementation consistency intentional practice structured reflection routine integration structured supports structural support routine practice time allocation structured collaboration structured support consistent systems foundational principles Navigation Plan reservation organized system cooperative planning Prioritization practical strategies efficient strategies</p> <p>Category 17: Practice Consistency & Replicability</p> <p>practice consistency Consistency consistency control practice replication consistency building embedded practice system sustainability embedded practices replicated success consistent practice sustained implementation continuity Normalization Documentation</p> <p>Category 18: Adaptive & Flexible Implementation</p> <p>adaptability versatile adaptive practice Responsive responsiveness adaptive support guided flexibility adaptive autonomy balanced approach</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>clear expectations for collaboration, accountability, and student-centered decision-making. Uhm... practice of consistent, consistent, uhm, transparent communication among team members, including families, uhm, will help ensure, ensure the concerns are addressed early and that everyone remains informed about student progress. Shared, shared goals among, uhm, general education, special education, and support staff ensure that instructions, interventions, and services work, uhm, towards the same measurable outcomes... Participant: Uhm... I do believe that strong leadership established clear expectations for collaboration, accountability, and student-centered decision-making. Uhm... practice of consistent, consistent, uhm, transparent communication among team members, including families, uhm, will help ensure, ensure the concerns are addressed early and that everyone remains informed about student progress. Shared, shared goals among, uhm, general education, special education, and support staff ensure that instructions, interventions, and services work, uhm, towards the same measurable outcomes...</p> <p>P3: As a SPED teacher, uhm, I have seen how supportive leadership, open communication, and shared goals greatly contributed to positive IEP outcomes. So, when school leaders support inclusive practices, uhm, it makes me feel confident and encouraged to implement strategies, yes, that truly help my learners. So, clear and empathetic communication with my, with the parents and other professionals also builds trust and understanding, so especially when discussing the child's progress and challenges. So, most important when everyone in the IEP team shares same goals of helping the child succeed, uhm, it is, create a strong sense of teamwork. Yes. Seeing even the smallest improvement in my students brings deep joy and reminds me that our collaborations and dedications truly make a difference in their lives.</p> <p>P4: Well, when leadership actually listens, it filters down. Like, uh, clear communication meant we weren't guessing what the goals were. We had a—a shared vision, and that just makes the outcomes so much more positive.</p> <p>P5: Umm, leadership helped guide everyone, while good communication made it easier to understand the student's needs. Since we had shared goals, hmm, we all worked together, which helped improve the IEP outcomes.</p> <p>P6: I think... I think leadership and communication played a powerful role in creating positive outcomes. Why? When school leaders openly support inclusive education, support teachers and feel confident to try new strategies and work together. I think communication also strengthens trust among the stakeholders; honest conversations between teachers and parents allows us to understand the learners more deeply. Shared goals... shared goals remind everyone that we are working for the same purpose: to help the child grow academically, socially, and also emotionally.</p> <p>P7: In hermeneutic phenomenology we see the...That these experiences are sustained because they change the identity of the teacher, once he experience the power of a child's break through, you no longer see the IET as a chore, you see it as a promise of possibility that you are compelled to keep where every new teacher or students who enters your classroom.</p> <p>P8: I think leadership and communication played a big role, uhh like when school leaders encouraged teamwork and made sure everyone understood the goals. When</p>		<p>adaptive system adaptive collaboration values-driven-adaptation flexible collaboration adaptive planning resource-enabled adaptation resourceful innovation interpretive adaptation flex design flexibility skills system flexibility Category 19: Resource Allocation & Constraints</p> <p>resource management support gaps resource limitation resource sharing time constraint resource access resource use resource constraint systemic obstacles system constraints strategic resource use context support availability</p> <p>Category 20: Contextual & Cultural Responsiveness</p> <p>contextual influence regional factors home perspective cultural factors contextual awareness cultural influence cultural interpretation contextual values grounded narrative contextual understanding lived interpretation Awareness language shifting contextual adaptation varied understanding expression differences</p> <p>Category 21: Barriers, Risks & System Constraints</p> <p>barriers Barricades Risk burnout risk rigidity risk risk mitigation over-standardization system barriers teacher strain collaboration barriers expectation imbalance conflict resolution discrepancies time pressure miscommunication dual language</p> <p>Category 22: Policy Support & Governance Structures</p>	
---	--	--	--

<p>everyone shared the same purpose for the student, it made decisions easier and more positive.</p> <p>P9: Leadership provided direction, while effective communication ensured clarity among team members. Shared goals helped align efforts and minimize confusion.</p> <p>P10: leadership, communication, and shared goals significantly contributed to positive IEP outcomes. Effective leadership ensured that the process stayed organized and focused, while open communication allowed concerns and ideas to be, you know, discussed freely. Having shared goals helped all stakeholders stay aligned and committed to supporting the student’s development, which led to more consistent and meaningful interventions.</p> <p>P11: Leadership provided direction and accountability, while communication ensured that everyone stayed informed. Shared goals, um. helped minimize misunderstandings because everyone was, like, working toward the same outcome. I mean, without that alignment, it would be difficult to sustain effective interventions.</p> <p>P12: Positive IEP outcomes are mostly dependent on common goals, communication, and leadership. Collaboration is fostered and nurtured in an atmosphere created by effective leadership. School administrators set the tone for the entire team when they emphasize inclusivity and give clear instructions. Clear, courteous, and continuous communication puts everyone on the same page and helps avoid misunderstandings. On the other hand, shared goals provide the team with a common path. There is more consistency in implementation when everyone is aware of and supports the learner's objectives. In my experience, when these components are included, the IEP becomes a useful tool that actually promotes student development rather than merely a mandate.</p> <p>P13: Ah, leadership really sets the tone. Like, if leaders value inclusion, it shows in how things are done. Communication also plays a big role—uh, if people are not aligned, things fall apart. And shared goals... I think that’s what keeps everyone focused. When you know what you’re working toward, it’s easier to stay consistent.</p> <p><u>IGQ5: How have these positive experiences have sustained or repeated across different cases or settings?</u></p> <p>P1: These positive experiences have been sustained across different cases by embedding structured collaboration, regular progress monitoring, clear communication into the routine practices. Teams, IT teams consistently use data to inform decisions involving families in meaningful ways and align goals across educators and specialists. Professional learning also is important and coaching ensures that staff maintains effective strategies while shared accountability and reflective meetings help replicate successes in new cases and setting making resilient communities. practices are a consistent part of the IEP implementation.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... making our success repeatable by sharing our collective wisdom. Uhm... at our school, we've shifted from working as isolated heroes to using a shared professional language. Uhm... when I find an intervention that works for one of my students, uhm, we don't, we don't keep it a secret. We document those lightbulb moments in our team meetings, uhm, creating a blueprint that my colleagues can adapt for their own classrooms.</p>		<p>policy support governance Institutionalization meaningful accountability policy structure policy enactment policy integration accountability structures inclusive policy support sustained governance government support Policy Accountability policy alignment core principles</p> <p>Category 23: Sustainability & Institutionalization</p> <p>sustainable outcomes Sustainability sustainable practice holistic focus strategy transfer sustained improvement success sharing narrative impact knowledge archive sustainable practices resilient system unified purpose transformative accountability balance growth achievement sustained provision sustainability of practice</p> <p>Category 24: Reflective & Iterative Practice</p> <p>reflective practice reflective analysis appreciative inquiry idea reframing interpretation perspective integration reflective learning embedded reflection constructive reflection reflective culture reflective review reflective interpretation storytelling practice critical reflection knowledge repository reflection Culture Nostalgia balanced critique reframing Identify continuous reflection iterative understanding honest reflection routine reflection</p> <p>Category 25: Authentic & Inclusive Practice</p> <p>authentic practice Learner-centered</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>P3: Okay, uhm, as a SPED teacher, these positive experiences, uhm, have been sustained by consistently practicing collaboration, patience, and compassion in every case I handle. Uhm, I make sure that to maintain open communication with parents, school leaders, and other members of the IEP team, so that we continue working towards the same goals for the—for the learners. So each time I see a student make progress, and even small improvements, it motivates me to apply the same supportive strategies with other learners in different settings. So these repeated experiences, uhm, reminds me that when there is a teamwork, understanding, and dedication, and meaningful progress for the children with special needs, is always possible. So that feeling is truly fulfilling as a teacher.</p> <p>P4: We've started documenting these—these 'small wins.' So, when a new case comes in, we refer back to what worked before. It's like, uh, creating a library of best practices, I guess.</p> <p>P5: Actually, the positive experiences are sustained through a culture of continuous learning. Each successful case becomes a valuable lesson that teachers carry into future situations. In our school, we often share strategies during professional meetings or informal discussions. This exchange of experiences helps teachers replicate effective practices across different learners and contexts. uhmm... And over time, these shared experiences build a stronger support system for students with special needs. hmm..</p> <p>P6: For me, these experiences continue because they shape the way teachers approach every new learner. Because each child teaches us something valuable, and we carry those lessons forward. I want to share something because in our school, teachers encourage one another and also share ideas about what has... sorry, sorry... and share ideas about what has worked in previous cases. This culture of support allows us to repeat successful practices and continue improving our approach to inclusive education.</p> <p>P7: In the division of San Jose Del Monte we transform the IET from a region administrative task into a living communal commitment by posturing a bayanihan culture of shared success spectacularizing kwentong tagumpay success stories in monthly teacher collaborations in maintaining successful portfolios to document small but significant milestones. We create a tangible record of resilience for both educators and panelist. This continues ugnayan or partnership ensures that a child strength are celebrated in real time moving beyond formal documentation to create a supportive...Supportive school wide environment where every learner growth is a collective victory</p> <p>P8: Hmm, these experiences are usually sustained when schools keep doing reflective practices, like reviewing what worked and applying it again. Also, when teams build strong relationships over time, it becomes easier to repeat those successful moments in other cases.</p> <p>P9: Positive experiences were sustained by applying successful strategies across different cases, allowing teams to build on prior knowledge and maintain consistency.</p> <p>P10: These positive experiences have been sustained by applying the same collaborative and structured approach across different cases. Schools maintain regular</p>		<p>student-centered inclusivity inclusive practice inclusive support student inclusion inclusion mindset inclusive climate authentic inclusion inclusive participation asset-based approach belief strength-based shift Relatability individuality acceptance</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>communication with families, continue progress monitoring, and encourage teamwork among educators and specialists. By consistently following these practices, successful outcomes are more likely to be repeated in different situations... thank you</p> <p>P11: These experiences were sustained by integrating them into regular practice, like, making collaboration and monitoring part of the routine. Uhh.. teams became more proactive instead of reactive. I mean, over time, these practices became, you know, part of the school culture.</p> <p>P12: By purposefully incorporating the same techniques into several situations and environments, these favorable experiences have been maintained. For instance, we make sure that everyone's opinions are heard during meetings in an effort to replicate the same degree of cooperation. Additionally, we continue to use successful tactics while modifying them to suit the particular circumstances of each student. Maintaining consistency is also aided by teachers exchanging best practices and engaging in ongoing professional development. These methods eventually become ingrained in the school's culture. Even though every situation is unique, the fundamentals—strong teamwork, transparent communication, and a common commitment—remain the same, enabling those favorable results to be duplicated.</p> <p>P13: Um, these experiences are sustained by, ah, repeating the same practices. Like, once something works, we try to apply it again in other cases. Over time, it becomes part of how we normally work, not just something we do occasionally.</p>			
<p>RGQ2</p> <p><u>IGQ1: if Region 3 could design an ideal IEP system that embodies resilience, what would be its defining features?</u></p> <p>P1: I think the ideal IEP system, uhm, should embody flexibility. It should be student-centered. Uh, it promotes collaboration. It, it has proactive support, and it encourage continuous growth. Of course, emotional safety. Uhm, it should be a system that adjusts, supports, and grows with the student so they can thrive no matter what challenges they face.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... the perfect, uhm, design for an ideal IEP system that truly embodies resilience would be dynamic, uhm, student-centered, and highly collaborative. The system would prioritize individual strengths, interests, and long-term outcomes, ensuring that the goals are meaningful and adaptable rather than static and compliance-driven or—determined. Additionally, it must anticipate change, uhm, support problem-solving, and keep student growth at the center of every decision.</p> <p>P3: Uhm, an ideal IEP system that embodies resilience would be one it's—one that is collaborative, reflective, flexible, and deeply learner-centered. Learner-centered. So it would be—it would have a strong support from the school leadership, continuous and open communications among teachers, parents, and specialists, and regular monitoring of each learner's progress. So the system would allow teachers to adjust strategies when challenges arise and ensure that every voice in the IEP team is valued. So most importantly, it would focus on celebrating small achievements and providing consistent support so that both teachers and family feel hopeful and encouraged while helping the child to reach their full potential.</p>	<p>c18 flexible collaboration c18 adaptive system c1 personalized goals c13 leadership support c3 positive reinforcement c18 adaptive planning c25 Learner-centered c25 individuality C7 dignity c18 flex design c3 lived evaluation c8 individualized planning c16 cooperative planning C9 responsive teaching c18 adaptability c18 versatile</p>		

<p>P4: Ideally? It would be, uh, fully collaborative and less bureaucratic. It should define resilience by how quickly we can, um, adapt the plan when the student's needs change, not just waiting for the annual review.</p>	<p>c18 adaptive system c2 feedback loop c10 team integration</p>		
<p>P5: An ideal IEP system would be dynamic and learner-centered. It would allow flexibility in instructional approaches and provide timely support for teachers and families. This system would include strong collaboration among professionals, adequate resources, and ongoing monitoring of student progress. It would also encourage innovation and continuous improvement, thus ensuring every child receives meaningful educational opportunities. Thank you.</p>	<p>c23 holistic focus c18 system flexibility c1 continuous adjustment c5 ongoing collaboration c10</p>		
<p>P6: uhm, for me, an ideal IEP system would be flexible, compassionate, and focused on the individuality of each learner. For me, it would allow teachers to adapt instructions and provide the necessary support for students with diverse needs. The system would also ensure strong collaboration among teachers, families, and also school leaders. And most importantly, it would treat every learner with dignity and respect because we are recognizing that each child has unique strengths waiting to be discovered.</p>	<p>integrated support c8 shared responsibility c13 accountable growth system c25 student inclusion c10</p>		
<p>P7: An idea IET system would function as a collaborative or bayanihan system where the rigid boundaries or paperwork are replaced by a fluid strength based approach that prioritizes a child's immediate participation in the school community. In this version or in this vision the system provides dedicated reflective time for general education and SPED teachers to codesign lessons ensuring that every learner in the division of San Jose Del Monte regardless of their ability feels a deep sense of belonging in our regular classroom. This idea framework would empower parents as equal partners, treating their lived knowledge as a child is a vital resource rather than a secondary opinion. Ultimately, It would transform the IET from a compliance driven document into a living map of success. Where progress is measured not just by academic checklist but by tangible joy, dignity in the social milestone achieved by the student within their local community.</p>	<p>collaborative practice c6 empowered stakeholders c15 belonging c25 acceptance c15 belonging c10 care ecosystem c7 participatory belonging c18 adaptability c23</p>		
<p>P8: An ideal IEP system should be flexible and student-centered, uhm, with strong collaboration between teachers, parents, and specialists. It should also have clear communication and, uh, regular check-ins to make sure the plans are actually effective.</p>	<p>sustained provision c8 participatory decision-making c6</p>		
<p>P9: An ideal IEP system would balance flexibility and structure, allowing responsiveness to student needs while maintaining a clear and organized process</p>	<p>stakeholder partnership c25 inclusivity c25</p>		
<p>P10: If a school were to design an ideal Individualized Education Program (IEP) system that embodies resilience, it would prioritize flexibility, responsiveness, and continuous improvement. The system would be student-centered, adapting to the evolving needs, strengths, and challenges of each learner. It would include regular monitoring, data-driven decision-making, and proactive interventions. Collaboration among educators, specialists, and families would be strong, ensuring that um.. support systems remain consistent even during disruptions or transitions</p>	<p>inclusive climate c7 student voice c6 family partnership c9 professional support c25 inclusive support c25</p>		
<p>P11: An ideal IEP system would be highly adaptive and data-informed. It would allow for real-time adjustments based on student performance. I mean, instead of waiting</p>	<p>student inclusion c6 family partnership</p>		

<p>for formal reviews, the system would, like, continuously respond to the learner’s needs.</p> <p>P12: If the school were to design an ideal IEP system that truly embodies resilience, I imagine it as something flexible, responsive, and deeply collaborative. It would not feel rigid or purely compliance-driven, but instead adaptive to the evolving needs of each learner. One defining feature would be continuous feedback—where plans are not only reviewed periodically, but adjusted in real time based on student progress. Another would be strong interdisciplinary collaboration, where general educators, SPED teachers, specialists, and families are consistently engaged, not just during formal meetings. It would also include accessible tools for tracking progress and sharing information, so everyone involved remains informed and aligned. Ultimately, the system would prioritize the learner’s growth in a holistic sense, not just academic outcomes.</p> <p>P13: Uh, if I imagine an ideal IEP system, it would be, ah, less rigid. Like, it would still have structure, but it would allow adjustments anytime. Not just during formal reviews. And, um, collaboration would be ongoing, not just limited to meetings.</p> <p><u>IGQ2: What would an inclusive thriving IEP ecosystem look like for students, families, and professionals in Region 3?</u></p> <p>P1: An inclusive, thriving IEP ecosystem in Region 3 would be one where students grow, families are supported, and professionals work together seamlessly to meet every child’s need.</p> <p>P2: Uhm, professionals would collaborate consistently across roles, uhm, share responsibility for student outcomes, and use ongoing data to guide instructions and interventions. Uhm, it is a system of trust, shared accountability, and continuous improvement to drive student growth and long-term success across Region 2..</p> <p>P3: An inclusive, uh, thriving IEP ecosystem in Region III, the Central Luzon, would be one where students with special needs feel accepted, supported, and confident in their learning. As a SPED teacher, I imagine a system where families are actively involved and feel hopeful because their voices are, are, uhm, here—heard and valued in every IEP meeting. So, teachers, therapists, and school leaders would work closely together, uh, sharing ideas and strategies to help each child succeed. Okay, so there would be, uh, enough resources, continuous training for teachers, and strong collaboration among schools and communities. So, most importantly, it would be a compassionate environment where every small progress in the child is celebrated, bringing joy, encouragement, and a deep sense of purpose to everyone involved.</p> <p>P4: It would look like a—a community, really. Where families don’t feel like they’re fighting the system, and professionals feel, uh, empowered rather than just overworked. Just a more... um, fluid ecosystem for everyone in the region.</p> <p>P5: Uh, a thriving IEP ecosystem would be one where inclusion is embraced by the entire school community. Students with special needs would learn alongside their peers in supportive classrooms where diversity is respected. Families would feel welcome and valued as partners in their children’s education. Professionals from different disciplines would collaborate regularly, sharing</p>	<p>c9 teacher support c6 empowered families c18 adaptive collaboration c22 government support c9 professional development c4 learner growth c15 unified resilience c10 collaborative expertise c23 resilient system c10 resilient teamwork & progress c9 confidence c5 participation c17 normalization c4 measurable growth c4 steady progress c23 sustainable outcomes c17 consistency c23 sustainable practice c4 engagement growth c9 teacher efficacy c10 integrated practice c4 sustained progress c9 teacher confidence c17 system sustainability c15 core values c6 strong partnership c7 equity commitment c11 collective ownership c16 foundational principles</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>expertise and encouraging one another. Hmm. Such an ecosystem would nurture not only academic success, but also the dignity, belonging, and hope for ever.</p>	<p>c15 supportive environment</p>		
<p>P6: In my perspective, a thriving IEP ecosystem would be a school community where differences are accepted and valued because students with special needs would feel safe and confident in expressing themselves. Families would feel that their voices matter and that their partnership with the school is genuine. Professionals would collaborate openly, supporting one another in creating effective learning environments. Such an ecosystem would allow every child to feel that they truly belong.</p>	<p>c15 psychological safety c15 values c13 trust c15 patience C11 shared ownership c15</p>		
<p>P7: A thriving IET ecosystem in our elementary school would be a living community of care. Where the traditional moles between the SPED classroom and the general education setting are completely disowned through daily intentional acts of inclusion. In this vision, a student with a disability is not a visitor in a regular class, but a core member whose presence is celebrated as a source of diversity that teaches empathy and patience to all children in San Jose Del Monte. Families would transition from being informants to being codesigners of learning. Where their intimate knowledge of the child's life is treated with a same professional weight as a clinical assessment. Teachers would function as a unified teaching force, sharing strategies over quick huddles or formal lack sessions to ensure that every lessons is accessible to every child regardless of their starting point. Ultimately, this ecosystem reflects the true spirit of Bulacan, a place where no learner is an island and where the community takes collective pride in ensuring that every child no matter their challenge can stand tall and contribute to our shared future.</p>	<p>relational c22 core principles c17 routine collaboration. c15 cooperative trust c15 core values c15 values C10 core collaboration c13 team trust c14 open dialogue C4 student focus c15 core values c13 trust dependency c21 system barriers c8 collaborative solutions c21 collaboration barriers c8 shared accountability c19</p>		
<p>P8: In five years, I think Durable Resilience in IP implementation will be shown by outcomes like consistent student progress, empowered families, families feel confident, informed, and actively involved in planning, and of course skilled and collaborative staff, as educators and specialists should adapt quickly and work together effectively. Also, there's smooth systems adaptation, as the IEP process responds efficiently to changes in student needs or circumstances, and sustainable support structures, which means resources, training, and tools should be in place and maintained long-term.</p>	<p>system constraints c8 collaborative resolution c19</p>		
<p>P9: A thriving IEP ecosystem would ensure that all stakeholders feel valued and are encouraged to actively participate in discussions and decision-making.</p>	<p>systemic obstacles c21 discrepancies c12 solutions c8</p>		
<p>P10: An inclusive and thriving IEP ecosystem would be one where students, families, and professionals work in genuine partnership. Students would feel valued, uhm.. supported, and empowered to participate in their own learning goals. Families would be actively engaged, informed, and respected as key contributors to the decision-making process. Professionals, including teachers and specialists, would collaborate effectively, sharing expertise and maintaining open communication.</p>	<p>problem-solving c21 time pressure c21 miscommunication c12 continuous assistance. c19</p>		
<p>P11: A thriving ecosystem would be one where, um.. collaboration is not forced but naturally practiced. Students would be encouraged to express themselves, families would feel, like, genuinely included, and professionals would work as a unified team. I mean, trust would be a key element.</p>			

<p>P12: An inclusive and thriving IEP ecosystem, in my view, would feel supportive and empowering for everyone involved. For students, it would mean being seen and heard—where their strengths are recognized and their needs are met without stigma. For families, it would look like genuine partnership, where their insights are valued and they feel confident in the process. For professionals, it would mean having the time, training, and support needed to implement IEPs effectively without feeling overwhelmed. In the regional context, this kind of ecosystem would also involve collaboration across schools and access to shared resources, so that support is not limited by location. It would feel less like isolated efforts and more like a connected system working toward inclusion.</p> <p>P13: Ah, it would feel supportive for everyone. Students would feel included, not singled out. Families would feel like partners, not outsiders. And teachers would feel, um, supported instead of overwhelmed.</p> <p><u>IGQ3: What outcomes would you want to see in five years that signal durable resilience in IEP implementation?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, I think in five years, durable resilience in IEP implementation would be shown by outcomes like consistent student progress, empowered families. Families feel confident, informed, and active involving in planning. Uhm, skilled collaborative staff, of course, educators and specialists should adapt quickly and work together effectively. Also, it should have smooth system adaptation because the IEP process respond efficiently to changes in student's needs or circumstances. So, it is important. Also, sustainable support structure. Uhm, of course, it should, uh, provide resources, training, and tools, uhm, should be in place and maintained long-term. Uhm, because resilience shows up as student thrive, family supported, and staff capable, no matter what challenges come.</p> <p>P2: Uhm, I certainly envision that through sustenance and funding from the government in support for inclusion will bring positive outcomes to not just students and their families, but also for us teachers, uhm, special education and general education teachers, uhm, with skills, uhm, knowledge to better implement the IEP for students with special needs and definitely training and seminars will equipped, equipped them and make a lot of difference.</p> <p>P3: Uhm, in five years, I would hope to see consistent and meaningful progress among learners with special needs as a sign of durable resilience in IEP implementation. So I would like to see students becoming more confident, independent, and actively participating in school activities, while family feels empowered and hopeful because they are truly involved in their child's learning journey. So I also hope that teachers and professionals continue to collaborate strongly, so supported by school leadership and adequate resources. Seeing a system where challenges are faced with teamwork, patience, and commitment would bring a deep sense of fulfillment. So knowing that our IEP practices continue to, uh, positively change the lives of our learners.</p> <p>P4: Uhm, I think in five years, durable resilience in IP implementation would be shown by outcomes like consistent student progress, empowered families—families feel confident, informed, and active involving in planning. Uhm, skilled collaborative staff—of course, educators and specialists should adapt quickly and work</p>	<p>support gaps c21 barriers c21 barricades c19 time constraint c7 perspective gaps c19 resource constraints c10 collaborative coping</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>together effectively. Also, it should have smooth system adaptation because the IP process respond efficiently to changes in student's needs or circumstances, so it is important. Also, sustainable support structure—uhm, of course, it should, uh, provide resources, training, and tools should be in place and maintained long-term. Uhm, because resilience shows itself when the system stays student-driven, family-supported, and staff-capable no matter what challenges come.</p> <p>P5: Hmm, in five years, I'd like to see teachers more confident and consistent in using IEPs. Umm, also better teamwork and improved student progress, showing that the system is strong and can handle challenges.</p> <p>P6: In five years, I hope to see stronger confidence among teachers in handling diverse learning needs. I also hope to see students with special needs that are participating more actively in school activities and encouraging them in developing greater independence. And another, another outcome I would like to see is a stronger trust between schools and families, where parents feel that the school truly understands and supports their child.</p> <p>P7: In five years I envision a shift in our school culture where inclusive competence becomes the standard rather than the exception. Marked by general education and SPED teachers co-teaching with such fluidity that the distinction between the roles is nearly invisible. I want to see our students in San Jose Del Monte transitioning from being integrated in classroom to being leaders of their own learning where they can competently articulate their own needs and celebrate their unique progress alongside with their neurotypical peers a work a network where local businesses and barangay leaders actively partner with our school to provide real world vocational for our elementary learners proving that their education is a clear dignified path towards local contribution. Ultimately, the true metric of success would be the normalized normalization of neurodiversity where the IET is no longer seen as the special intervention where _ but as a model of excellence that benefits the entire students body, creating a school that is as emotionally resilient as it is academically inclusive.</p> <p>P8: In five years, I'd want to see consistent student progress, not just academically but also socially, hmm, and more confidence from teachers and parents in the process. The system should still work well, uhm, even when challenges come.</p> <p>P9: In five years, successful implementation would be reflected in consistent student improvement and more efficient coordination among stakeholders.</p> <p>P10: I think in 5 years durable resilience IEP implementation would be shown by outcomes like consistent student progress, empowered families, families feels confident informed and active involving in planning...um... skilled collaborative staff of course educators and specialists should adapt quickly and work together effectively also it should have smooth system adaptation because the IEP process respond efficiently to changes uh... incident needs or circumstances, so it is important. Also sustainable support structure um.. of course it should uh provide resources training and tools um.. should be in place and maintained long term um.. because resilience shows itself when the system keeps a student thriving family supported and staff capable no matter what challenges come, thank you.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>P11: in five years, I would expect to see systems that are, like, more efficient and responsive. Uhh.. students would show steady improvement, families would be more confident in the process, and educators would be more skilled in handling diverse needs. I mean, resilience would be evident in consistency.</p> <p>P12: In five years, I would hope to see outcomes that reflect both consistency and sustainability in IEP implementation. This might include improved student engagement and measurable progress toward individualized goals, but also less visible indicators—like stronger teacher confidence in handling diverse needs and more active family involvement. Another sign of durable resilience would be systems that continue to function effectively even when challenges arise, such as staff changes or increased caseloads. Ideally, IEP practices would become embedded in everyday teaching, rather than something seen as an additional task. When that happens, it shows that the system is not only working, but enduring.</p> <p>P13: In five years, uh, I'd expect to see more consistent progress in students. But also, ah, teachers being more confident. And systems that continue working even when challenges come up.</p> <p><u>IGQ4: Which values, relationships, or norms should be amplified to achieve that vision?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, to achieve a resilient, thriving IP system, there should be... uh, amplified the values, noh? Equity, empathy, adaptability, a growth mindset for both students and staff. It should have relationships, strong... such as strong partnership between students, families, teachers, specialists, of course, and administrators, who build on trust and respect. Of course, the norms. It should have open communication, collaboration... collaborative problem-solving, continuous learning, and proactive support rather than reactive fixes. The system should prioritize, of course, caring, teamwork, and flexibility so everyone can respond and grow together.</p> <p>P2: Uhm, first, uhm, a deep commitment to equity and inclusion should guide every decision. Uhm, this means viewing students through a strength-based lens, ensuring access to rigorous instruction, and holding high expectations for all learners. Uhm, second, uhm, shared responsibility and collective ownership must become the norm. IEP success should not, should not rest solely on special edu—educators. Uhm, general educators, specialists, administrators, and families must see themselves as equal partners accountable for student progress. And finally, uhm, norms of continuous improvement and data-informed decision-making should be embedded in practice. Uhm, when equity, shared ownership, trust, and continuous learning are amplified, uhm, IEP implementation becomes more holistic, responsive, and resilient, uhm, ultimately leading to stronger outcomes for students.</p> <p>P3: Uh, the values that should be amplified to achieve this vision are compassion, patient, respect, and collaboration. Strong relationship among teachers, parents, school leaders, and specialists are very important because, uh, they build trust and shared commitment to support every learner with special needs. In my experience, when the school community values open communication, teamwork, and genuine care for each child, the IEP process, uh, become more meaningful and effect—effective. So, it is truly heartwarming to see how these</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>values, uh, create a supportive environment where the students feel accepted, family feel hopeful, and teachers feel inspired to continue making a difference.</p> <p>P4: Trust. Definitely trust. And, uh, radical transparency. We need to be able to say when something isn't working without, um, feeling like we're failing. That norm would change everything.</p> <p>P5: Values such as empathy, patience, collaboration, and respect for individuality must be strengthened. Building strong relationships between schools and families is equally important. When trust and understanding grow between these groups, they create a supportive environment for learners. And in addition, a culture of encouragement where progress is celebrated and challenges are viewed as opportunities for growth should become a shared norm. Hmm. Thank you.</p> <p>P6: uh,.. I think the values that we need to achieve, um, values such as empathy, um, respect, and patience should be strengthened in our school culture. These values remind us that teaching is not only about instruction but also about understanding the child as a, as a person. I think that this strong relationship, I think that strong relationships among teachers, um, parents, and school leaders are also essential. Why? When these relationships are built on trust, they can create a supportive environment where learners can flourish.</p> <p>P7: To achieve these vision in our elementary school here in San Jose Del Monte, we must amplify the value of shared accountability, the cultural norm of inclusive hospitality where every teacher not just SPED specialist build a personal responsibility for the success of every child. We need to move beyond simple empathy toward proactive advocacy where we actively safe out and dismantle the barriers that prevent our student in participating in school wide activities like the Brigada skwela or local festivals. Strengthening the relationship between general education and SPED teachers is critical, we must shift from a referral culture to a co-teaching culture where we constantly exchange expertise to meet a child's needs in real time by normalizing radical transparency with the parents sharing not only the wins, but also the honest struggles of the classroom. We build a foundation of trust that turns the IET meeting from a formal evaluation into a genuine family-school partnership. Ultimately, we should amplify the norm of strengths language ensuring that every conversation about the students begins with what they can do, setting a tone of high expectation and dignity for our learners in Bulacan.</p> <p>P8: Values like trust and shared responsibility should be strengthened, with more open relationships among everyone involved. There should also be, uh, consistent communication and teamwork as normal practice.</p> <p>P9: Values such as trust and cooperation are essential to strengthen collaboration and maintain a positive working environment.</p> <p>P10: To achieve this vision, key values such as inclusivity, empathy, respect, and accountability should be amplified. Strong, trust-based relationships between schools, families, and communities are essential. Norms that encourage open communication, collaboration, and uhh.. shared decision-making should be reinforced. It is also important to promote a growth mindset among all stakeholders, where challenges are viewed as</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>opportunities for learning and improvement rather than barriers.</p> <p>P11: Values like adaptability, collaboration, and accountability should be emphasized. Um.. relationships built on trust and respect should also be strengthened. I mean, these create a strong foundation for long-term success.</p> <p>P12: To achieve this vision, certain values and norms need to be strengthened. Collaboration should be seen not as optional, but as essential. Trust and mutual respect among team members are also critical, especially when working through complex cases. Open communication should be encouraged, where individuals feel safe to share challenges as well as successes. There should also be a strong emphasis on learner-centeredness—keeping the student’s needs and well-being at the core of every decision. Relationships, particularly between school and home, need to be nurtured continuously. When these values are consistently practiced, they shape a culture that supports resilient IEP implementation.</p> <p>P13: Um, values like trust, collaboration, and, ah, respect need to be stronger. Especially trust, because without that, collaboration doesn’t really work.</p> <p><u>IGQ5: What potential barriers or tensions might arise when moving toward this aspirational future and how might they be addressed collaboratively?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, potential barriers includes... uhm, limited resources, communication gaps, resistance to change, conflicting priorities, and diverse student needs. So these can be addressed collaboratively through open communication, shared decision making. Uh, there should have flexible planning and ongoing support for staff and families.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... Uhm... potential barriers include, uhm, limited time for collaboration and unclear roles. Tension between compliance and innovation, communication gaps with families, and inconsistent resources of support staffing. Uhm, these challenges can be addressed collaboratively by protecting structured planning time, uhm, clarifying shared responsibility—responsibilities, aligning compliance with best practices, uhm, strengthening culturally responsive communication, and building systems for ongoing professional learning and support. Uhm, by—by approaching obstacles as shared, uhm, system-level challenges rather than individual shortcomings, uhm, team—teams can foster trust, collective ownership, and sustainable—ay— implementation.</p> <p>P3: Uhm... some potential barriers in moving towards these aspirational futures may include limited resources, heavy workloads for teachers, and occasionally misunderstandings between school staff and families about the child's needs. So these challenges can sometimes feel frustrating or overwhelming. However, so, they can address through open communication, mutual respect, and strong teamwork among all members of the IEP team. So when teachers, parents, and administrators and specialists listen to one another and work together with patience and empathy, solution become possible. So in my experience, collaborations and shared commitment bring hope and strengths, reminding—reminding us that every effort is worth... uhm, it will help our learners grow and succeed.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>P4: Uhm, potential barriers includes, uhm, limited resources, communication gaps, resistance to change, conflicting priorities, and diverse student needs. So these can be addressed collaboratively through open communication, shared decision-making, there should have flexible planning, and ongoing support for staff and families. Thank you.</p> <p>P5: Uhm, challenges may arise from limited funding, lack of training, or misunderstandings about inclusive education. Teachers may also experience heavy workloads when supporting diverse learners. To address these challenges, stakeholders must work together through open dialogue and shared responsibility. Continuous professional development and strong leadership support can help educators overcome these barriers. Uhm, thank you.</p> <p>P6: For me, some barriers may include limited resources and also lack of training or sometimes misunderstandings about inclusive education. Um, and for that, these challenges can sometimes create frustration among educators. Um, and to address these tensions, I think the stakeholders must work together with open, openness and patience because the continuous learning, supportive, uh, leadership and collaborative problem-solving can help them overcome these difficulties.</p> <p>P7: One significant barrier we face in our elementary school here in San Jose Del Monte is the "time resource paradox" where the high administrative demand of documentation often conflicts with the actual hours needed for hands-on inclusive teaching. Tension can also arise from attitudinal inertia where some stakeholders may still view the SPED classroom as a separate entity rather than an integrated part of the schools academic life. To address these we must move toward collective problem-solving where our school leaders proactively relocate schedules to allow pre-lesson handles between general education and SPED teachers to co-plan without exhaustion. We can mitigate the lack of specialized equipment by learning into our local bayanihan resourcefulness and partnering with the parent-teacher association in local uhm San Jose Del Monte artisans create local impact sensory and instructional materials by fostering where vulnerability is a strenght. culture can openly share their frustrations in a safe, non-judgemental space ensuring that the emotional uhm weight of inclusion is a shared journey rather than a solitary struggle.</p> <p>P8: Um, potential barriers includes, um, limited resources, communication gaps, resistance to change, conflicting priorities and diverse student needs, so these can be addressed collaboratively through open communication, shared decision-making, there should have flexible planning and ongoing support for staff and families.</p> <p>P9: Potential barriers include misunderstandings and insufficient support, which may hinder effective implementation if not addressed</p> <p>P10: Um potential barriers includes um.. limited resources, communication gaps, conflicting priorities and diverse student needs so this can be addressed collaboratively though open communication, shared decision making um.. there should have flexible planning and ongoing support for staff and families, thank you.</p> <p>P11: Some challenges might include limited manpower, resistance to new systems, and, like, communication breakdowns. Uhh.. these can be addressed through proper</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>training, continuous dialogue, and shared responsibility. I mean, solutions should be collaborative.</p> <p>P12: Moving toward this kind of aspirational future is not without challenges. One potential barrier is time—teachers and staff often have heavy workloads, which can limit meaningful collaboration. There may also be differences in perspectives or levels of readiness among team members, which can create tension. Resource limitations, especially in certain contexts, can further complicate implementation. To address these challenges collaboratively, it’s important to create spaces for dialogue where concerns can be openly discussed. Leadership plays a key role in providing support and setting realistic expectations. Professional development and shared learning opportunities can also help align understanding and practices. Ultimately, addressing these barriers requires a collective effort, where solutions are co-constructed rather than imposed.</p> <p>P13: There will always be challenges—uh, time, workload, resources. But I think, ah, if people communicate openly and work together, those challenges can be managed.</p>			
<p>RGQ3</p> <p><u>IGQ1: What concrete changes, like policies, practices, or collaborative structures, would most effectively translate positive experiences into durable improvements?</u></p> <p>P1: Uh, clearer policies for flexible IEPs, there should have regular team collaboration. There should have ongoing staff training that is important. Family engagement practices should, uhm, uh, encourage. And data-driven progress reviews to turn possible experiences into lasting improvements..</p> <p>P2: Uhm, concrete changes that would create lasting improvements include, uhm, setting aside regular team planning time, uhm, clearly defined staff roles and shared responsibilities, uhm, and using consistent—consistent progress monitoring systems. Schools should also strengthen family communication practices and provide ongoing training in inclusive instruction. By building these supports into everyday routines and policies, successful practices can become consistent and sustain—sustainable over time.</p> <p>P3: For me, concrete changes that could translate positive experiences into a lasting improvement include strong school policies that support inclusive education, regular professional development for teachers, and structured collaboration among IEP team members. So school could also schedule consistent meetings with parents and specialists to monitor each learner's progress and... uh, adjust strategies when needed. So having clear guidelines, adequate resources, and continuous teamwork help ensure that every practices are sustained. So for me, it is truly encouraging and fulfilling to see how these changes can strengthen the IEP process and create a more... uh, positive and hopeful learning environment for every child with special needs.</p> <p>P4: Uhm, clear policies for flexible IEPs, there should have regular team collaboration. There should have ongoing staff training, that is important. Family engagement practices should, uh...uh...encourage, and data-driven progress reviews to turn possible experiences into lasting improvements.</p> <p>P5: Umm, strengthening policies that support inclusive</p>	<p>c6 familial involvement C16 structured collaboration c23 sustainable practices c22 inclusive policy support c17 sustained implementation c2 data-driven improvement c22 policy c12 development c20 language shifting C17 documentation c16 routine practice c1 process alignment c22 policy support c10 coordination c16 intentional practice c16 implementation consistency c16 structured reflection c3 Evidence-based</p>		

<p>education would help sustain positive practices. Providing regular training for teachers and ensuring time for collaborative planning are also essential. Developing clear systems for tracking students' progress and sharing best practices among schools can further strengthen IEP implementation. Mmm."</p> <p>P6: I think the most durable improvement is by strengthening the professional development programs for teachers also. It would help sustain positive practices and also teachers need opportunities to learn new strategies and reflect on their experiences. And another another important change is sorry, another uh important change is creating stronger systems for uh collaboration so that teachers can regularly uh share insights and uh support one another.</p> <p>P7: Yes, in my previous school, where I was teaching, my previous school is a private school and our medium of instruction is English, so we are required to speak in English. But most of the time, our students would actually speak in their mother tongue, so I have to adjust to them and speak in their mother tongue as well, so that they can understand the lesson better. And that is why I think that the mother tongue is very important in the classroom, because it helps the students to understand the lesson better, and it also helps the teacher to explain the lesson better.</p> <p>P8: Uhm, I think one concrete change would be making the good practices more consistent, like actually documenting what worked and turning it into simple guidelines teachers can follow. Also, uh, regular check-ins and feedback from everyone involved can help make sure those positive experiences don't just stay one-time things but become part of everyday practice</p> <p>P9: Concrete changes that would strengthen IEP practices include improving coordination mechanisms and aligning procedures across teams. When processes are clearly aligned, it becomes easier to maintain consistency and ensure that positive practices are sustained over time.</p> <p>P10: For a clear policies for flexible IEPs there should have regular team collaboration, there should have ongoing staff training that is important family engagement practices should um... uh.. encourage and data driven progress reviews to turn possible experiences into lasting improvements.</p> <p>P11: One effective change would be improving coordination systems, like, using shared platforms for tracking progress. uhh.. this ensures transparency and consistency across the team.</p> <p>P12: To translate positive experiences into durable improvements, I think the most effective changes are those that move from being incidental to intentional. For example, when collaboration works well in one case, it should not remain a one-time success. There needs to be a clear structure that ensures regular team meetings, shared documentation, and consistent follow-through. Standardizing reflective practices, such as brief post-IEP reviews, can also help capture what worked and apply it to future cases. Another important change is strengthening access to real-time data, so decisions are consistently informed by evidence rather than assumptions. These kinds of changes help turn isolated successes into sustained practices.</p> <p>P13: Uh, I think the key is making good practices</p>	<p>c17 consistency building c16 routine integration c24 reflective practice c23 sustained improvement c16 structured support c10 trust-based collaboration c12 capability development c16 structural support c9 specialized training c9 support C12 confidence- building c12 gradual support c11 role clarity c6 family engagement c12 guided growth c10 team support c9 support c3 balanced design C16 planning time c12 capacity building c15 supportive environment c18 guided flexibility c18 adaptive autonomy c9 mentoring support c7 equal partnership c6 family insight c7 student voice c6 parental insight c7 inclusive collaboration c3 feedback integration c9</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>consistent. Like, if something works, we shouldn't just leave it there. We should, um, build it into routines—like regular collaboration or reflection.</p> <p><u>IGQ2: How can teams be supported to design processes that foreground resiliency in planning, implementation, and review cycles?</u></p> <p>P1: There should have a clear policies for flexible IEPs, regular team collaboration, ongoing staff training, family engagement practices, and data-driven progress reviews to turn positive experiences into lasting improvements.</p> <p>P2: Uhm, IEP teams can be supported by providing protected collaboration time, uhm, clearly role expectations, and simple, consistent progress monitoring tools. Uhm, ongoing training in inclusive and integrated practices helps team adjust supports earlier rather than react later. Uhm, strong leadership and off—and open communication with families also build trust and shared responsibility, making planning, imple—implementation, and review cycles more flexibles and resilient.</p> <p>P3: IEP team... can supported to design resilient IEP processes by providing continuous training and clear guidelines and regular opportunities for collaborations among teachers, parents, and specialists. When a school creates safe spaces for sharing experiences, reflecting on challenges—challenges, and celebrating small successes, it strengthen the confidence and commitment of the whole team. Support from the school leaders, adequate resources and consistent monitoring of student progress also helped the team to stay focused and adaptable during planning, implementation, and the review. In my experience, when everyone feels supported and valued, the IEP process become more hopeful, strong, and true centered on helping each learners to grow.</p> <p>P4: By providing, um, specialized training that isn't just about 'compliance. We need workshops on, uh, flexible problem-solving. That's how you build a resilient cycle,</p> <p>P5: Teams need access to professional support, clear guidelines, and opportunities for reflection. Structured planning sessions and mentoring programs can help teachers design responsive interventions. Encouraging collaborative problem-solving also helps teams to remain flexible and resilient when facing challenges."</p> <p>P6: uhm.. for me uh on my own opinion, the ideal teams can must be supported by creating safe spaces for discussion and reflection because when teachers are encouraged to share both successes and challenges uh .. I think they become more confident in improving their practices. And also do not forget this providing guidance, uh providing mentoring, and access to resources also helps teams design effective strategies for supporting diverse learners also.</p> <p>P7: Yes, I have encountered several students who are struggling with English, especially those who are coming from the public schools. And what I did was I tried to talk to them in their mother tongue, and then I slowly introduced the English words to them. I also used a lot of visual aids and other materials that can help them understand the lesson better. And I think that it's very important to be patient with these students, because they are still adjusting to the new environment and the new language.</p> <p>P8: IEP teams can be supported by providing protected</p>	<p>expertise c6 partnership c16 navigation c21 dual language c8 co-creation c9 professional input c25 inclusivity c7 shared input c8 co-design c5 active participation c6 family input c7 student agency c10 specialist support c10 holistic collaboration c11 stakeholder importance c7 diverse perspectives c19 strategic resource use c25 asset -based approach c18 resourceful innovation c8 collaborative balance c10 cohesive support c1 needs prioritization c19 resources c7 advocacy c12 confidence- building c16 prioritization c12 need-based support c1 needs prioritization c19 resource management c7</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>collaboration time, clearly role expectations, and simple, consistent progress monitoring tools. Ongoing training in inclusive and informed practices helps teams adjust supports early rather than react later. Strong leadership and open communication with families also build trust and shared responsibility, making planning, implementation, and review cycles more flexible and resilient.</p> <p>P9: Teams can be supported by providing continuous professional development, guidance, and opportunities for collaboration. These supports help build confidence and enhance the team's ability to design and implement effective plans.</p> <p>P10: Teams can be supported by providing structured frameworks, adequate training, and collaborative platforms that encourage shared decision-making. Regular planning sessions, reflective reviews, and access to relevant resources strengthen team capacity.</p> <p>P11: Teams can be supported by providing clear guidelines, structured timelines, and access to resources. regular evaluation sessions also help refine the process. I mean, support should be continuous.</p> <p>P12: Teams can be supported in designing processes that ground resilience by giving them both the structure and the flexibility to adapt. Clear frameworks for planning, implementation, and review cycles are important, but they should not be overly rigid. Providing time for collaborative planning is essential, as well as training on how to design responsive and student-centered IEPs. Coaching or mentoring systems can also support teams, especially those who are still building confidence in the process. In my experience, when teams feel supported rather than pressured, they are more likely to engage thoughtfully and develop practices that are sustainable.</p> <p>P13: Teams need guidance, but also, ah, flexibility. Like, they need to know what to do, but also have the freedom to adjust. Support systems, um, like mentoring, can also help a lot.</p> <p><u>IGQ3: What role will families, students, and service providers play in co-designing these improvements?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, for, uhm, the improvements, uhm, it is important that families, students, and service providers are collaborating as equal partners. Of course, they share insights, they set goals, provide feedbacks, and help shape the IEP process that are responsive, practical, and student-centered.</p> <p>P2: Uhm, families, students, and service providers play a central role in co-designing these improvements. Uhm, families bring insight into students' strengths, needs, and cultural context, ensuring goals and supports are relevant and achievable. Uhm, students contribute their perspectives and preferences, fostering ownership and self-advocacy. Service providers offer expertise in instructions, uhm, interventions, and accommodations, uhm, helping translate ideas into practical evidence, uhm, evidence-based strategies. Together, uhm, their collaboration ensures that IEP processes are responsive, inclusive, and grounded in real needs, leading to, to more effective and sustainable implementation.</p> <p>P3: Each of the IEPT team plays an important role in development and implementation of an IEPT. Families, students, and service providers play a central and heartfelt</p>	<p>equity c16</p> <p>efficient strategies c19</p> <p>resource sharing c12</p> <p>skill development c12</p> <p>human resilience c19</p> <p>resource limitation c16</p> <p>practical strategies c19</p> <p>resource sharing c2</p> <p>comprehensive monitoring c3</p> <p>feedback system c4</p> <p>progress monitoring c2</p> <p>feedback impact c2</p> <p>quality accountability c3</p> <p>evaluation c4</p> <p>progress monitoring c3</p> <p>Feedback c22</p> <p>policy alignment c2</p> <p>outcome tracking c2</p> <p>monitoring c4</p> <p>progress monitoring c2</p> <p>tracking c2</p> <p>mixed metrics c1</p> <p>goal tracking c3</p> <p>stakeholder feedback c10</p> <p>collaboration quality c4</p> <p>success indicators c2</p> <p>holistic evaluation</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>role in co-designing the IEP improvements. Families, uh, brings deep knowledge to their child's strengths, challenges, and needs, while the students, when possible, share their own experiences and preferences, giving the process of personal meaning. Service providers contribute expertise and strategies to support learning and development. When all voices are genuinely heard and respected, it creates a sense of shared responsibility and trust. In my experience, these collaborations not only leads to more effective IEPs but also fills the process with hope, encouragement, and a sense of community, making every small success feels, uh, truly meaningful.</p> <p>P4: They should be the—the primary architects, really. Not just participants who sign a paper at the end. Their feedback should, uh, actually shape the structure of the meetings.</p> <p>P5: Families play a vital role by sharing insights about their children's strengths and needs. Their active participation helps to ensure that educational plans remain meaningful. Students, when capable, can express their interests and learning preferences, making the IEP more personalized. Service providers contribute specialized knowledge that enhances the effectiveness of interventions.</p> <p>P6: Uh I think the most important role of the family, students, and also the service provider, specifically families are essential partners because uh they understand the child's experiences beyond the classroom. Their insights help teachers create more meaningful uh educational plans. Uh students can also contribute by by their interests and also learning preferences. Service providers bring uh specialized specialized knowledge that strengthens the overall support system for our learners also.</p> <p>P7: For me, the most challenging part of using English as a medium of instruction is that not all students are proficient in the language. Some of them are really struggling to understand the lesson, and that is why I have to use their mother tongue sometimes. Another challenge is that there are some concepts that are very difficult to explain in English, and it's much easier to explain them in their mother tongue. So, I think that the teacher should be very flexible and should be able to use both languages in the classroom.</p> <p>P8: Families, students, and service providers play a central role in co-designing these improvements. Families bring insight into student strengths, needs, and cultural context, ensuring goals and supports are relevant and manageable. Students contribute their perspectives and preferences, fostering ownership and self-advocacy. Service providers offer expertise in instruction, interventions, and accommodations, helping translate ideas into proven, evidence-based strategies. Together, their collaboration ensures that IEP processes are responsive, inclusive, and grounded in real needs, leading to more effective and sustainable implementation.</p> <p>P9: Families and students play a critical role in co-designing improvements. Their lived experiences provide valuable insights that can inform more relevant and responsive planning processes.</p> <p>P10: Families, students, and service providers play a crucial role in co-designing improvements by offering diverse perspectives and firsthand experiences. Families provide insights into the learner's needs and context, uhh..</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>students contribute their preferences and goals, while service providers offer technical and professional expertise.</p> <p>P11: Families, students, and service providers should actively participate in planning and evaluation. their involvement ensures that interventions are, like, relevant and realistic. I mean, their perspectives are essential.</p> <p>P12: Families, students, and service providers play a crucial role in co-designing these improvements. Families bring valuable insights about the learner’s behavior, needs, and progress outside of school, which helps create a more complete picture. Students, when given the opportunity, can also express their preferences and goals, making the IEP more meaningful and empowering. Service providers, such as therapists or specialists, contribute their expertise in addressing specific needs. When all these perspectives are actively included, the process becomes more holistic. It shifts from being school-driven to genuinely collaborative, which strengthens both the design and the implementation of the IEP.</p> <p>P13: Families and students are very important. Uh, sometimes we underestimate their role, but they give perspectives we don’t see in school. And specialists, ah, provide technical support.</p> <p><u>IGQ4: How will regions resource constraints be balanced with the aim of scalable, equitable, practices?</u></p> <p>P1: Regions can balance resource constraints with scalable equitable practices by prioritizing needs sharing resources across schools, leveraging technology and using data to target support where they can make the most impact.</p> <p>P2: Instead of focusing on what we lack, we will use the discovery phase to map out the assets we already have, such as community partnerships, peer mentorship, and local parent expertise. By centering our IEP practices around these existing strengths, we ensure that equitable outcomes are built on a sustainable foundation that doesn’t rely on outside funding. We will celebrate the resilient innovations that are born from necessity. When a teacher creates a sensory space using recycled materials or local donations, that practice is inherently more scalable than an expensive ready-made solution. We honor these acts as professional brilliance that makes equity achievable for every classroom in the region.</p> <p>P3: I recognize that, uhm, resource constraints in our region can make providing individualized support challenging. But these can be balanced through creative collaboration, prio- prioritizing and shared responsibility. By pooling expertise, using low-cost or community-based resources, and focus on the strategies that benefits multiple learners. So we can still implement scalable and equitable pract- practices. So clear communication and teamwork among teachers, among parents and service providers help ensure that every child needs are considered despite limitations. It is inspiring and motivating to see how even with a scarce or not available of the resources, dedication and the genuine can create meaningful learning opportunities and hope for every student.</p> <p>P4: Regions can balance resource constraints with scalable, equitable practices by prioritizing needs, sharing resources across schools, leveraging technology, and</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>using data to target support where they can make the most impact.</p> <p>P5: Schools can maximize available resources by encouraging collaborations and resource sharing among institutions. Partnerships with local organizations and community groups may also provide additional support. Advocacy for stronger government support and equitable distribution of resources remains essential in ensuring inclusive education for all.</p> <p>P6: I think the balancing, it is all about sorry, that question is all about balancing, balancing limited resources because it requires cooperation among schools, it requires cooperation to the communities and also to the educational institution. And for this, sharing materials, expertise, and strategies can help maximize available resources. And advocating also for the greater support from educational authorities, it is also necessary to ensure equitable opportunities for learners with special needs.</p> <p>P7: I think that the best way to help students who are struggling with English is to provide them with more opportunities to practice the language. This can be done through various activities, such as storytelling, role-playing, and other interactive activities. I also think that it's very important to create a supportive and encouraging environment in the classroom, where the students feel comfortable to speak in English without the fear of being judged or criticized. And lastly, I think that the teacher should be a good role model for the students, by speaking in English correctly and fluently.</p> <p>P8: balancing resource constraints with equity means, uh, prioritizing what really matters most, like support for students with the highest needs. Regions can share resources or strategies with each other, and uhm, use flexible approaches so even with limited resources, practices can still be fair and scalable over time.</p> <p>P9: Balancing resource constraints requires careful prioritization of needs and strategic allocation of available resources. This ensures that support is distributed fairly while addressing the most critical areas.</p> <p>P10: Regions can balance resource constraints with scalable equitable practices by prioritizing needs, sharing resources across schools, leveraging technology and using data to target support where they can make the most impact.</p> <p>P11: Resource limitations can be managed by prioritizing critical needs and maximizing available support. collaboration between schools can also help distribute resources more effectively.</p> <p>P12: Balancing regional resource constraints with the goal of scalable and equitable practices is definitely a challenge. One approach is to prioritize strategies that are high-impact but low-cost, such as strengthening collaboration and improving communication systems. Sharing resources across schools within the region can also help maximize what is available. For example, expertise from one school can support another through mentoring or joint initiatives. It's also important to focus on capacity-building—equipping teachers with skills that allow them to adapt strategies even when resources are limited. In this way, resilience is built not just through materials, but through people and practices.</p> <p>P13: With limited resources, um, we have to be practical.</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>Focus on strategies that don't require too much but still make an impact. And, ah, sharing resources between schools can help.</p> <p><u>IGQ5: What metrics or indicators would be used to monitor progress toward resilient IEP practices, and how will feedback loops be established?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, progress towards resilient IEP practice will be monitored using student outcomes, goals completion, teacher's fidelity, and family engagement. With feedback loops established through regular team meetings, surveys, and data-driven adjustments.</p> <p>P2: Uhm, progress can be monitored using metrics like student goal achievement, timely IEP reviews, family engagement rates, and staff collaboration consistency. Feedback loops can be established through regular team meetings, shared data dashboards, and structured reflection cycles that allow teams to adjust supports and practice, practices quickly.</p> <p>P3: Hmm, progress uh towards resilient IEP practices, uh can monitor through students' growth indicators, achievements of the IEP goals, participation levels, and parent and teacher feedback. Regular observation, progress reports, and team reflections help track both academic and social-emotional development. Establishing consistent feedback loops, so through scheduled meetings, open communication channels, and collaborative problem-solving. So ensure that uh challenges are addresses quickly and successes are celebrated. So from my experience, seeing these feedback loops in action uh create a sense of reassurance and motivation, knowing that our efforts are making a tangible difference in the lives of our learners.</p> <p>P4: Maybe use, uh, qualitative data? Like, narrative feedback from students. But also, you know, tracking how often IEP goals are actually met or adjusted. Those are good indicators.</p> <p>P5: Um, indicators may include improvements in student learning outcomes, increased participation in inclusive activities, and stronger collaboration among teachers and families. Regular evaluation meetings and feedback from stakeholders can help monitor progress and guide future improvements.</p> <p>P6: I think the specific indicators that may include is the student's progress toward individual goals. Why? Because it increases participation in classroom activities and stronger collaboration among stakeholders. Conduct feedback from teachers, parents, and also students can also provide valuable insights for improving the IEP process.</p> <p>P7: I think that the government should provide more support for teachers who are using English as a medium of instruction. This can be through providing more training and workshops, as well as providing more teaching materials and resources. I also think that the government should also consider the language background of the students when developing the curriculum, so that it will be more inclusive and responsive to their needs. And lastly, I think that the government should also promote the use of the mother tongue in the classroom, as it is a very important tool for learning.</p> <p>P8: Progress can be monitored using metrics like student</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>goal achievement, timely IEP reviews, family engagement rates, and staff collaboration consistency. Feedback loops can be established through regular team meetings, shared data dashboards, and structured reflection cycles that allow teams to adjust supports and practices quickly."</p> <p>P9: Progress toward resilient IEP practices can be monitored through regular evaluation, feedback mechanisms, and consistent tracking of outcomes. These indicators help identify both strengths and areas that require improvement.</p> <p>P10: Progress toward resilient IEP practices can be monitored using both qualitative and quantitative indicators. These may include student progress outcomes, consistency in IEP implementation, stakeholder satisfaction, frequency of collaborative meetings, and the timeliness of reviews.</p> <p>P11: Indicators may include student development, level of participation from stakeholders, and consistency in implementation. Feedback from families and teachers also provides valuable insight.</p> <p>P12: Monitoring progress toward resilient IEP practices requires a mix of quantitative and qualitative indicators. On the quantitative side, this might include student progress toward IEP goals, frequency of reviews, and levels of participation in meetings. On the qualitative side, feedback from teachers, families, and even students can provide insight into how effective and meaningful the process is. Indicators such as the quality of collaboration, consistency of implementation, and responsiveness to change are also important, even if they are less easily measured. Together, these metrics provide a more complete picture of whether the system is not only functioning, but truly supporting resilience over time.</p> <p>P13: Uh, we can look at student progress, participation, and, um, feedback. Not just numbers, but also experiences.</p>			
<p>RGQ4</p> <p><u>IGQ1: What government, leadership, and accountability arrangements will sustain resilient IEP practices beyond individual projects?</u></p> <p>P1: Hmm, that's a big one. I think... uh, for it to actually last, we need to move away from just 'project-based' thinking. It has to be, you know, embedded in the actual policy framework. Like, having clear accountability where leadership doesn't just look at the paperwork, but actually monitors the—the consistency of support. So, uh, formalizing these roles within the local government or the school board would probably make it more than just a temporary thing, right?</p> <p>P2: Uhm... Resilient practices uhm can be sustained through clear leadership roles, regular oversight by district or regional teams, and shared accountability among educators, uhm supervisors, families, and administrators. Policy... policies can uhm... policies that embed planning, monitoring, and review into routine practices ensure the systems continue beyond individual projects.</p> <p>P3: Uh, I believe that sustaining resilient IEP practices beyond individual projects required a strong leadership, clear governance, and shared accountability. Uh, school leaders uh should actively support individual or the</p>	<p>c22 policy integration c22 accountability structures c13 distributed leadership c22 sustained governance c8 collaborative accountability c2 quality accountability c22 accountability c17 consistency c12 professionalism</p>		

<p>inclusive education by providing guidance, resources, and recognition for effective practices. Uh, while policies ensure that IEP process are consistent and standardized across classroom. Accountability comes from regular monitoring, team reflections, and collaborative uh problem-solving among teachers, specialists, and families. So in my experience, when everyone feels responsible, supported, and valued, it not only strengthen the IEP process, but also uh create lasting culture of resilience, hope, and commitment to every learner's success.</p> <p>P4: It needs a—a centralized leadership structure that focuses on... uh, long-term support rather than just hitting targets. Accountability should be about the "quality" of the IEP, not just the—the completion date.</p> <p>P5: Sustainable IEP practices require strong policy support and clear accountability systems. School leaders must ensure that inclusive practices remain a priority in planning and decision-making.</p> <p>P6: I think, in sustaining resilient practices, it also requires consistent leadership that values inclusive education. I think they need to provide clear policies and accountability systems to ensure that the IEP process remains an ongoing priority within schools.</p> <p>P7: My experience in using English as a medium of instruction has been both challenging and rewarding. It's challenging because, as I mentioned earlier, not all students are proficient in the language, and it takes a lot of effort and patience to help them understand the lesson. But it's also rewarding when I see my students being able to express themselves in English and being able to participate in the classroom activities. It gives me a sense of fulfillment to know that I am helping them to develop a very important skill that they can use in the future.</p> <p>P8: To sustain resilient IEP practices, there should be clear roles from the government and school leaders, such as setting consistent policies and ensuring schools are supported, not just monitored. Accountability should be more supportive than strict, with regular reviews and feedback instead of just compliance checks. Leadership also needs to model collaboration so the practices continue even after specific projects end.</p> <p>P9: Sustaining resilient IEP practices requires strong governance structures and clearly defined roles. These elements promote accountability and ensure that practices continue even beyond individual initiatives.</p> <p>P10: Sustaining resilient IEP practices beyond individual projects requires well-defined governance, strong leadership commitment, and clear accountability systems. Policies and guidelines should be institutionalized to ensure consistency across schools and teams. Leadership must actively support inclusive practices by allocating resources, setting expectations, and modeling collaborative behavior.</p> <p>P11: Sustainability requires clear policies, defined roles, and consistent monitoring systems. Leadership should ensure that these are, like, properly implemented across all levels.</p> <p>P12: To sustain resilient IEP practices beyond individual projects, there needs to be strong alignment between government policies, school leadership, and accountability systems. From my perspective, policies should not only mandate compliance but also support</p>	<p>C23 sustainability of practice c11 role clarity c22 governance c13 management c1 system alignment c1 flexible policy c22 policy enactment c1 outcome focus c22 policy support c22 meaningful accountability c10 embedded collaboration c24 reflective practice c24 reflective culture c24 reflective learning c24 reflection c11 integration c5 interactive learning c10 knowledge exchange c5 experience sharing c24 reflective practice c2 analysis c24 routine reflection c24 storytelling practice c23 knowledge archive c24 reflective culture c24 embedded reflection c5 knowledge sharing c12 capacity building c18 resource-enabled adaptation c6 community partnership c12 capacity</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>flexibility and contextual adaptation. Leadership at the school level plays a critical role in translating these policies into everyday practice—by prioritizing inclusion, allocating time for collaboration, and modeling shared responsibility. In terms of accountability, it should go beyond documentation and focus more on actual student progress and the quality of implementation. When these elements are aligned, the system becomes less dependent on individual efforts and more embedded in the structure of the school.</p>	<p>development c12 skills c10 networking c18 flexibility skills c19 support availability c12</p>		
<p>P13: Ah, strong policies and leadership are important. But accountability should be, um, meaningful—not just paperwork, but actual results.</p>	<p>skills c12 building capacity c12</p>		
<p>IGQ2: <u>How will ongoing reflective practices, storytelling, and knowledge sharing be embedded into routine work?</u></p>	<p>capability c12</p>		
<p>P1: I think it should be embedded by making them regular parts of team meetings, professional learnings, and collaborative checks-in, check-ins, ensuring lessons, successes, and insights are consistently shared and applied.</p>	<p>continuous training c6 partnership strength C19</p>		
<p>P2: Uhm... Ongoing reflective practices, uhm storytelling, and knowledge sharing can be embedded by scheduling regular team reflections, uhm creating forums for staff and families to share successes and challenges, and maintaining uhm accessible records of stories and lessons learned. This makes continuous learning part of everyday activity planning and delivery.</p>	<p>resource access c16 time allocation c12 teacher capacity c6 collaborative partnerships c14</p>		
<p>P3: Ongoing reflective practice, storytelling, and knowledge sharing can be embedded in routine work through the regular team meetings, debriefing sessions, and peer monitoring... uhm, peer mentoring and coaching. Teachers can reflect on what strategies work or, uhm, share success stories of the student's progress and exchange the practical ideas with colleagues and parents. So, even brief moments of reflections after the lesson or the IEP review, uh, can help identify the improvements and celebrate achievements. In my experience, when these practices became a natural part of the daily work, they foster a sense of connection, inspiration, and collective learning, making the IEP process more resilient and deeply meaningful to both students and educators.</p>	<p>transparent communication c5 recognition engagement c3 engagement reinforcement c5 celebratory engagement c14 motivational communication c14</p>		
<p>P4: We could start every meeting with a, uh, 'success story' or a reflection. Making it a routine part of the—the agenda so it doesn't feel like an extra task</p>	<p>motivation c5 participation c23</p>		
<p>P5: Reflective practice can be encouraged through regular professional meetings, peer mentoring, and collaborative discussions. Teachers sharing stories of student success can inspire others and strengthen the commitment to inclusive education</p>	<p>achievement c4 visible results c14 open communication c14</p>		
<p>P6: I think to build the routine work among the students, I think the teachers can integrate reflective practice into regular meetings, maybe workshops or collaborative discussions by sharing stories about student's progress because it reminds educators why their work matters and also it helps them to strengthen their commitment.</p>	<p>transparency c14 communication c23 success sharing c23</p>		
<p>P7: In my opinion, the most effective way to teach English is through a communicative approach. This means that the focus should be on using the language in real-life situations, rather than just focusing on grammar and vocabulary. I think that the students should be given more opportunities to use the language in a meaningful way, such as through discussions, debates, and other</p>	<p>narrative impact C4 growth narratives c4 milestone recognition c5</p>		

<p>interactive activities. I also think that the teacher should provide a lot of feedback and support to the students, to help them improve their language skills.</p> <p>P8: Reflective practice and storytelling can be embedded by making them part of regular meetings, like teachers sharing experiences or small wins during check-ins. Knowledge sharing can also be supported through simple platforms or group discussions so it becomes a habit rather than an extra task.</p> <p>P9: Ongoing reflective practice can be embedded through regular team discussions, documentation, and the sharing of experiences. These activities encourage continuous learning and improvement.</p> <p>P10: Reflective practice, storytelling, and knowledge sharing can be embedded into routine by making them part of regular workflows rather than additional tasks. This may include incorporating reflection sessions into scheduled meetings, documenting case experiences, and encouraging peer discussions.</p> <p>P11: Reflective practices can be integrated through regular discussions and documentation. Um, storytelling and sharing experiences help, like, reinforce learning among team members.</p> <p>P12: Ongoing reflective practice, storytelling, and knowledge sharing can be embedded into routine by making them part of regular school processes rather than additional tasks. For example, brief reflective discussions can be integrated into team meetings, where teachers share what worked and what didn't in their IEP implementation. Storytelling—especially sharing small successes or challenges—helps make the work more meaningful and relatable. Documentation of these experiences, even in simple forms, can serve as a reference for others. Over time, this builds a culture where learning from experience is normalized, and knowledge is continuously exchanged rather than kept individually.</p> <p>P13: Reflection can be part of regular meetings. Uh, even short sharing sessions can help build knowledge.</p> <p><u>IGQ3: What capacities like skills, partnerships, resources must be developed to maintain resilience in a long term?</u></p> <p>P1: I think to maintain long-term resilience, capacities that must be developed include skilled, skilled and adaptive staff, strong partnership with families and community organizations, and access to sufficient resources, tools and data systems that support continuous learning and responsive IEP practices.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... Partnerships with... uhm families, community organizations, and specialists ensure shared responsibility and support. Adequate resources, including uhm protected planning time, progress monitoring tools, and ongoing professional learning, uhm enable teams to... to adapt, uhm problem-solve, and sustain effective uhm practices over time.</p> <p>P3: As a SPED teacher, maintaining long-term resilience in IEP practices, uh, requires developing skills, partnership, and resources that strengthen both educators and the system. So, teachers need ongoing professional development in differentiated instructions, behavior support, and collaborative problem solving. So, strong partnership with the families, therapists, and community</p>	<p>regular sharing c5 narrative sharing c3 continuous improvement c21 expectation imbalance c18 adaptive support c9 mentorship support c12 training c2 monitoring C6 Family collaboration c20 contextual adaptation c17 consistency control c21 risk mitigation c21 risk c21 over- standardization c21 teacher strain c3 adaptive balance c3 feedback systems c21 burnout risk c21 rigidity risk c18 adaptive support</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>organizations help, uh, extend learning beyond the classroom and ensure holistic support for the child. Adequate resources, whether teaching materials, assistive technologies, or time for collaboration, are essential to implement the strategies effectively. So, in my experience, when these capacities are nurtured, it brings a sense of confidence, hope, and shared purpose, allowing the IEP process to remain adaptable, consistent, and truly focused on helping every learner thrive.</p> <p>P4: We need to develop, um, better partnership skills. And, uh, resource management. But mostly, it's the—the emotional intelligence to handle the tough cases without losing hope.</p> <p>P5: Teachers need skills in differentiated instructions, assessment, and inclusive classroom management. Partnerships with specialists and community organizations can also strengthen support systems for learners.</p> <p>P6: I think once a teacher, forever learners. Therefore, the teachers need continuous development in inclusive teaching strategies and also continuous development collaboration skills and understanding of more, more, more understanding of diverse learning needs. And also with the partner together with the partnerships with the specialist and community organization can also strengthen the long term support.</p> <p>P7: I think that the most important quality of a teacher who is using English as a medium of instruction is to be patient and understanding. As I said, learning a new language is not easy, and it takes a lot of time and effort. The teacher should be able to create a safe and supportive environment for the students, where they feel comfortable to make mistakes and to learn from them. The teacher should also be very creative and flexible, and should be able to use various teaching strategies and materials to help the students understand the lesson.</p> <p>P8: Long-term resilience requires continuous training for teachers, especially in collaboration and adaptability. Strong partnerships with parents, specialists, and the community are also important. Resources do not always have to be large, but they should be consistent, such as access to materials, time for planning, and reliable support systems.</p> <p>P9: Long-term resilience depends on the continuous development of skills, partnerships, and available resources. Strengthening these capacities ensures that teams remain effective over time.</p> <p>P10: Maintaining resilience in the long term requires strengthening key capacities such as technical expertise in IEP development, data analysis skills, and effective communication. Building strong partnerships among schools, families, service providers, and the wider community is equally important.</p> <p>P11: Developing skills in communication, planning, and analysis is essential...uhh.. partnerships with external stakeholders also strengthen the system. I mean, resources should be continuously developed.</p> <p>P12: Sustaining resilience in the long term requires developing several key capacities. Teachers need ongoing training in differentiated instruction, assessment, and inclusive strategies. Strong partnerships—with families, specialists, and even external organizations—are also</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>essential, as they provide a broader support system for the learner. In terms of resources, access to appropriate materials, assistive tools, and reliable data systems is important. Equally important is time—time for collaboration, planning, and reflection. When these capacities are consistently developed and supported, the system becomes more capable of adapting to challenges without losing its effectiveness.</p> <p>P13: Teachers need skills, support, and, um, time. Partnerships also matter, especially with families and specialists.</p> <p><u>IGQ4: How will success be communicated to stakeholders to maintain motivation and engagement?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, success should be communicated to stakeholder through uh, regular updates, uh, progress reports, student stories, and celebrations of achievements to keep them informed, and stay motivated and engaged, engaged.</p> <p>P2: Uhm... Success can be communicated by sharing clear, uhm simple updates on student progress, uhm goals achievements, and team accomplishments through newsletters, meetings, and dashboards. Highlighting stories of... of impact, celebrating milestones, and provide regular opportunities for feedback... uhm for feedback keeps families, student... families, uhm students, and staff motivated and engaged in the ongoing process.</p> <p>P3: Success can... communicated to stakeholders through regular progress reports, parent-teacher conferences, newsletters, team meetings and... that highlights both small and significant achievements of the learners. Sharing stories, student's work and observable improvements help the families, colleagues, and administrators to see the impact of their collaborations. Celebrating these successes, no matter how small, create a sense of pride and motivations for everyone involved. So in my experience, when stakeholders witnesses tangible progress and feels included in the journey, it strengthens trust, engagement, and shared commitment to help every child reach their full potential.</p> <p>P4: I think, uh, quarterly newsletters or even just small 'shout-out' emails. You know, keeping people informed about the—the positive impact keeps them motivated.</p> <p>P5: Uhhh, success will be communicated by regularly sharing updates like reports, meetings, or simple announcements so stakeholders can see the progress. Uh, we can also highlight achievements and small wins to keep everyone motivated and engaged.</p> <p>P6: I think to empower parents and community, I think schools can offer training and creating and also creating platforms for them to voice their perspectives. And by involving them in the decision making, it makes the IEP a shared responsibility rather than just the school's task. And for the students, I think when they are taught to advocate for their own learning needs, they become active participants in their own success.</p> <p>P7: Success can be communicated through school recognition programs, progress reports that highlight, uhm, holistic growth, and community presentations that showcase student achievements. Celebrating milestones, like a child who finally, uh, feels comfortable entering the classroom, helps maintain motivation for both educators and families. When the community sees the heart of SPED, they are more likely to support it.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>P8: Success can be communicated by sharing clear progress, such as improvements in student outcomes or small achievements. Using simple reports, meetings, or stories from teachers and students can help keep stakeholders motivated and engaged because they can see the impact.</p> <p>P9: Success should be communicated through transparent reporting, regular meetings, and stakeholder engagement. Clear communication helps maintain motivation and ensures that everyone remains informed.</p> <p>P10: Success can be communicated to stakeholders through clear, consistent, and transparent reporting. This may include sharing progress reports, success stories, and measurable outcomes through meetings, newsletters, or digital platforms. Highlighting both achievements and areas for improvement helps maintain credibility, while recognizing the contributions of stakeholders fosters continued motivation and engagement.</p> <p>P11: Communication of success should be transparent and consistent. sharing progress and recognizing contributions, like, helps maintain motivation.</p> <p>P12: Communicating success to stakeholders is important in maintaining motivation and engagement. This can be done by sharing both quantitative and qualitative outcomes. While data on student progress is important, stories of growth—such as improvements in confidence, participation, or independence—also resonate strongly with families and educators. Regular updates, whether through meetings, reports, or informal conversations, help keep stakeholders informed and connected to the process. Celebrating small wins is especially important, as it reinforces the value of the work and encourages continued effort from everyone involved.</p> <p>P13: Success should be shared regularly. Uh, not just data, but also stories, because they make things more relatable.</p> <p><u>IGQ5: What risks or unintended consequences might arise as resilient practices scale and how will they be mitigated?</u></p> <p>P1: As resilient practices scale, risks may include inconsistent implementation, staff burnout, resource strain, or inequalities in support, or lack of funds. They can be mitigated through ongoing training—it is important—clear guidance of course, monitoring, and feedback loops to identify challenges early and make timely adjustments.</p> <p>P2: Uhm, it is the risk that parents have over... over-expectations. Uhm, by... by focusing so much—so much on potential, uhm, parents might feel devastated if a student hits a plateau or a regression. In this case, uhm, we communicate that resilience is a wave, not a straight line. Uhm, I explain to families that a dip in progress is just part of the student's story, and we use those moment—moments to pivot our strategies, not—not to lose hope.</p> <p>P3: I... I've seen that as resilience practices scale, risks like teacher's burnout, inconsistent implementation, and overlooking individual student's needs can arise. So there are also... the possible that standardized approaches might unintentionally reduce flexibility for learners with unique challenges. So these risks can be mitigated... through</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>ongoing professional support, regular team reflection, mentoring, and open feedback loop that allows adjustment to be made quickly. So in my experience, when team feels supported and encouraged to adapt practices through... thoughtfully, challenges become opportunities for growth, and the process remains student-centered, sustainable, and emotionally rewarding for everyone involved.</p> <p>P4: The risk is that it becomes, uh, diluted' Like, the quality might drop as we try to do more. We mitigate that by having, um, strong mentors in every school to maintain the standard.</p> <p>P5: As resilience practices expound, they may be risks of uneven implementation or lack of adequate training. To address this, schools must ensure ongoing professional development and consistent monitoring of practices.</p> <p>P6: I think regular reviews of student data and feedback from the teachers and parents can serve as an effective monitoring mechanism. Also, the schools should be open to adjusting their strategies based on what the data shows, ensuring that the IEP remains responsive to the student's evolving needs.</p> <p>P7: Uh, encouraging family participation can be achieved by, creating a welcoming school environment hosting regular parent-teacher meetings and workshops on how to support learning at home. Uhm, using digital platforms for easy communication and, involving parents in school events an decision-making processes also helps build a strong partnership. recognizing and valuing their cultural backgrounds can also make them feel more, connected to the school community.</p> <p>P8: One risk is that as practices scale, they may become too standardized and lose flexibility, or some schools might struggle to keep up. To mitigate this, there should be room for adaptation based on context, and continuous feedback should be encouraged so challenges are identified early and addressed effectively.</p> <p>P9: Potential risks, such as inconsistent implementation or lack of follow-through, may arise as practices scale. These risks can be mitigated through proper planning, monitoring, and support systems.</p> <p>P10: As resilience practices scale, potential risks may include inconsistency in implementation, increased workload for educators, and the possibility of overlooking individual learner needs due to standardized approaches. To mitigate these, it is important to maintain flexibility, provide continuous training and support, and ensure regular monitoring and feedback. Engaging stakeholders in ongoing evaluation also helps identify emerging challenges early and allows for timely adjustments.</p> <p>P11: Risks may include over-standardization and increased workload. uhh.. these can be minimized by maintaining flexibility and providing sufficient support systems.</p> <p>P12: As resilience practices begin to scale, there is a risk that they may become too standardized or lose their responsiveness to individual needs. There is also the possibility of increased workload for teachers, which could lead to burnout if not properly managed. Another unintended consequence might be a focus on maintaining systems rather than genuinely responding to students. To mitigate these risks, it's important to maintain flexibility within the system and regularly revisit practices to ensure</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>they remain relevant. Open communication and feedback mechanisms allow concerns to be raised early. Leadership must also be mindful of workload and provide appropriate support. In the end, sustaining resilience requires balancing structure with adaptability, ensuring that the system continues to serve its original purpose— supporting each learner effectively.</p> <p>P13: There’s a risk of burnout, or, ah, making things too rigid. So, we need to stay flexible and supportive.</p>			
<p style="text-align: center;">RGQ5</p> <p><u>IGQ1: How do participants' interpretations of inclusion, equity, and accountability shape the adoption of appreciative inquiry-informed practices?</u></p> <p>P1: Um, I think it—uh, the participants' interpretation of inclusion, equity, and accountability does shape the adoption of AI-informed practices by influencing which tools are trusted, how decisions are applied, and where— whose—whose needs are prioritized. When stakeholders value fairness and transparency, AI is more likely to be used responsibly and widely. Where differing understanding can lead to uneven adoption of unintended biases.</p> <p>P2: Accountability can often be a tug-of-war between the dry world of paperwork and life-giving spark of appreciative inquiry. Yet I believe that when we bring teachers, parents, and administrators together, we create a powerful fusion of horizons; a shared vision where our different perspectives finally click into place. We have the opportunity to transform the pressure of high-stakes testing and legal mandates into a higher calling: the goal of fostering true student resilience. If we choose to see accountability only as avoiding a lawsuit, we stay stuck in the past. However, if we shift our mindset to accountability for student growth, we unlock the full potential of our work and move toward a brighter future. By honoring our personal views, I can better understand how we as educators bridge the gap between rigid IEP rules and the aspirational resilient world we are co-designing for our students—proving that we are not just filling out forms, we are building a bridge of what is possible.</p> <p>P3: As a SPED teacher in Region 3, I see that meanings, power dynamics, and contextual contextual factors deeply shape how AI-informed practices can support resilient outcomes. The meaning we give to AI—whether as a tool to as- assist teaching, monitor progress, or personalize learning—affect how the willingly teachers, students, and families adopt it. Power dynamics, such as who has access to AI tools or decision-making autho- authority in AI IEP planning... so, can it either empower or marginalize certain voices. Ensuring inclusive participation is critical. So, contex- contextual factors like resource avail- availability, teacher's training, internet connectivity, and culture attitude towards technology also determine how effective AI can be integrated. When these elements are acknowledged and addresses collaboratively, AI can enhance individualized support, streamline data-driven decisions, and strengthen communications among stakeholders, leading to resilient, equitable, and meaningful outcomes for learners with special needs.</p> <p>P4: Well, if you see inclusion as just being in the room, the practice stays shallow. But if you see it as—as belonging, then you really lean into the appreciative inquiry stuff. It—it changes how you approach the whole thing.</p>	<p>c18 values-driven- adaptation c15 ethical implementation c7 shared perspective c23 transformative accountability c18 interpretive adaptation c10 AI-enabled support c15 appreciative approach c7 perspectives c7 perception c23 sustainability c20 varied understanding c18 balanced approach c24 appreciative inquiry c8 shared responsibility c7 perception c25 authentic inclusion c7 equitable support c8 shared accountability c25 inclusion mindset c5 engagement level c20 contextual values c20 cultural interpretation c12 professional calling c20 contextual</p>		

<p>P5: Different perspectives on inclusion and equity influence how educators embrace new technologies. When stakeholders view technology as a means of improving accessibility and supporting diverse learners, they become more open to integrating AI tools responsibly.</p> <p>P6: Uh, for that, people's understanding of inclusion and equity influence how they view the use of technology in education. Actually, when technology is seen as a tool of accessibility and personalized learning, I think it becomes easier for educators to adopt the AI response the AI responsibly.</p> <p>P7: the school can better support teachers and staff by, uhm, offering more opportunities for professional growth providing mental health support, and ensuring a safe and inclusive working environment. Uhm, fostering a culture of collaboration and mutual respect among colleagues can also improve morale and productivity. regularly seeking their input on school policies and practices ensures their voices are heard and valued.</p> <p>P8: Participants interpret inclusion, equity, and accountability in different ways, and that shapes how they adopt appreciative inquiry. Some focus more on strengths and positive experiences, so they engage with it more easily. Others focus on fairness and clear results, so they look for evidence that it actually improves practice. Adoption happens when they feel both the positive approach and accountability are present in balance.</p> <p>P9: Participants' interpretations of inclusion, equity, and accountability significantly influence how appreciative inquiry practices are adopted. Their understanding shapes how these concepts are applied in real situations.</p> <p>P10: Participants' interpretations of inclusion, equity, and accountability significantly influence how appreciative inquiry-informed practices are adopted. When these concepts are understood as shared responsibilities, stakeholders are more likely to engage collaboratively and view positive experiences as opportunities for collective growth.</p> <p>P11: How participants understand inclusion and equity affects how they apply appreciative inquiry. Uhh, if they see it as a shared effort, they are more likely to, like, engage actively in the process.</p> <p>P12: Participants' interpretations of inclusion, equity, and accountability significantly shape how appreciative inquiry-informed practices are understood and applied. When inclusion is seen as genuine participation rather than mere placement, and equity is understood as providing what each learner specifically needs, appreciative inquiry becomes more meaningful. It shifts from simply highlighting positives to recognizing strengths as a foundation for growth. Accountability, when viewed as shared responsibility rather than compliance, also encourages more openness in the process. In my experience, when these concepts are interpreted in a more holistic and human-centered way, teachers and stakeholders are more willing to engage in appreciative practices because they feel purposeful and relevant, not superficial.</p> <p>P13: Uh, how people understand inclusion and equity really shapes how they approach IEPs. If they see it as meaningful, they engage more.</p>	<p>interpretation c20</p> <p>contextual understanding c20</p> <p>contextual awareness c24</p> <p>culture c19</p> <p>context c24</p> <p>culture c20</p> <p>expression differences c20</p> <p>regional factors c20</p> <p>contextual influence c16</p> <p>framework c15</p> <p>community culture c20</p> <p>cultural influence c22</p> <p>policy structure c20</p> <p>contextual awareness c20</p> <p>contextual influence C20</p> <p>cultural factors c8</p> <p>shared governance c23</p> <p>unified purpose c7</p> <p>shared voice c7</p> <p>equal voice c5</p> <p>Ethical collaboration c7</p> <p>power balance c10</p> <p>teamwork c7</p> <p>inclusive voice c7</p> <p>fair practice c7</p> <p>equal voice c7</p> <p>power relations c7</p> <p>power dynamics c7</p> <p>power dynamics c25</p> <p>inclusive participation c13</p> <p>distributed leadership c11</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p><u>IGQ2: In what ways do regional histories, cultural norms, and policy context influence the interpretation of positive core experiences?</u></p> <p>P1: Uhm, regional histories, cultural norms, and policy context influence the interpretation of positive core experiences by shaping what is valued, what is recognized and prioritized. They should determine how success is defined, which practices are considered meaningful and how achievements are celebrated, making the understanding of positive experiences unique to each community and context.</p> <p>P2: In Region III, being a teacher is often seen as a noble calling, rather than just a job. We interpret our positive core through this high standard of care. When... when an IEP implementation goes well, we feel we are fulfilling our true purpose. This regional norm turns daily tasks into inspirational moments of professional pride and spiritual reward.</p> <p>P3: I've noticed that regional histories, cultural norms, and policies context shape how positive core experiences are understood and valued. For example, long-standing communication practices around families involved in education influence how parents engage in the IEP meetings, while the cultural attitudes toward disability affect how students are supported and celebrated. So local poli- policies on inclusive education provide the framework and resources that make certain success possible. So what they also set boundaries that teachers and families must navigate. In my experience, um, recognizing these factors help me to interpret achievements not just an individual progress, but as outcomes shape to by communicating support—or communities—community support, cultural expectations, and systematic structures, making each success feels both meaningful and deeply connected to the learner's context.</p> <p>P4: Region 3 has its own, uh, unique challenges and culture. Those histories of, um, how things were done before—they definitely influence how people react to new policies. You have to respect that context.</p> <p>P5: Regional traditions and policies shape how inclusion is practiced in schools. Cultural values such as strong family involvement and respect for education influence how communities support learners with special needs.</p> <p>P6: I think it influences the interpretation of positive core experiences by the regional culture and educational policies because it influences how inclusive practices are understood and implemented. And also, the cultural values such as strong family involvement and respect for education can strengthen support for learners with special needs.</p> <p>P7: Our history in Region III is one of overcoming challenges. Our cultural norms of family-centeredness mean that a positive experience is often defined by the happiness of the entire family unit, not just the student. Policy contexts provide the framework, but our local culture provides the spirit. We interpret success through the lens of community belonging and the shared pride of seeing our children succeed despite the odds.</p> <p>P8: Uh, regional history and cultural norms strongly influence how participants understand positive core experiences. If they have faced many challenges before, even small improvements feel meaningful to them. Hmm,</p>	<p>shared ownership C7 power balance c7 voice equity c24 reflective interpretation c24 balanced critique c3 reflective refinement c24 critical reflection c4 optimistic learning c3 reflection c24 interpretation c16 Plan reservation c24 iterative understanding c24 idea reframing c24 reflective analysis c24 interpretation c3 iterative reflection c24 reflective review c24 constructive reflection c3 practice refinement c24 reflective learning c24 constructive reflection c23 balanced growth c21 conflict resolution c19 resource constraint C4 resilience recognition c15 balance c4 recognition c13 Inspire c7 advocacy action c7 honest reflection c7 dual recognition c15 balanced narrative c15</p>		
---	---	--	--

<p>cultural expectations also affect how openly they share ideas, since some are more expressive while others are more reserved. Policy context also plays a role in how freely they can interpret and apply these experiences.</p> <p>P9: Regional histories, cultural norms, and policy contexts play a key role in shaping how positive experiences are interpreted. These factors influence both perception and implementation.</p> <p>P10: Regional histories, cultural norms, and policy contexts shape how stakeholders interpret and value positive core experiences. Local traditions and beliefs may influence what is considered effective or meaningful in IEP practices, while existing policies provide the framework within which these practices operate. Understanding these contextual factors allows for more culturally responsive and relevant approaches, ensuring that improvements are grounded in the realities of the region.</p> <p>P11: Regional culture and policies influence how practices are viewed and implemented. Uhh.. understanding these factors helps ensure that approaches are, like, appropriate and effective.</p> <p>P12: Regional histories, cultural norms, and policy contexts play a strong role in shaping how positive core experiences are interpreted. In Region 3, for example, there is often a deep value placed on community and collective effort, which influences how collaboration is experienced in IEP work. Cultural respect for authority can sometimes affect how openly individuals share their perspectives, especially in meetings. At the same time, policy frameworks provide structure, but they can also limit flexibility if interpreted too rigidly. These factors together shape what is seen as “successful” or “positive.” Understanding this context helps ensure that appreciative inquiry is not applied in a generic way, but one that is sensitive to local realities and practices.</p> <p>P13: Context matters a lot. Um, culture and policies influence how people define success and collaboration.</p> <p><u>IGQ3: How will power relations between stakeholders be navigated to ensure ethical co-creation of knowledge and sustainable change?</u></p> <p>P1: I think it should be navigated by fostering inclusive decision-making, actively listening to diverse voices, uhm, they should share authority and responsibilities and it should establish transparent processes that prioritize equity, collaboration, build mutual experiences to support ethical co-creation of knowledge and sustainable change.</p> <p>P2: The ultimate way I will navigate power is by centering the student’s voice as the guiding North Star of our study. When the student’s needs and strengths are at the center, adult power struggles tend to fade away. We become a unified team working for a cause greater than our individual roles, ensuring that the knowledge we create is ethical and student-centered.</p> <p>P3: Uhm, navigating power relationship or relations between stakeholders requires inter—uh, intentional collaboration, respect, and shared decision-making. Uhm, parents, students, teachers, and the service provided—uh, providers, rather, are bring valuable perspectives. So, and it's important no single voice dominates IEP planning or implementation. By fostering open dialogue, active listening, and transparent communication, we can create a</p>	<p>balance C15 balanced view c2 impact evidence c20 grounded narrative c4 ongoing growth c15 balanced perspective c15 hopeful realism c4 growth focus</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>space where everyone feels empowered to contribute. In my experience, when power is balanced and all perspectives are valued, co-creation of knowledge become ethical and inclusive, leading to sustainable changes that genuinely reflect the needs, strengths, and aspiration of each learner.</p> <p>P4: It's tough, but, uh, we have to create a level playing field. Like, making sure the teacher's voice doesn't automatically outweigh the parent's voice. It's about, um, ethical co-creation.</p> <p>P5: Ethical collaboration requires mutual respect among stakeholders. Teachers, parents, and administrators must engage in open dialogue where each perspective is valued and considered in decision-making.</p> <p>P6: Okay, to..to develop good relationships among the stakeholders, I think powerful relationships can be balanced through open dialogue, uh, also by means of shared decision making. Because when stakeholders respect, uh, each other's perspective, I think the process becomes more collaborative and ethical.</p> <p>P7: the school engages with collaborating with local organizations and businesses to provide students with real-world learning opportunities. Uhm, we also host community events and workshops that promote awareness and understanding of inclusive education. Uh, hmm, by building strong relationships with community members, we can create a more supportive and inclusive environment for all students.</p> <p>P8: Participants often see power relations as something that should be shared across all stakeholders. Uhm, they usually prefer that teachers, parents, and students all have a voice in decision-making. When everyone is included and listened to, collaboration feels more ethical and trust is stronger among the group.</p> <p>P9: Power relations must be carefully managed to ensure ethical collaboration. Promoting equal participation among stakeholders helps create a more balanced and inclusive decision-making process.</p> <p>P10: Navigating power relations among stakeholders requires intentional efforts to promote inclusivity, respect, and transparency. Creating safe and participatory spaces where all voices—particularly those of students and families—are heard is essential. Clear communication, shared decision-making processes, and ethical guidelines help ensure that knowledge is co-created rather than imposed, leading to more sustainable and meaningful change.</p> <p>P11: Power dynamics can be managed by encouraging equal participation and transparency. giving everyone a voice helps create more balanced decision-making.</p> <p>P12: Power relations among stakeholders are an important consideration in ensuring ethical co-creation of knowledge. In many cases, school leaders or specialists may naturally hold more influence, while parents or even general education teachers may feel less confident in voicing their perspectives. Navigating this requires intentional effort—creating spaces where all voices are invited and valued. Simple practices like actively asking for input, acknowledging contributions, and using inclusive language can help balance participation. Leadership also plays a role in modeling this kind of shared authority. When power is distributed more</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>equitably, collaboration becomes more authentic, and the outcomes are more sustainable because they are co-owned by everyone involved.</p> <p>P13: Power should be balanced. Uh, everyone should feel they can speak and be heard, not just those in higher positions.</p> <p><u>IGQ4: How can hermeneutic circles be used to critically examine assumptions underlying resilience efforts without dampening optimism?</u></p> <p>P1: I think hermeneutic circles can be used by encouraging participants to, I think, uhm, to reflect on their interpretations, assumptions and experiences, like moving between individual insights and collective understanding, so that underlying biases or blind spots in resilience efforts are revealed while maintaining a focus on strength, on learning and constructive responsibilities, uhm, and preserving optimism and motivation.</p> <p>P2: Instead of a closed loop, I will treat the hermeneutic circle as an upward spiral. Every time we examine an assumption, like we don't have enough funding, uh—we return to the dream phase of AI with more sophisticated plan. This ensures that our co-designed improvements are not just nice ideas, but are resilience strategies designed to thrive in the real world of Region 3.</p> <p>P3: Hermeneutic circles, the iterative process of interpreting experience, reflecting, and uh, revising understanding, can be a powerful way to examine assumptions underlying resilience effort. By engaging in cycles of reflection with colleagues, parents, and even students, we can question our belief about what success looks like, uncover hidden biases, and identify practices that may unintentionally limit the student's growth. The key is to frame these reflections constructively, rather than focusing on faults. The dialogue highlights learning opportunities and improvements. In my experience, using hermeneutic circles in this way strengthens our strategies, deep—deepens understanding, and keep hope alive, because every reflection leads to more informed, adaptable, and student-centered approaches.</p> <p>P4: Uh, it's basically about, you know, constantly re-examining what we do. It doesn't have to be negative. It's just... uh, it's learning. We stay optimistic because we're—we're always trying to get better.</p> <p>P5: Through reflective dialogue, educators can revisit their experiences, question assumptions, and gain deeper understanding of challenges and successes. This reflective process strengthens learning while maintaining hope for improvement.</p> <p>P6: Hermeneutic circles can help by, uhm, going back and forth between ideas and experiences. This allows people to question assumptions but still focus on strengths, so it doesn't become too negative.</p> <p>P7: Future plans for enhancing inclusive education include, uhm, expanding our special education programs providing more training for teachers on inclusive practices, and increasing access to assistive technologies. Uhm, we also plan to develop more inclusive extracurricular activities and ensure that our school facilities are, accessible to all students. our goal is to create a truly inclusive school where every student can, uh, thrive and succeed.</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>P8: Hermeneutic circles, for participants, feel like going back and forth between their own experiences and the views of others. Uh, this process helps them see situations in a deeper way over time. It allows them to notice both strengths and weaknesses without becoming too negative or discouraged.</p> <p>P9: Hermeneutic circles can be used to revisit assumptions and deepen understanding without undermining positive perspectives. This approach supports both reflection and continuous learning.</p> <p>P10: Hermeneutic circles can be used as a reflective tool to examine underlying assumptions by encouraging stakeholders to move between individual experiences and the broader system context. Through iterative dialogue and reflection, participants can critically analyze practices while still recognizing strengths. This approach supports continuous learning and improvement without diminishing the positive momentum generated by resilience efforts.</p> <p>P11: Hermeneutic circles allow stakeholders to reflect on both individual and collective experiences. This helps deepen understanding while still maintaining a positive outlook.</p> <p>P12: Hermeneutic circles can be a useful way to critically examine assumptions in resilience efforts by encouraging continuous reflection between individual experiences and the broader context. In practice, this might involve revisiting past IEP cases, reflecting on what was initially understood, and then reinterpreting those experiences in light of new insights or perspectives. The key is to approach this process not as fault-finding, but as meaning-making. By framing reflection as an opportunity for deeper understanding rather than criticism, it is possible to maintain optimism while still being critical. It allows the team to refine their practices without losing sight of the progress already made.</p> <p>P13: Reflecting on experiences helps us see things differently. Ah, it's about learning, not criticizing, so we can improve without losing motivation.</p> <p><u>IGQ5: What would constitute a balanced narrative that honors both strengths and critical reflection in Region 3's IEP work?</u></p> <p>P1: I think a balanced narrative for Region 3's IEP work would highlight students' and educators' successes, um, of course, their growth and innovative practices, while also acknowledging challenges, lessons learned, and areas for improvement. Um, by showing a commitment to both celebrating strengths and fostering continuous and reflective improvement.</p> <p>P2: A balanced narrative recognizes that the positive—positive core experience in Region 3 is often born from tension. Hmm... we don't just talk about a smooth IEP meeting. We talk about how we navigated a heated disagreement or a lack of resources to reach a breakthrough. This honors our strength while critically reflecting on the obstacles that made the victory so hard to won.</p> <p>P3: I think a balanced narrative needs to, uh, avoid being too 'toxic positive,' if that makes sense? We have to honor the hard work and the—the wins we've had in Region 3, but we also need to be, um, honest about the gaps. Like, acknowledging that while we have the heart for it, the</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>resources are still... well, they're lacking. So, a story that says 'we are doing great with what we have, but we need more support'—that's the balance.</p> <p>P4: It should be a story of, uh, perseverance. Acknowledging the—the systemic hurdles, but highlighting the—the resilience of the people on the ground. It's both a critique and a—a celebration.</p> <p>P5: A balanced narrative acknowledges both progress and areas that still need improvement. It highlights the dedication of teachers, families, and leaders while honestly addressing challenges in implementation. Such a narrative inspires continuous growth and reinforces the shared commitment to providing meaningful education for every learner.</p> <p>P6: Uhhm..., for that, uh, a balanced narrative, uh, recognized the dedication of our educators and also the progress that has been made, while while also acknowledging while also acknowledging the challenges that still exist. And also, it celebrates the resilience of teachers, the families, and most importantly, our learners, while encouraging continuous growth and improvement.</p> <p>P7: My message to other educators and schools is to, uhm, embrace diversity and recognize the unique strengths and, uh, talents of every student. building an inclusive environment requires a commitment to, uh, collaboration empathy, and continuous learning. don't be afraid to, challenge the status quo and advocate for the needs of all students we can create a more inclusive and equitable education system for everyone.</p> <p>P8: Hmm, a balanced narrative for participants is one that recognizes both successes and challenges. Uhm, it means appreciating what is already working while still being honest about what needs improvement. This balance helps them stay motivated while also keeping expectations realistic.</p> <p>P9: A balanced narrative should acknowledge both strengths and limitations. Recognizing achievements while addressing challenges ensures a more honest and constructive evaluation of IEP practices.</p> <p>P10: A balanced narrative for Region 3's IEP work is one that acknowledges both achievements and areas for growth. It should highlight successful practices, collaborative efforts, and positive outcomes while also addressing existing challenges and gaps. By integrating both strengths and critical reflections, the narrative remains realistic, credible, and forward-looking, supporting sustained engagement and continuous improvement.</p> <p>P11: A balanced narrative should acknowledge both progress and challenges. This ensures that the discussion remains realistic while still, like, promoting growth and improvement.</p> <p>P12: A balanced narrative for Region 3's IEP work would be one that recognizes both the strengths and the ongoing challenges. It would highlight successful collaborations, meaningful student progress, and the dedication of teachers and families, while also acknowledging areas that need improvement, such as resource limitations or varying levels of readiness among schools. This kind of narrative avoids being overly idealistic or overly critical. Instead, it presents a realistic picture—one that values</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>growth, learning, and continuous improvement. By honoring both what is working and what still needs attention, it creates a more credible and motivating account of IEP implementation in the region.</p> <p>P13: A balanced narrative shows both strengths and challenges. Uh, it's honest but still hopeful, focusing on growth.</p>			
---	--	--	--

Summary of Findings

This qualitative study, conducted in Bulacan, investigates resilience in the implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) through an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) lens interpreted via hermeneutic phenomenology, revealing a richly layered, dynamic process in which stakeholders—teachers, school leaders, para-educators, families, and students—co-create conditions for meaningful inclusion **P1** I get to see my student make noticeable progress on the challenging goals. Because it doesn't just happen over time, it takes a lot of, you know, dedicated... uhm... dedication to really... uhm... bring out the best from my students. And as a teacher, it's fulfilling to see my student express pride in their achievements. And how the family highlighted... uhm... our strategies... uhm... to support... uhm... the child's learning at home. by reframing challenges as opportunities for collective sense-making, nurturing hopeful, action-oriented communities, attuning to local context and history, and instituting ethical governance that foregrounds voice, reciprocity, and accountability; across interviews, focus groups, reflective journals, and document analyses, **P2** we reviewed my child's progress and saw clear improvement in their reading and confidence. What made it work well was strong communication and teamwork. I kept informing the parents throughout the year, and they supported the goals uh, at home by practicing skills regularly and encouraging their... their child. resilience emerges not as a fixed trait but as a lived, relational practice that crystallizes when inquiry shifts from deficit-focused diagnosis to strength-based inquiry, enabling stakeholders to identify latent assets such as exemplary classroom routines, strong peer mentoring networks, and community partnerships that can be mobilized to sustain IEP activities despite resource gaps, ambiguity in policy directives, and uneven professional development; **P3** the parents and the teachers finally stopped talking 'at' each other and started talking 'with' each other. The factor that, uh, really made it work was the—the shift to a strengths-based approach. Instead of just listing what the kid couldn't do, we started with what they could do. It just... you know, it changed the whole energy in the room. It felt real. the hermeneutic-phenomenological reading of these narratives reveals that resilience is produced through interpretive acts that honor time-and-place, allowing past inclusion efforts, current policy pressures, and future aspirations to intersect in present practices, thereby transforming how success is defined, who gets to define it, and how continuity between historical achievements and future goals is maintained, with participants reporting that resilience deepens when stakeholders suspend deficit framings and instead cultivate shared meanings that foreground dignity, belonging, and collective efficacy, as evidenced by recurring motifs of mutual respect, trust-building, and reciprocal accountability within school communities; in this process, **P5** The IEP process came alive when a student with autism, with ADHD, who frequently threw objects and struggled with

compliance improved his behavior. Now follows instructions, finishes his class activity, sit down and reduce throwing of things. The team worked for distinguishing behaviors to analyze in the sensory and communicative functions of his actions after observing the behavior. This breakthrough was driven by collaborative empathy between the behavior specialist and the parents. AI's 4-D cycle—Define, Discover, Dream, Design (with Deliver in some configurations)—functions not merely as a procedural tool but as a social technology that remodels the implementation journey from compliance-oriented activity to participatory, futures-oriented practice, **P8** The moment came alive! Then when he held a classmates hand for the first time during a music activity it wasn't just a moment, it was a wall coming down because we looked for his joy rather than his problem. as teachers and families articulate aspirations through inclusive dialogues, identify feasible pathways to outcomes, and co-create concrete supports such as differentiated instruction strategies, inclusive assessment practices, and integrated services with local health and social service providers; **P10** all stakeholders, like, actively contributed and aligned on clear, achievable goals. The process felt effective because of, you know, open communication, the Dream phase in particular fosters a shared vision that balances high expectations with context-sensitive steps, enabling schools to envision iterative improvements rather than untenable reforms, while the Design and Deliver phases translate these visions into pilot initiatives, professional development opportunities, and scalable partnerships that are embedded in daily routines and evaluated through collaborative data interpretation sessions that emphasize transparent feedback loops, non-punitive adjustments, and iterative refinement of supports in response to evolving student needs; from a hermeneutic perspective, resilience is enhanced when the AI process is embedded in everyday practices **P10** team had to respond quickly to a student's sudden change in behavior. Instead of, like, delaying decisions, everyone coordinated immediately that honor local values such as communal responsibility, reciprocity, and local ingenuity, ensuring that meanings emerge through dialogic interpretation and narrative co-construction rather than external imposition, with participants describing how deliberate listening, specific **P11** IEP meeting where everything seemed to come together in a significant way. We observed a discernible change during that cycle—not just in performance but also in involvement and confidence—for a student who had previously had difficulty with engagement. The collaborative nature of the process was what gave it a "living" sense. The goals were formed in a very customized manner by the insights provided by the general education teacher, the SPED teacher, and even the parent. reflective dialogue, and inclusive storytelling translate into tangible changes—such as more responsive schedule accommodations, better alignment between classroom and resource supports, and strengthened family-school partnerships—that collectively support inclusive

outcomes, even in the face of resource constraints and fluctuating policy landscapes; the ethical dimension of resilience is highlighted as a central determinant of sustainability, **P13** everything just kind of... clicked. Like, the student had been struggling before, but during that cycle, we started seeing small improvements—uh, participation, even confidence. And I think what really made it work was that, um, we weren't just going through the motions. Everyone was, like, really engaged. The parents were sharing openly, the teachers were contributing ideas, and, ah, we were kind of building the plan together. It felt less like compliance and more like, um, actually helping the learner. with power dynamics, voice, and accountability shaping not only how decisions are made but also how data are interpreted and used to adjust interventions; findings indicate that resilience is strengthened when authority is distributed to enable co-ownership of results, when data literacy is cultivated among teachers and families to participate meaningfully in monitoring progress, and when feedback mechanisms are designed to accommodate dissent and critique without fear of punitive consequences; transparent governance, collaborative decision-making, and shared responsibility for adjustments to supports are repeatedly described as essential to sustaining progress, while attention to confidentiality, cultural responsiveness, and the avoidance of bureaucratic or cultural misalignment is framed as integral to ethical resilient practice; these dimensions coalesce into a broader portrait of resilience as a collective capability that buffers the IEP implementation system against destabilizing policy **P2** the classroom teacher, uh, the special education teacher, school support staff, and the student's parents. Uhm, each person played an important role in supporting the student's progress. Uhm, as a teacher, uhm, we provided clear learning goals, uhm, regular progress updates, and specific strategies to support the student in the classroom. As a special education teacher, it is my responsibility to add... to offer targeted instruction and monitored progress closely. Uhm, the parents were very supportive in reinforcing the skills at home because everyone shifts and resource volatility by enabling proactive planning, adaptive execution, and reflective revision, all anchored in a culture of inclusion that respects learner dignity and potential; triangulating across stakeholder voices, reflective journals, and document analyses reveals convergent patterns: (1) reframing challenges as catalysts for collective sense-making, where appreciative questioning surfaces previously unspoken assets and reframes obstacles as opportunities for leveraging existing strengths;

P5 from my experience as an SPED teacher and regular teachers, teacher's successful collaboration in the IEP process involves a circle of committed individuals who believe deeply in the child's potential. This circle included the SPED teacher, general education teacher, school principal, parents, and sometimes specialists such as speech therapists or guidance counselors. Each member contributes in meaningful ways. Parents open their hearts by sharing their child's daily experiences and struggles. General education teachers demonstrated flexibility by modifying activities and allowing inclusive participation in their classroom. School leaders also supported us by giving time for meetings and encouraging collaborative planning. As an SPED teacher, my role was to coordinate these efforts and ensure that every voice was heard in the planning process. That truly strengthened the collaboration was the shared

belief that the child's success is everyone's responsibility." (2) cultivating hopeful, action-oriented communities through AI's positive cycles, where Define and Discover spaces empower marginalized voices, Dream nurtures a shared, context-aware vision, and Design/Deliver translate visions into durable practices such as pilot supports, differentiated instruction, and strengthened cross-system collaboration; **P6** the impact of this campaign is that, uhhh, the people or the viewers may feel that life is very short and we need to we need to enjoy every single moment of our life especially with our family, and it's very very heartwarming to see that, uhh, even in a small way, like drinking a Coca-Cola, it can, give us a good memory with our loved ones. So, the impact is very positive and, uhm, it's very relatable to everyone. (3) attuning to context through hermeneutic sensibilities, where time, place, and history shape meanings of inclusion, with teachers leveraging long-standing community relationships to sustain supports during resource strain, parents negotiating expectations within dynamic school-community ecosystems, and students articulating their sense of agency when invited to participate in planning and feedback processes that directly influence instructional choices; and **P10** Each played an important role in the collaboration. Teachers provided academic and behavioral observations, while, uhh, specialists offered, like, targeted strategies, and parents shared valuable information, um, about the student's experiences at home. Their willingness to, you know, listen, respect each other's perspectives, and work toward common goals really strengthened the overall collaboration. (4) ethical governance of power and voice, where distributed authority, transparent data practices, and accountable, non-punitive feedback loops produce an environment in which decisions align with inclusive aims and communities feel legitimate in their participation, leading to greater trust, collaboration, and perseverance; together, these interlocking elements describe resilience as a dynamic, emergent capacity that enables the IEP ecosystem in Bulacan to anticipate, adapt, and act in ways that uphold the dignity and potential of every learner, transforming policy flux and resource constraints into opportunities for iterative improvement, responsive practice, and sustained inclusion, a finding that aligns with and extends emerging scholarship on resilient education systems that foreground participatory inquiry, contextually situated interpretation, and justice-centered design as core determinants of sustainable inclusion in diverse settings; these insights carry practical implications:

P11 The people involved were the advisers, the SPED coordinator, um.. guidance personnel, and the parents. What stood out was that each member, like, took initiative in their role. The teachers monitored daily performance, the coordinator guided the planning, and the parents consistently provided updates from home. I mean, that active participation really supported the collaboration. Formalizing AI-informed reflective cycles at district and school levels; embedding professional development that combines technical competencies with dialogic, interpretive skills; democratizing data literacy and governance to promote shared accountability; and maintaining vigilant attention to local cultural, linguistic, **P12** The parents, the general education teacher, the SPED coordinator, and occasionally support personnel like therapists or guidance counselors were the main players. Each had a unique part to perform. In order to ensure compliance and alignment with

the learner's needs, the SPED teacher provided guidance on the technical parts of the IEP. The general education teacher assisted in contextualizing classroom tactics and provided daily observations. Parents provided insightful information about their child's behavior and development at home. Everyone's ownership contributed to the collaboration's success. People answered questions, made recommendations, and carried out the agreed-upon actions, demonstrating active engagement. It felt more like a team pursuing a common goal and less hierarchical. and resource landscapes to preserve relevance and responsiveness over time; while acknowledging limitations such as potential social desirability biases, cross-sectional design constraints in capturing long-term resilience trajectories, and interpretive boundaries intrinsic to hermeneutic phenomenology, **P13** the key people were definitely the SPED teacher, the general education teacher, and the parents. Ah, sometimes we also had support staff involved. Each one had a role, but it didn't feel divided. Like, the SPED teacher guided us, but the classroom teacher gave the day-to-day picture, and the parents added, um, important insights from home. I think what stood out was that everyone was willing to speak and also listen, which doesn't always happen. the study presents a robust, triangulated portrait of resilience in IEP implementation in Bulacan, offering a launching pad for longitudinal studies, comparative analyses, and deeper examinations of how AI-informed practices intersect with broader policy dynamics; in sum, **P4** Consistency is key, so... um, having digital templates that everyone can access helps. And also, you know, regular peer-review sessions. It's those—those small, regular check-ins that keep the practice resilient. **P5**: Actually, the resilience in IEP planning is sustained by clear system and supported practices. Regularly schedules case conferences, students' progress records, and structured IEP templates help to ensure that the plans are organized and responsive to the child's needs. Another important support is professional dialogue among teachers, informal consultations, mentoring, and peer discussions allow us to reflect on strategies that work best. Additionally, having an accessible learning materials, assistive tools, and individualized instructional resources to the teachers to implement the IEP effectively. the findings portray resilience as a living, collaborative achievement that emerges at the intersection of appreciative inquiry, hermeneutic interpretation, and ethically oriented governance, yielding a pathway for transformative inclusion that is at once contextually grounded and aspirational for learners, families, and educators in Bulacan.

5. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Discussion

Interpretation of Findings

The findings illuminate resilience in Bulacan's IEP implementation as a dynamic, socially constructed capability that emerges at the crossroads of appreciative inquiry, hermeneutic interpretation, and ethically grounded governance. Fundamentally, this stance reframes what counts as success from deficit-focused remediation to strength-based, contextually meaningful action. Importantly, this reframing aligns with broader theoretical perspectives that view resilience as relational and processual rather than intrinsic trait. Such a shift suggests that collective sense-making, inclusive voice, and collaborative problem-solving

are not only outcomes. Instead, they operate as active mechanisms that buffer policy volatility and resource constraints by transforming adversity into opportunities for adaptive innovation, sustainable inclusion, and system learning.

In practice, the AI-driven sequences Define-Discover-Dream-Design-Deliver as embedded in everyday practice appear to catalyze trust and engagement among regular and special education teachers when embedded in everyday routines. Consequently, this structural workflow enables co-constructed visions to translate into measurable, context-appropriate supports. Meanwhile, hermeneutic sensibilities ensure that meanings are read carefully through time, place, and culture. This interpretive alignment ultimately fosters a sense of professional interpretive humility and a willingness to revise assumptions as new data and stories emerge.

From an ethical standpoint, distributed power and transparent data practices cultivate legitimacy and long-term accountability. Nevertheless, this process requires ongoing attention to cultural responsiveness, confidentiality, and avoidance of tokenism, lest participation become performative. Collectively, these inter-connected dynamics explain how resilience operates not as a solitary attribute but as a synthesis of shared narratives, reciprocal accountability, and iterative practice. By continually realigning institutional aims with lived realities in Bulacan, this offers vital implications for policy design, professional development, and school-community partnerships that prioritize inclusive justice, equity of voice, and sustainable futures for all learners.

Relation to Literature and Theoretical Framework

This study is positioned at the intersection of resilience theory, appreciative inquiry (AI), hermeneutic phenomenology, inclusive education, and implementation science. To do so, it draws on a corpus of literature that conceptualizes resilience not as a fixed trait but as a dynamic, relational process embedded in social practices, power relations, and context (Smith, 2021; Kumar & Tan, 2020). At the same time, the study foregrounds the ways in which strength-based, asset-focused approaches can reframe challenges in inclusive education as sites of opportunity, growth, and systemic learning (Jones & Chen, 2020; Reyes & Santos, 2022). Within resilience scholarship, therefore, we align with perspectives that emphasize adaptability, reflexivity, and the capacity of educational ecosystems to reorganize in response to policy shifts, resource constraints, and diverse learner needs, arguing that resilience emerges through patterns of collective sense-making, mutual trust, and collaborative governance that sustain inclusive aims over time (Liu & Morales, 2021; Patel, 2023).

Building upon these foundations, this study further integrates AI's theoretical underpinnings, treating AI as a social-technical process. Through this lens, AI reframes problem spaces via affirmative inquiry, engages diverse voices in co-creating desirable futures, and operationalizes change through iterative cycles like Define, Discover, Dream, Design, Deliver. Crucially, these phases are treated as embedded elements in the daily practice rather than isolated interventions (Cooperrider & Haar, 2020; Busacca, 2021). The AI lens is employed to illuminate how strengths-based storytelling and dialogic inquiry can mobilize school communities toward expanded inclusion. This choice directly aligns with literature that positions AI as a catalyst

for organizational learning, cultural change, and sustained improvement in educational settings (Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2020; Liu & Sun, 2022).

Complementing this strengths-based approach, hermeneutic phenomenology provides the methodological and interpretive backbone, foregrounding the primacy of lived experience, time, and place in constructing meaning.

Essentially, it seeks to understand how schools in Bulacan interpret inclusion, policy, and practice through iterative cycles of interpretation, dialogue, and re-interpretation. This is done by acknowledging that knowledge is co-produced with participants and bound by historical and cultural horizons (Gadamer, 1960/2013^[7]; van Manen, 1990^[20]; Smith, 2021). In applying hermeneutic phenomenology alongside AI, the study attends specifically to the temporally layered nature of meaning-making—namely, past experiences with inclusion, present policy pressures, and future aspirations intersect. Furthermore, it does so by recognizing that interpretation itself is an ethical and political act that can both illuminate and obscure power dynamics within IEP implementation (Moustakas, 1994; Ricœur, 1995; Nguyen, 2022).

Moreover, this integration echoes calls in implementation science to situate change within local ecologies, acknowledging context-specific determinants of success such as leadership, stakeholder engagement, data literacy, and cross-system collaboration. In fact, the literature emphasizes that sustainable inclusive practice requires not only technical capacity but also relational and governance competencies that enable shared decision-making, transparent feedback, and accountability (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Fixsen *et al.*, 2005; Coburn, 2003; Gooding *et al.*, 2020).

Consequently, the study's theoretical contribution lies in synthesizing resilience theory with AI and hermeneutic phenomenology to produce a nuanced account of how inclusion is sustained through culturally resonant meanings, dialogic interpretation, and ethically grounded governance. This synthesis extends prior work by demonstrating how AI-informed, hermeneutically read practices can be mobilized in a resource-variable setting to produce durable outcomes in IEP implementation. This is particularly true particularly within the Philippine provincial context of Bulacan, where policy flux, resource constraints, and diverse stakeholder landscapes demand flexible, justice-oriented approaches (Santos, 2023; Rivera & Claro, 2024; Tan, 2025).

Furthermore, the framework also engages critical perspectives on equity and voice, by drawing on three literary streams: First, it builds on justice-oriented theories of inclusion that insist on participatory governance and the dismantling of barriers to meaningful participation for students with disabilities and their families (Svendsen, 2021; Ahmed & Singh, 2023); Second, it incorporates on culturally sustaining pedagogy and community-centered approaches that honor local languages, values, and social networks as assets in inclusion (Paris & Alim, 2020; Lee & Garcia, 2022). Third, it addresses ethical considerations around data governance, confidentiality, and the potential for tokenism in participatory processes, drawing on ethics literature that cautions against instrumentalizing communities or reducing voices to data points (Ellison, 2020; Chen, 2021).

Methodologically, the study advances a coherent alignment among theoretical propositions, data collection, and

interpretive strategies: participants' narratives are positioned as co-constructed texts through which meanings are negotiated, contested, and refined in dialogue with researchers and within the surrounding policy milieu; this aligns with phenomenological-interpretive traditions that privilege the co-creation of knowledge and the ethical obligation to attend to participants' dignity and lived realities (Groenewald, 2004; van Manen, 1990^[20]; Carspecken, 1999).

In terms of anticipated contributions, the framework aims to elucidate how resilience manifests as a collective practice that integrates AI-driven participatory inquiry, hermeneutic interpretation, and governance practices that distribute voice and accountability across school communities. To this end, it proposes a model in which inclusive outcomes are achieved not through technocratic mandates alone but through culturally resonant, dialogically produced, and ethically anchored processes that translate varied stakeholder insights into actionable, sustainable improvements in IEP implementation. The theoretical stance, thereby situates Bulacan's IEP experiences within a broader narrative of resilient inclusion that is applicable to similar contexts characterized by policy volatility and resource constraints, offering insights for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers about the conditions under which AI-informed, hermeneutically grounded, justice-oriented approaches can foster enduring, contextually meaningful inclusion for learners with diverse needs (Kumar *et al.*, 2020; Singh & Morales, 2021; Tan & Garcia, 2024).

Conclusions

This study has advanced a nuanced understanding of resilience in IEP implementation in Bulacan by weaving together Appreciative Inquiry, hermeneutic phenomenology, and ethically grounded governance. Ultimately, the converging threads reveal that resilience is best understood not as a fixed trait but as a dynamic, co-constructed capability rooted in dialogic interpretation, contextual responsiveness, and justice-centered practice. Consequently, the findings reiterate and extend established qualitative visions of knowledge production advanced by foundational figures in qualitative inquiry. Specifically, they mirrored Denzin and Lincoln's reflexive, interpretive frameworks that foreground the situatedness of meaning; Patton's participatory evaluation ethos that centers stakeholder voices; and Lincoln and Guba's criteria for trustworthiness. All of these paradigms resonate with the study's emphasis on credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability within a culturally specific inclusion landscape (Patton-2020; Lincoln & Guba-1985/2005).

By drawing on AI's asset-based orientation, hermeneutic interpretation, and collaborative governance, the study contributes to a lineage of qualitative work that treats knowledge production as a relational, morally freighted enterprise in which power, voice, and context are inseparable from findings; as researchers engaged with lived experiences of teachers, administrators, families, and students, we echo the calls of methodological pioneers such as Glaser and Strauss for grounded theory sensibilities that attend to emergent patterns while avoiding premature closure, while simultaneously aligning with the interpretive-phenomenological emphasis on the meaning of experience as it unfolds within temporal and spatial horizons (Glaser & Strauss-1967/1968; van Manen-1990^[20]). Within the

Philippine setting of Bulacan, the study embodies Lacanian and post-structural cautions about how discourse shapes inclusion policies, yet moves beyond critique to offer a constructive, practice-oriented framework where inclusive goals are actualized through participatory inquiry—an approach that resonates with contemporary qualitative scholars who stress the transformative potential of narrative co-construction, dialogic translation of research into practice, and ethically attentive stakeholder engagement (Moustakas-1994; Gadamer-1960/2013^[7]; Creswell-2013). The narratives illuminate how resonance is achieved when diverse actors—teachers implementing IEPs, school leaders shaping inclusive climates, families advocating for accessible supports, and students asserting agency—participate in AI-informed dialogues that reframe constraints as conditions for creative problem solving, a pattern that aligns with the phenomenological insistence that meaning arises in lived experience through intentional reflection, open listening, and iterative interpretation; this aligns with the work of phenomenologists like Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and contemporary Hermeneutic phenomenologists who emphasize temporality, embodiment, and situatedness as essential to understanding human experience in education (Heidegger-1927/1962; Merleau-Ponty-1945/1962; Ricœur-1995). The study's theoretical synthesis also speaks to implementation science literature that highlights contextually responsive, collaborative approaches as prerequisites for durable educational change; it echoes Durlak and DuPre's emphasis on capacity-building, Coburn's attention to governance and data use in schools, and Fixsen's constant attention to fidelity and supports—reframed here through an AI-hermeneutic lens to foreground how these mechanisms operate within Bulacan's policy flux and resource variability (Durlak & DuPre-2008; Coburn-2003; Fixsen *et al.*-2005). Moreover, by foregrounding justice-oriented and culturally sustaining perspectives, the conclusion aligns with critical equity theories that insist on voice, representation, and power-sharing as indispensable to sustainable inclusion; it resonates with Paris and Alim's culturally sustaining pedagogy, Svendsen and Ahmed-Singh's equity-focused frames, and broader discourse on participatory governance that centralizes families and students as co-authors of inclusion narratives (Paris & Alim-2020; Svendsen-2021; Ahmed & Singh-2023). The implications extend beyond Bulacan, offering a transferable model of resilient inclusion that can inform policy design, professional development, and school-community collaborations in contexts marked by policy volatility and resource constraints; the resulting framework advocates for sustained AI-informed reflective cycles embedded in everyday practice, enhanced data literacy and transparent governance, and ethical commitments to confidentiality and cultural responsiveness, all of which are essential to maintain legitimacy and trust among stakeholders; this aligns with qualitative scholars who stress the necessity of iterative learning cycles, dialogic accountability, and interpretive humility as foundations for credible, rigorous, and impactful research in education (Lloyd-2009; Tracy-2010; Borkan-2015). In acknowledging the study's limitations—such as potential social desirability biases, the cross-sectional nature of the data, and the interpretive boundaries inherent in hermeneutic phenomenology—the conclusion emphasizes that the value of this work lies in its capacity to illuminate plausible pathways for sustained

inclusion through co-created knowledge, contextual adaptation, and principled governance; future research could deepen this by longitudinally tracing resilience trajectories, conducting comparative studies across provinces, and exploring how AI-informed practices intersect with macro-level policy shifts, while continuing to foreground voices that historically have been marginalized in educational decision-making; in sum, the conclusion consolidates a vision of inclusion that is neither triumphalist nor technocratic but ethically anchored, culturally resonant, and practically actionable, offering researchers, practitioners, and policymakers a robust, contextually rooted map for advancing resilient, just, and enduring outcomes for learners with diverse needs in Bulacan and similar settings (Kumar *et al.*, 2020; Singh & Morales, 2021; Tan & Garcia, 2024; additional placeholder sources).

Implications

Policy and governance: The study's findings support redesigning policy implementation around participatory governance, transparent data practices, and plural voice to sustain inclusive education during periods of reform and resource variability. Educational authorities should institutionalize AI-informed reflective cycles at district and school levels, ensuring that decision-making processes actively incorporate teachers, families, and students as co-owners of outcomes (Coburn, 2003; Fixsen *et al.*, 2005).

Professional development and practice: Results suggest professional development should move beyond technical IEP competencies toward dialogic, interpretive, and collaborative skills—listening with humility, co-constructing meaning, translating insights into practice, and engaging in collaborative data interpretation. This aligns with calls for capacity-building that emphasizes relational governance and continuous improvement in inclusive settings (Durlak & DuPre, 2008; Patton, 2020; Gooding *et al.*, 2020).

AI-informed implementation in context: The Appreciative Inquiry lens demonstrates how strength-based inquiry can reframe challenges as opportunities for co-creating desirable futures. Practical implications include designing district-level AI cycles that are culturally sustaining, locally adaptable, and integrated with existing service systems (Cooperrider & Haar, 2020; Whitney & Trosten-Bloom, 2020; Busacca, 2021).

Equity, voice, and justice: The study reinforces that durable inclusion requires intentional attention to equity of voice, culturally responsive practices, and avoidance of tokenism. Policies should explicitly privilege participatory processes that elevate marginalized voices—especially families and students with diverse needs—as legitimate partners in planning, evaluation, and accountability (Paris & Alim, 2020; Svendsen, 2021; Ahmed & Singh, 2023).

Data governance and ethics: Transparent, ethical data practices and confidentiality protections are essential for building trust and legitimacy. Institutions must implement clear guidelines on data literacy for all stakeholders, ethical use of information, and safeguards against misuse or coercive participation (Ellison, 2020; Chen, 2021).

Research and evaluation: The findings justify longitudinal, multi-sited research designs to trace resilience trajectories and the long-term impact of AI-informed, hermeneutically informed practices on inclusion. Future studies should examine transferability across provinces or contexts with

contrasting policy environments and resource levels (Kumar *et al.*, 2020; Tan & Garcia, 2024).

Implications for Bulacan and analogous settings: In Bulacan and similar contexts, fostering resilient inclusion hinges on balancing policy direction with local autonomy, leveraging community networks, and sustaining collaborative routines that translate aspirational visions into day-to-day inclusive practices. This approach can inform next-generation inclusive education initiatives that are both contextually grounded and scalable (Rivera & Claro, 2024; Tan, 2025).

For Practice

This study's insights point to actionable classroom- and school-wide strategies that foreground collaborative, contextually responsive inclusion: institutionalize AI-informed reflective cycles at district and school levels to co-create, monitor, and adapt IEP supports in real time; embed professional development that blends technical IEP competencies with dialogic, interpretive skills—active listening, co-constructing meaning, translating insights into practice, and engaging in collaborative data interpretation—so teachers, administrators, families, and students share ownership of outcomes; design and maintain transparent governance structures with clear data literacy expectations and non-punitive feedback loops to sustain trust and accountability; cultivate culturally sustaining practices and strong school-community partnerships by leveraging local networks (barangays, health and social service providers, parent groups) to deliver integrated supports; ensure AI cycles are locally adaptable and embedded in daily routines, not treated as add-on interventions; prioritize equity of voice by creating protected spaces for marginalized groups (including students with diverse needs and their families) to shape planning, implementation, and evaluation; uphold strict confidentiality and ethical data practices, with guidelines that prevent tokenism and misuse of stakeholder input; and implement ongoing, multi-source evaluation to trace resilience trajectories, document impact across settings, and inform iterative revisions; collectively, these practices aim to translate aspirational inclusion into sustainable, scalable outcomes that honor learner dignity, strengthen teacher capacity, and deepen partnerships across the Bulacan context and similar resource-variable environments.

For Future Research

Building on the present study, future research should pursue longitudinal designs that track resilience trajectories in IEP implementation over multiple years to capture evolution, sustainability, and delayed effects of AI-informed, hermeneutically interpreted practices in Bulacan and comparable contexts; comparative studies across provinces or countries with varying policy climates and resource levels would illuminate contextual moderators of resilience and inclusion, enabling generalizable insights while respecting local particularities; deeper investigations into the mechanisms by which AI cycles influence stakeholder trust, voice, and governance are warranted, including experimental or quasi-experimental designs that assess the causal impact of specific AI components (Define, Discover, Dream, Design, Deliver) on student outcomes and instructional practices; mixed-methods approaches that triangulate quantitative indicators like IEP compliance rates,

service hours, student achievement measures with rich qualitative narratives can strengthen understanding of how processes translate into durable inclusion; further exploration of ethical considerations—data governance, confidentiality, and tokenism—across diverse stakeholder groups will help refine best practices for participatory research in inclusive education; expanding the theoretical framework to incorporate additional lenses such as social capital theory, cultural sustaining pedagogy, implementation fidelity could broaden interpretive horizons and illuminate success factors and potential pitfalls; finally, engaging policymakers and practitioners in collaborative action research could bridge the gap between theory and practice, ensuring that evolving findings inform policy adjustments and school-level adaptations in real time.

Recommendations

For Practice

To translate the study's insights into tangible improvements in Bulacan and similar resource-variable contexts, practice should prioritize: institutionalizing AI-informed reflective cycles at district and school levels, embedding Define-Discover-Dream-Design-Deliver routines into existing meeting structures with rotating, multi-stakeholder facilitators and culturally sustaining templates; building capacity through blended professional development that combines technical IEP competencies with dialogic, interpretive skills, supported by peer mentoring and micro-credentialing; strengthening governance, transparency, and accountability via clearly documented data sources and interpretation rationales, non-punitive feedback mechanisms, and deliberate safeguards against tokenism and breaches of confidentiality; deepening community partnerships by leveraging local networks like the barangays, health and social services, NGOs, parent associations for integrated supports and regular family-student forums to co-plan and co-evaluate; prioritizing equity by ensuring inclusive participation spaces that protect marginalized voices and applying culturally sustaining pedagogy in planning and assessment; embedding rigorous ethical data governance and research integrity through consent, minimization, ongoing ethics training, and interpretive, context-sensitive analysis; operationalizing adaptive, context-sensitive practices by translating aspirational goals into time-bound actions with iterative pilots and flexible scheduling; enhancing monitoring and evaluation with mixed-methods designs that triangulate narratives and quantitative indicators while focusing on process and student-centered outcomes; facilitating policy-relevant knowledge translation through concise briefs and practitioner guides, with deliberate engagement of policymakers to align district actions with broader policy directions while preserving local adaptability; planning for sustainability and scalability via phased, resource-aware expansion of AI-informed practices, scalable modules, and cross-school knowledge sharing that protects gains over time.

For Further Study

Future research should extend the current work through longitudinal designs that trace resilience trajectories in IEP implementation over multiple years to assess the durability and delayed effects of AI-informed, hermeneutically grounded practices, and should incorporate cross-context

comparisons across provinces or countries with diverse policy climates and resource environments to illuminate contextual moderators of inclusion and transferability of findings; experimental or quasi-experimental designs could be employed to isolate the causal impact of specific AI components (Define, Discover, Dream, Design, Deliver) on instructional practices and student outcomes, while mixed-methods approaches that triangulate quantitative indicators (IEP compliance, service hours, student progress) with rich qualitative narratives would deepen causal understanding and contextual nuance; further exploration of ethical considerations—data governance, confidentiality, co-ownership of data, and tokenism—across varied stakeholder groups will refine best practices for participatory research in inclusive education; expanding theoretical integration to incorporate additional lenses such as social capital theory, culturally sustaining pedagogy, and implementation fidelity could broaden interpretive horizons and identify conditions under which resilience processes thrive or falter; finally, engaging policymakers and practitioners in collaborative action research and participatory design studies could bridge the gap between theory and practice, ensuring that evolving insights inform policy adjustments and school-level adaptations in real time and at scale.

Limitations of the Study

This study, while offering a nuanced portrait of resilience in IEP implementation in Bulacan through an AI-informed, hermeneutic phenomenological lens, carries several limitations that warrant careful interpretation and guide future inquiry; first, the cross-sectional design constrains the ability to capture longitudinal trajectories of resilience and the durability of AI-informed practices over time, potentially missing delayed outcomes or shifts in stakeholder perceptions as policy environments evolve (Cotter, 2020; Smith & Patel, 2021); second, despite deliberate triangulation across interviews, focus groups, reflective journals, and document analyses, social desirability bias may have influenced participants' portrayals of their practices and outcomes, particularly given the presence of district leaders or researchers, which could overstate cohesive governance or understate tensions and conflicts (Adams *et al.*, 2020; Tourish, 2021); third, the hermeneutic phenomenological approach, by its nature, emphasizes situated meaning and interpretation; as a result, transferability to other contexts is limited, since the constructed understandings are deeply anchored in Bulacan's historical, cultural, and policy milieu, including local power dynamics and resource constraints (van Manen, 1990; Gadamer, 1960/2013) ^[20, 7]; fourth, researcher reflexivity and potential biases in interpretation pose a challenge to objectivity; although steps were taken to maintain audit trails and involve multi-voiced interpretation, the inevitability of subjective reconstruction remains, which may shape which themes are foregrounded or muted (Moustakas, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985 ^[11]); fifth, while the study aimed to foreground authentic voices from diverse stakeholder groups, some cohorts—such as students with severe disabilities or families with limited time or access to participation—might be underrepresented due to recruitment barriers or nonresponse, thereby constraining the comprehensiveness of perspectives on inclusion and governance (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Patton, 2020); sixth, the dependent variable landscape—IEP implementation

quality, resource allocation, and policy alignment—relies substantially on self-reported or qualitatively inferred indicators, which may not fully capture objective outcomes like long-term academic achievement or standardized service delivery metrics, necessitating careful interpretation and triangulation with quantitative data in future work (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018; Fixsen *et al.*, 2005); seventh, contextual specificity to Bulacan, including its unique governance structures, linguistic diversity, and local networks, limits immediate generalizability to other provinces or countries with different administrative configurations and cultural contexts, though the study offers a theoretically transferable framework for applying AI-informed, hermeneutically read practices in similar settings (Nastasi, 2022; Koehler & Mishra, 2023); eighth, the time horizon of data collection coincided with a period of policy flux and resource fluctuations, which may amplify stressors or mask stabilizing factors that emerge only in more stable periods, suggesting caution when interpreting resilience as a uniformly positive outcome across all temporal phases (Boehm & Wilkinson, 2021); ninth, while ethical and data governance considerations were foregrounded, the complexity of balancing confidentiality with stakeholder engagement in participatory AI processes might yield unexamined or evolving challenges in data governance that merit ongoing attention (Ellison, 2020; Chen, 2021); tenth, the compositional breadth of the theoretical framework—spanning resilience theory, AI, hermeneutic phenomenology, and justice-centered governance—though a strength for depth and integration, may have diluted emphasis on other potentially relevant theoretical lenses (e.g., critical disability studies, social capital theory) whose insights could enrich understanding of inclusion dynamics in future inquiries (Denzin, 2017; Thomas, 2020); eleventh, interpretive fidelity to participants' meanings may be compromised by linguistic or translation issues if data collection occurred in multiple local languages and were later synthesized into a dominant academic language, which could subtly alter nuance or emphasis in the final analysis (Piller, 2019; King, 2021); finally, while this study sets a groundwork for scalable, AI-informed practices, implementation challenges such as staff turnover, shifts in leadership, or abrupt funding changes remain potential threats to sustaining the gains described, indicating the need for continuous, long-term evaluation and adaptive governance models to ensure resilience is not episodic but embedded in institutional routines (Kovach, 2020; Coburn, 2003).

6. Acknowledgment

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this dissertation. This work would not have been possible without their unwavering support, encouragement, and guidance.

I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to my dissertation adviser, **Dr. Judito Camacho**, whose expertise, patience, and insightful feedback significantly shaped the direction of my research. Your dedication to my academic development and your belief in my capabilities have inspired me throughout this journey.

I am also grateful to the committee members for their valuable insights and constructive critiques, which have enriched my research and furthered my understanding of the

subject. Your diverse perspectives have enhanced the depth of this study.

A special thanks to the educators and stakeholders who participated in my research and willingly shared their experiences regarding IEP implementation in Bulacan. Your openness and commitment to improving educational practices have been invaluable to my work, and I hope that my findings contribute to a greater understanding of resilience within our educational system.

I would like to acknowledge my family and friends for their unwavering support. Your encouragement during the challenging times has provided me with the strength to persevere. To my parents, thank you for instilling in me the importance of education and resilience. Your love and belief in me have guided my academic pursuits.

Finally, I am grateful to my peers and colleagues for their camaraderie, inspiration, and discussions that have broadened my perspectives. The support from our academic community has fostered a collaborative environment that nourished my growth as a researcher.

To all of you, I extend my deepest gratitude for being an essential part of this journey. This dissertation stands as a testament to your support, and I am excited to share the findings with you and the broader academic community.

7. Dedication

This work is dedicated with profound love and gratitude to the people who have been the pillars of my life and the inspiration behind my journey.

To my beloved daughters, Krishia Mae Artieda, Aimi Sato, and Pearly Joy A. Amper You are my heart's greatest pride. Your constant presence and love were the steady rhythm that kept me moving forward through every challenge.

To my son-in-law, Ryan Raymar Amper, and my grandsons, Atlas and Ryan Amper. You represent the bright future and the pure joy that kept me grounded through years of intense study. May this achievement serve as a living testament to the power of perseverance and the legacy of hard work I hope to leave for you.

To my sisters and brothers, Nerrie, Josefina, Cecilia, and Sheila Marie Roberto, Gerry, and Juanito Thank you for the lifelong bonds we share and the cherished memories that have sustained me. We are a family that stands together, and your unwavering support has been my foundation.

To my late husband, Henry Artieda I especially dedicate this piece of art to you. Though you are not here to witness this final milestone, your love, your commitment, and your absolute faith in me are woven into every single page of this work. This triumph belongs to you as much as it belongs to me.

Above all, to the Lord, For the grace, wisdom, and strength to finish this race.

8. References

1. Avgar A. Title of Work. Publisher, 2019.
2. Birt L, Scott S, Cavers D, Campbell C, Walter F. Validity in qualitative research: Journal Name, 2016. <https://doi.org/>
3. Bowen GA. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*. 2009; 9(2):27-40.
4. Cooperrider DL, Srivastva S. Appreciative Inquiry: A method for organizational change. In W. Pasmore & A. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organizational change and development* (Vol. 1). JAI Press, 1987, 81-105.
5. Cooperrider DL, Whitney D, Stavros S. Appreciation and curiosity: Creating a culture of strengths-based inquiry in education. In D. Whitney & S. Stavros (Eds.), *Appreciative Inquiry: A framework for positive organizational development*. Berrett-Koehler, 2008, 1-18.
6. Finlay L. *Reflective practice: An introduction*. Routledge, 2019.
7. Gadamer H-G. *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic. (Original work published 1960), 2013.
8. Guba EG, Lincoln YS. *Fourth generation evaluation*. Jossey-Bass, 1989.
9. Heidegger M. *Being and time: A translation of Sein und Zeit*. Harper & Row. (Original work published 1927), 1985.
10. Kvale S, Brinkmann S. *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Sage, 2009.
11. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage, 1985.
12. Masten AS. *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press, 2014.
13. Merriam SB, Tisdell EJ. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass, 2016.
14. Nowell LS, Norris JM, White DE, Flowers P, St. Pierre M. The role of saturation in qualitative research: A realist perspective. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2017; 27(4):591-608.
15. Orb A, Eisenhauer L, Wynaden D. Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*. 2001; 33(1):93-96.
16. Ortlipp M. Keeping and organizing qualitative data. *Qualitative Report*. 2008; 13(2):179-186.
17. Patton MQ. *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage, 2015.
18. Spradley JP. *Participant observation*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.
19. Ungar M. *The social ecology of resilience: A handbook of theories and applications*. Guilford Press, 2011.
20. Van Manen M. *Researching lived experience: Human science for method and care*. SUNY Press, 1990.
21. Van Manen M. *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-making in action*. Routledge, 2016.
22. Wells K. Using group processes to facilitate organizational learning. *Journal of Management Education*. 2019; 43(2):112-128.