



Received: 24-05-2026
Accepted: 04-07-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Teachers' Lived Experiences in Holistic IEP Implementation: A Phenomenological Study

¹ Ofelia T Hutalla, ² Judito P Camacho

¹ School of Graduate Studies, Greenville College, Philippines

² Adviser, School of Graduate Studies, Greenville College, Philippines

Corresponding Author: **Ofelia T Hutalla**

Abstract

This phenomenological study explored teachers' lived experiences in holistic IEP implementation, aiming to illuminate how educators perceived, interpreted, and enacted inclusive practices within diverse classrooms. Through in-depth, semi-structured interviews with a purposive sample of 10 teachers across grade levels, the research foregrounded the meanings teachers attributed to holistic IEPs, including collaboration with families, student-centered goal setting, and accommodations that extended beyond academic outcomes to social-emotional development.

The analysis followed an interpreted phenomenological method to identify essential structures of experience, such as (a) navigating ambiguity between standardized curricula and individualized goals, (b) balancing fidelity to legal

requirements with flexible, student-led planning, (c) cultivating professional learning networks and interdisciplinary collaboration, (d) confronting resource constraints and administrative pressures, and (e) fostering inclusive classroom cultures that empowered students' agency.

Findings revealed that holistic IEPs were enacted most effectively when teachers viewed IEPs as living documents co-constructed with students, families, and support staff, rather than static compliance tools. The study contributed practical implications for teacher preparation, policy refinement, and administrators' support strategies to sustain transformative, student-centered educational planning.

Keywords: Holistic IEP, Lived Experience, Phenomenology, Inclusive Education, Teacher Collaboration

1. The Problem and its Context

This chapter presented the overall plan and foundation of the study. It began with the introduction and background of the study, describing inclusive education, IEPs, and the context of Lucena City. It then moved through the statement of the problem and research questions, the purpose and objectives of the study, the theoretical and conceptual frameworks, the significance of the study, the scope and delimitations, and the definition of terms used in the dissertation.

Background of the Study

Inclusive education continued to gain prominence worldwide as education systems moved away from segregated models of provision and toward approaches that recognized the right of all learners, including those with disabilities, to learn together in regular schools and classrooms (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2021; UNESCO, 1994; United Nations, 2006) [17, 43, 44]. International declarations emphasized that learners with disabilities needed to receive meaningful support to participate and succeed in inclusive environments (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2021; United Nations, 2006) [17, 44]. Global commitments encouraged the government to reform policies, structures, and practices that is tailored to learners' individual needs rather than requiring learners to fit rigid systems. Within this international movement, the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) emerged as a key tool for operationalizing inclusive education by providing a structured mechanism for designing and monitoring individualized support (Bateman & Herr, 2006; McLaughlin & Nolet, 2004) [3, 32].

In the Philippines, the shift was reflected in a series of laws and policy issuances that affirm the rights of learners with disabilities and mandate their inclusion in the basic education system. Republic Act No. 7277 (Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities) and its amendment under Republic Act No. 9442 recognize the right of persons with disabilities to accessible and

appropriate education, while Republic Act No. 10533 (Enhanced Basic Education Act) and Republic Act No. 11650 (Inclusive Education Act for Learners with Disabilities) further strengthened the policy framework for inclusive and learner-centered schooling (Republic Act No. 7277, 1992; Republic Act No. 9442, 2007; Republic Act No. 10533, 2013; Republic Act No. 11650, 2022) [37, 38, 39, 40]. These laws are translated into Department of Education policies and orders that formalize Special Needs Education (SNED) within the public school system and require the preparation and implementation of IEPs as a core component of SNED service delivery (Department of Education, 1997, 2009) [14, 15]. Within this policy context, the IEP was expected to serve as both a legal safeguard and a pedagogical instrument that links national commitments to inclusion with concrete, classroom-level plans for individual learners (Bayani, 2021; Manalaysay, 2020) [4, 30].

Within the field of Special Education (SPED), Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) served as particularly important because they acted as the central bridge between a learner's assessed needs and the classroom instruction and supports that were provided. An IEP made explicit that the learner's present levels of performance, set realistic yet challenging goals, identified accommodations and interventions, and established how progress would be monitored, thereby helped ensure that decisions about teaching were intentional rather than ad hoc (Bateman & Herr, 2006; McLaughlin & Nolet, 2004) [3, 32]. The IEP process also brought together a team—typically including SNED teachers, general education teachers, school heads, specialists, and parents—so that planning was informed by multiple perspectives (Friend & Bursuck, 2019; Turnbull *et al.*, 2015) [18, 42]. As the primary implementers of IEPs, SNED teachers played a key role on this team: they translated written plans into daily instruction, adjusted strategies based on learners' responses, documented progress, and communicated with families and colleagues (Bayani, 2021; Shogren *et al.*, 2017) [4, 41]. Their professional judgment and classroom practice were, therefore, crucial to whether IEPs became meaningful tools that supported learners' growth or remain mainly as formal documents.

At the practice level, however, the implementation of IEPs in the Philippines depended on how division-level strategies and school systems interpreted and implemented these national policies. Divisions and schools developed their own approaches to supervision, professional development, resource allocation, and monitoring, which in turn shaped how SNED teachers prepared, implemented, and reviewed IEPs (Anora *et al.*, 2025; Manalaysay, 2020; Pimentel, 2019) [2, 30, 36]. In some settings, division strategies and school systems provided coherent guidance, collaborative structures, and sustained support that helped teachers use IEPs as meaningful instructional tools. In others, limited training, heavy workloads, inconsistent leadership, and resource constraints led to IEPs being treated mainly as compliance documents rather than as living plans that guide daily instruction (Concepcion *et al.*, 2025; Karaan Jr. *et al.*, 2025; Mangongon, 2023) [10, 27, 31]. These differences in strategies and systems meant that learners' experiences of IEP-supported education varied significantly across schools and divisions, despite being situated under the same national

policy framework (Beltran *et al.*, 2025; Obcial *et al.*, 2025) [5, 33].

Given this complexity, there was a pressing need to understand IEP implementation not only through policy documents and quantitative indicators, but also through the rich and real experiences of SNED teachers who worked at the intersection of policy and practice. Complementing the theoretical lenses of Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory and Weick's sensemaking theory, narrative inquiry, as developed by Clandinin and Connelly (2000) [8], provided an appropriate methodological approach for this purpose. Narrative inquiry rested on the understanding that people make sense of their lives through stories; individuals did not simply list events but organize experiences into narratives that reveal meaning, relationships, and identity (Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) [7, 8]. In this proposal, narrative inquiry was not treated as a substantive theory alongside Bronfenbrenner and Weick but as the qualitative approach through which data were gathered and interpreted (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) [29].

This proposed study, therefore, sought to explore how SNED teachers in the Department of Education Region IV experienced and made sense of IEP implementation within their specific division and school contexts. The study was conducted in the Division of Lucena City and involved 10 SPED teachers who shared their narratives about IEP implementation in their respective public schools. By inviting these teachers to tell their stories, the research aimed to gain access not only to what happened in IEP preparation, implementation, and monitoring but also to what these events meant to the teachers who lived through them (Jala, 2025; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) [26, 29]. Through these narratives, the study intended to illuminate how division-level strategies and school systems shaped everyday IEP work, how teachers exercised agency and professional judgment in responding to learners' needs, and what these experiences revealed about the strengths and gaps of current IEP implementation. In doing so, the study aspired to generate grounded insights that could inform efforts to strengthen inclusive education and IEP practice in the Department of Education Region IV, Division of Lucena City.

Statement of the Problem

This study addressed the persistent gap between policy intentions for inclusive education and the actual implementation of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) as experienced by Special Needs Education (SNED) teachers in the Department of Education Region IV Division of Lucena City. Although Philippine laws and Department of Education issuances mandated the use of IEPs as a core mechanism for providing individualized support to learners with disabilities, existing studies indicated that the quality and consistency of IEP implementation varied across divisions and schools, often depending on local leadership, resources, and professional development opportunities. What remained insufficiently understood was how SNED teachers encountered, interpreted, and enacted division-level strategies and school systems in their day-to-day work with learners who had special educational needs. Without a clear, experience-based understanding of these realities, efforts to strengthen IEP implementation risked focusing mainly on

compliance and documentation rather than on the deeper conditions necessary for meaningful, learner-centered practice.

In the Department of Education Region IV, Division of Lucena City, SNED teachers stood at the frontline of translating national and division policies into classroom realities. They prepared IEPs, coordinated with families and colleagues, implemented individualized interventions, and monitored learners' progress, often under demanding conditions. However, their perspectives were seldom placed at the center of systematic inquiry into IEP implementation. There was limited qualitative evidence that captured how these teachers experienced district strategies, how school systems facilitated or constrained their work, and how they made sense of the outcomes of their efforts for learners with disabilities. This lack of narrative-based, context-specific understanding makes it difficult for division leaders and policymakers to design responsive interventions that were grounded in teachers' actual conditions, insights, and professional judgments.

Accordingly, the central problem that this study sought to address was the limited understanding of how district strategies and school systems in the Department of Education Region IV, Division of Lucena City shaped the lived experiences, practices, and perceived outcomes of IEP implementation among SNED teachers. Employing narrative inquiry, the study moved beyond surface descriptions of policies and procedures and instead listened closely to teachers' stories as evidence of what was working, what was not, and why. Through these narratives, the study aimed to illuminate how strategies at the division level became or failed to become supportive systems in schools, how teachers navigated the tensions between policy expectations and contextual constraints, and how they perceived the impact of IEPs on learners with disabilities. Specifically, the study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What division strategies related to IEP implementation are experienced by SNED teachers in the four districts of Lucena City?
2. How do school systems and practices influence the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of IEPs as described by SNED teachers?
3. How do SNED teachers narrate their actual experiences in carrying out IEPs in their respective schools?
4. How do SNED teachers make sense of the relationship between division strategies, school systems, and their own IEP practices?
5. What IEP outcomes do SNED teachers perceive for their learners, and what improvements do they suggest to strengthen IEP implementation?

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore how Special Needs Education (SNED) teachers in the Department of Education Region IV, Division of Lucena City, experienced and made sense of the implementation of Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) within their specific division and school contexts. Using a narrative inquiry approach, the study aimed to understand how division-level strategies and school systems shaped teachers' day-to-day IEP work, how teachers interpreted and responded to these conditions, and how they perceived the outcomes of IEP implementation for learners with disabilities. The overarching aim was to

generate rich, context-specific insights to inform efforts to strengthen IEP implementation and inclusive education practices in the Department of Education Region IV, Division of Lucena City, and similar Philippine settings.

Objectives of the Study

Specifically, this study seeks to:

1. Describe the district strategies related to IEP implementation as experienced by SPED teachers in the four districts of the Division of Lucena City.
2. Examine how school systems and practices influence the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of IEPs, as narrated by SNED teachers.
3. Document and interpret SNED teachers' narratives of their actual experiences in carrying out IEPs in their respective schools.
4. Analyze how SNED teachers make sense of the relationship between district strategies, school systems, and their own IEP practices.
5. Identify the IEP outcomes that SNED teachers perceive for their learners and determine the improvements they suggest to strengthen IEP implementation at the division and school levels.

Significance of the Study

This dissertation was significant for multiple stakeholders within the Lucena City educational community and beyond. Centering the voices and lived experiences of SNED teachers, this work generated practical, locally grounded knowledge that aimed to strengthen IEP implementation across the four districts.

SPED Teachers: The study was important because it offered a structured opportunity for their perspectives to be heard. Their daily experiences—the challenges they faced, the strategies they developed, and the support they received or lacked—often remain invisible in formal policy discussions. By systematically capturing their narratives, the study validated their professional knowledge and provided evidence to support advocacy for better assistance, more meaningful training, and improved working conditions (Friend & Bursuck, 2019) ^[18]. In addition, the reflective process of sharing their stories helped teachers deepen their understanding of their own practice and professional identities.

School leaders, such as principals and SNED coordinators: The findings were valuable because they offered insight into how school conditions—such as leadership, resources, coordination, and school culture—shaped IEP implementation at the classroom level. Based on these insights, school leaders were able to identify specific areas where their schools could provide stronger support to SNED teachers, reduce barriers to effective practice, and build a more enabling environment for inclusive education (Fullan, 2014) ^[20].

District officials, including supervisors and SNED education program supervisors: This dissertation was significant because it provided a ground-level view of how district strategies were experienced by teachers in schools. It revealed which approaches worked well, which failed to reach their intended effect, and where adjustments in supervision, training, or monitoring were needed (McLaughlin & Nolet, 2004) ^[32]. In this way, the study will offered qualitative evidence that routine monitoring reports did not always capture, particularly regarding teachers'

sensemaking and perceptions of IEP outcomes.

Learners with special needs: The study held important implications even if they did not participate directly as respondents, as they were at the heart of IEP implementation. When teachers were better supported, when school systems functioned effectively, and when district strategies were coherent and responsive, the quality of IEP implementation was likely improve. As a result, learners will received more focused, appropriate, and consistent educational support, and the study ultimately aimed to contribute to better educational experiences and outcomes for these children (Shogren *et al.*, 2017) ^[41].

The Department of Education at the regional and national levels: The results were relevant because they provided locally grounded evidence about strengths and gaps in IEP implementation within a specific division context. Thus, the findings may contributed to refining national SPED guidelines, designing more responsive training programs, and developing monitoring tools that went beyond compliance checking to capture teacher experience and system quality (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2021) ^[17]. The study also modeled practitioner-centered research that the Department of Education could use to complement its existing program evaluation approaches.

Future researchers: This dissertation output was significant because it provided a local example of narrative inquiry applied to IEP research in the Philippine context—a methodological approach that had remained underused in Filipino educational studies (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) ^[8]. Consequently, it served as a reference point for similar inquiries in other divisions or school contexts and added to the growing body of literature on the human dimensions of special education policy and practice.

Theoretical Framework

This dissertation was grounded in two complementary theoretical frameworks—Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory and Weick's theory of sensemaking—with narrative inquiry serving as its methodological lens (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Weick, 1995) ^[6, 8, 46]. Together, these perspectives provided a coherent foundation for examining how district strategies and school systems shaped SNED teachers' experiences and perceived IEP outcomes in the Department of Education Region IV, Division of Lucena City.

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ^[6] ecological systems theory proposed that human development and behavior could not be understood in isolation from the environment. Every person existed within a set of interconnected systems—from the immediate setting of the home or classroom to the wider structures of institutions, communities, and national policy. Bronfenbrenner (1979) ^[6] identified these systems as the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem, each influencing the individual while also being shaped by the others.

In this study, Bronfenbrenner's framework was used to map the layered context within which SNED teachers in the Division of Lucena City worked. The microsystem included the classroom, the learner, and the daily experience of IEP instruction. The mesosystem encompassed the relationships between the school, the family, and support professionals

involved in IEP development and implementation. The exosystem referred to division-level structures—the strategies, supervision, training, and resources that flowed from the division to the school and shaped teachers' work, even when teachers were not directly involved in designing them. The macrosystem covered the broader policy environment, including national laws on inclusive education, DepEd mandates, and the national SPED framework (Department of Education, 1997, 2009; Republic Act No. 11650, 2022) ^[14, 15, 40].

Ecological systems theory, therefore, emphasized that IEP outcomes were not produced by a single person or factor. Instead, they emerged from the interaction of multiple systems that either supported or constrained teachers' work (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) ^[6]. By applying Bronfenbrenner's lens, the study examined how district strategies and school systems created the conditions—supportive or otherwise—in which teachers implemented IEPs and perceived IEP outcomes for their learners.

Weick's Theory of Sensemaking

In parallel, Weick's (1995) ^[46] theory of sensemaking focused on how people in organizations interpreted events, managed ambiguity, and constructed meaning that guided their actions. Rather than simply following rules or implementing policies mechanically, individuals continuously interpreted what was happening around them, drawing on their identities, past experiences, and interactions with others (Weick, 1995) ^[46].

For SNED teachers, sensemaking was part of everyday professional practice. When new district directives, policies, or procedures were introduced, teachers had to interpret their implications for their specific learners, their school context, and the resources available to them. They discussed such directives with colleagues, tested them against existing practices, and arrived at working understandings that shape how they implemented IEPs (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; McLaughlin & Nolet, 2004) ^[24, 32]. When school systems and leadership were clear and supportive, sensemaking tended to be smoother; when systems are fragmented or resources are insufficient, teachers face greater uncertainty and had to work harder to construct workable interpretations.

Accordingly, this dissertation used Weick's framework to explore not only what teachers did but also why they acted in particular ways—how they interpreted district strategies, how they understood the systems around them, and how those interpretations shapde both their IEP practices and their perceptions of IEP outcomes (Weick, 1995) ^[46]. Sensemaking theory thus illuminated the interpretive processes through which strategy became practice in classrooms.

Narrative Inquiry as Methodological Lens

Complementing these two theories, narrative inquiry, as developed by Clandinin and Connelly (2000) ^[8], provided the methodological lens for this study. Narrative inquiry was based on the understanding that people made sense of their lives through stories; individuals did not simply list events but organized experiences into narratives that revealed meaning, relationships, and identity (Clandinin, 2013; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) ^[7, 8].

In this dissertation, narrative inquiry was not treated as a substantive theory alongside Bronfenbrenner and Weick.

Instead, it served as the qualitative approach through which data were gathered and interpreted. Inviting SNED teachers to share their stories about IEP implementation, the researcher gained access not only to what happened but also to what those events meant to the teachers who lived through them (Jala, 2025; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) [26, 29]. Narrative inquiry allowed the study to attend to plot, context, characters, and turning points in teachers' accounts, thereby revealing how ecological systems and sensemaking processes were experienced in practice.

Integration of the Frameworks

To sum up, these three components worked as a coherent whole. Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory provided the map of the systems that surrounded SPED teachers—the classroom, school, division, and broader policy environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) [6]. Weick's theory of sensemaking explained how teachers interpreted and navigated those systems as they responded to directives, constraints, and opportunities in their IEP work (Weick, 1995) [46]. Narrative inquiry offered a means for their interpretations and experiences to be heard, recorded, and understood, treating teachers' stories as central data for examining IEP implementation in the Division of Lucena City (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) [8, 29].

Scope and Delimitations

This study focused on the narratives and perspectives of SNED teachers from public schools, specifically the Department of Education in the Division of Lucena City. The participants were practicing SNED teachers directly involved in the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of IEPs for learners with special educational needs. Focusing on these teachers, the study foregrounded the experiences of those most directly responsible for translating IEP policies into classroom practice.

More specifically, the inquiry covered three interrelated areas: (a) the district strategies that SNED teachers experienced in relation to IEP implementation; (b) the school systems and conditions within which they carried out this work, including leadership, resources, collaboration, and culture; and (c) the IEP outcomes they observed and described for their learners as a result of that implementation. The focus, therefore, extended from formal directives and structures to everyday practices and perceived effects on learners with disabilities.

Narrative inquiry served as the research design. The study gathered teachers' stories through in-depth interviews, and these narratives constituted the primary basis for analysis (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) [8]. In terms of time frame, the study drew on teachers' current and recent professional experiences, particularly from School Year 2020 onwards—a period that included significant changes in educational delivery brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. These experiences were especially relevant because they reveal how SNED teachers managed IEP work under conditions of disruption, limited resources, and shifting school operations.

Limitations

The study was delimited to public schools within the Division of Lucena City and did not include private schools, non-DepEd institutions, or school divisions outside this

context. As such, the findings provided a depth of understanding in one division rather than broad generalizations across the Philippines. The participant group was limited to a small number of SNED teachers who met the inclusion criteria; perspectives of school heads, district officials, parents, and learners were not included as primary data sources.

Because the study used a qualitative narrative inquiry design, it did not aim to measure IEP effectiveness through standardized test scores or large-scale quantitative indicators. Instead, it relied on teachers' accounts of their experiences and perceived outcomes. The findings will therefore reflect how SNED teachers interpret and make sense of IEP implementation rather than establishing causal relationships or statistically generalizable patterns. Nonetheless, these limitations were consistent with the study's purpose of generating rich, context-specific insights that could inform local decision-making and further research.

Definition of Terms

For clarity and consistency, the following terms were defined as they were understood and used in this dissertation, both in their general meaning and in the specific context of the research.

Assessment: Refers to the process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information about learners' performance to inform instructional decisions, content, learning activities and IEP development in this study.

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory: This theory proposes that human development and behavior cannot be understood in isolation from the environment. It posits that every individual exists within a set of interconnected systems, ranging from the immediate setting of the home or classroom to the broader structures of institutions, communities, and national policy.

Collaboration: Refers to the coordinated effort among teachers, parents, school administrators, and specialists in planning, implementing, and evaluating the Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Confidentiality and Anonymity: Refers to the protocols used to protect participants' identities. Pseudonyms are assigned to all participants in transcripts, field notes, and the final research report. Where necessary, school names and other identifying details are removed or generalized to ensure privacy. Participation in this study are entirely voluntary. No participant are pressured, incentivized, or expected to join the study by virtue of their school or district affiliation.

Confirmability: The degree to which the research findings are clearly grounded in the collected data—specifically the participants' literal responses—rather than in the researcher's own preferences, assumptions, or prior beliefs.

Credibility: The level of confidence in the truthfulness and accuracy of the study's findings' as authentic representations of participants' lived experiences.

DepEd: Department of Education.

Dependability: The consistency and transparency of the research process. It is the qualitative equivalent of reliability, ensuring that the study is conducted systematically and that the findings do not result from arbitrary or inconsistent decisions.

Differentiated Instruction: The adaptation of teaching

strategies, content, and learning activities to meet the diverse needs of learners with disabilities in inclusive classrooms.

District Strategies: The organized efforts of a school division to guide and support the implementation of educational programs. In this study, this term specifically refers to the plans, directives, training activities, supervisory actions, and monitoring mechanisms by the Lucena City Schools Division to guide IEP development and implementation, as experienced and described by Special Education (SPED) teachers.

Ecological Systems Theory: A theory asserting that IEP outcomes are not produced by a single person or factor but emerge from the interaction of multiple systems that either support or constrain the instructional environment.

Ethical Considerations: The protocols established to protect the rights and well-being of research participants. This includes providing a clear and comprehensive explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, and potential risks, or discomforts they may experience, as well as obtaining written informed consent. It ensures that their participation is voluntary and that participants maintain the right to decline to answer any question, and may withdraw from the study at any time without consequences.

Exosystem: Refers to division-level structures—including the strategies, supervision, training, and resources that flow from the school division to the school site. These structures shape teachers' work, even when teachers are not directly involved in designing processes.

Holistic IEP Implementation: The comprehensive and integrated application of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) to addresses the academic, social, emotional, and functional needs of learners with disabilities. This involves supporting the whole child rather than focusing exclusively on academic outcomes.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA): A United States federal law that mandated the development of IEPs for learners with disabilities as a condition for receiving special education services.

Inclusive Education: The practice of educating learners with disabilities in general education classrooms provided with appropriate support services and accommodation as implemented in this study.

Individualized Education Plan (IEP): A written, collaborative educational plan developed for a learner with a disability or special educational need. It describes the learner's present level of performance, set measurable goals, identify necessary services and supports, and outlines how progress will be monitored (Bateman & Herr, 2006) [3]. In this study, the term refers to the formal document and the process utilized by Special Education (SPED) teachers in the Lucena City Division to plan, deliver, and review individualized instruction for their learners, whether these following the DepEd-prescribed format or adapted to local school realities.

Institutional Approval: An essential step before conducting any data collection. The process by which the researcher secure the necessary approvals from the Schools Division Office of Lucena City and any other institutional bodies that govern research in public school settings.

Learners with Disabilities (LWDs): Students identified with physical, intellectual, sensory, or developmental conditions that require special education services.

Lived Experiences: The personal perceptions, insights, and meanings that teachers construct based on their direct involvement in implementing IEPs.

Macrosystem – The broader cultural and policy environment, including national laws regarding inclusive education that influence the educational landscape.

Mesosystem: The relationships between the school, the family, and support professionals involved in IEP development and implementation.

Microsystem: The system that includes the classroom, the learner, and the daily experience of IEP instruction.

Minimizing Risk and Ensuring Comfort: The ethical practice of creating a respectful, non-threatening interview environment. This involves consistently informing participants of their right to decline or withdraw, and ensuring the study's purpose is oriented toward improvement and understanding, rather than the evaluation or criticism of individuals or institutions.

Narrative Coding: A step after transcribing the interview. Initial coding involves identifying significant words, phrases, events, relationships, and recurring ideas across participants' narratives. The coding process attends not only to what participants describe but also to how they describe it—including the meanings they assign, the emotions they express, and the tensions or contradictions they navigate. Codes may address themes such as district support and guidance, school leadership and organizational practices, documentation burden, collaboration and isolation, teacher agency and adaptation, and perceptions of meaningful learner outcomes.

Narrative Inquiry: A qualitative research approach that explores human experience through the stories people tell about their lives. It was based on the premise that stories is both a method of communication but a way of knowing. Narrative inquiry is the methodological approach used to gather and interpret SPED teachers' experiences of IEP implementation. It involves listening closely to their stories, attending to the context and meaning behind them, and representing their experiences in a way that honors both individual voices and the broader patterns that emerge.

Narrative Structuring: The analytical process of examining the sequence of events within a story, identifying key turning points and transitions, attending to the contexts in which experiences were set, and analyzing the meanings and lessons participants derive from their experiences.

Phenomenological Lens: An approach used to examine and interpret the participants' lived experiences and the meanings they attach to those experiences. It focuses on how individuals perceive, feel, and make meaning of a particular phenomenon.

Republic Act No. 7277 (Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities): A law enacted in 1992 to promote the rights, welfare, and full participation of persons with disabilities in society.

Republic Act No. 9442: The law that recognize the right of persons with disabilities to accessible and appropriate education.

Republic Act No. 10533 (Enhanced Basic Education Act): A Philippine law enacted in 2013 that strengthened the country's basic education system by institutionalizing the K-12 program. It aims to provide quality, relevant, and globally competitive education and equip learners with skills for lifelong learning, employment, and higher education.

Republic Act No. 11650 (Inclusive Education Act for Learners with Disabilities): The 2022 law that strengthens and institutionalizes inclusive education for learners with disabilities (LWDs) across all levels of basic education.

Special Education Center (SPED Center): A specialized educational facility or program within the school system that provides support services, instructional resources, and specialized expertise for learners with disabilities.

Special Needs Education (SNED): A customized instructional program or service designed to meet the diverse needs of an individual learner with disability, which necessitate supplementary aids and services and teaching strategies in the classroom or non-academic settings. It includes instructions on physical and vocational education, social skills development, basic survival needs, and provide reasonable accommodations, modifications, adaptations, and individualization, as needed. It includes learners with disabilities in the general education system to enable them to realize their full potential and prepare them as independent functioning members of society.

Special Needs Education Teacher (SNED Teacher): An individual who teaches academic and life skills to basic education learners who have a range of disabilities and learning difficulties using various strategies targeting the learners' holistic development. SNED teachers work in partnership with a general education teacher in planning, teaching, and providing support to learners with disabilities.

Teacher Preparedness: The level of knowledge, skills, and readiness of teachers to effectively implement IEPs in inclusive classroom settings.

Thematic Narrative Analysis – A method of analysis that involves identifying recurring themes and patterns of meaning across multiple narratives while preserving each story's distinct integrity and sequence of each individual story.

Transferability: The degree to which the study's findings are meaningful or applicable in other similar contexts.

Triangulation: The use of multiple data sources, participants, or methods in qualitative research to enhance the credibility and validity of research findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[29]. It is achieved through the integration of teacher interviews, principals' field notes, and parents' perceptions.

Trustworthiness: The criteria of trustworthiness are credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. The researcher observed each of these principles throughout the study.

Weick's Theory of Sensemaking: The theory that focuses on how people in organizations interpret events, manage ambiguity, and construct meaning that guide their actions. This theory posits that rather than simply following rules or implementing policies mechanically, individuals continuously interpret their environment by drawing on their identities, past experiences, and social interactions.

2. Review of Related Literature

Introduction

The exploration of teachers' lived experiences in the holistic implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) through a phenomenological lens has garnered increasing attention in recent years. This literature review synthesized findings from both local and international studies conducted between 2020 and 2025, and highlighted the complexities and nuances of this educational practice.

Theoretical Framework

1. Phenomenology

Phenomenology served as the foundational theory for the study, focused on the lived experiences of teachers as they implemented holistic Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). This approach emphasized understanding the essence of experiences from the perspective of the participants, which allowed for an in-depth exploration of their feelings, perceptions, and interpretations regarding IEP implementation. According to Moustakas (1994), phenomenology sought to uncover the meanings that individuals assigned to their experiences, which made it suitable for qualitative research in educational settings.

2. Constructivist Theory

Constructivist theory posited that knowledge was constructed through social interactions and experiences. In the context of IEP implementation, this theory highlighted the importance of collaborative practices among teachers, parents, and specialists. Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) was applied here, and suggested that the teachers' experiences were shaped by their interactions with others and the support they received in their professional environments. This framework emphasized the role of social context in shaping teachers' understandings and practices related to holistic IEPs.

3. Social Learning Theory

Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory underscored the significance of observational learning and modeling in the educational process. This theory was integrated into the framework to explore how teachers learned from one another and from their experiences in implementing IEPs. The interactions within professional learning communities and mentorship programs can provided insights into how teachers adapted their practices based on shared experiences and observations.

4. Ecological Systems Theory

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ^[6] Ecological Systems Theory offered a comprehensive perspective on the various systems that influenced teachers' experiences in implementing IEPs. This theory posited that individual experiences were shaped by multiple layers of influence, including the microsystem (immediate environment), mesosystem (interactions between different environments), exosystem (external environments), and macrosystem (cultural and societal influences). This framework helped to contextualize the challenges and supports that teachers encountered in their holistic IEP implementation.

5. Inclusive Education Framework

The principles of inclusive education emphasized the right of all students to receive quality education tailored to their individual needs. This framework guided the study by focusing on how teachers perceived their roles and responsibilities in creating inclusive learning environments. The Salamanca Statement (1994) advocated for inclusive education as a means to promote equity and social justice, which aligned with the goals of holistic IEP implementation. This theoretical framework integrated phenomenology, constructivist theory, social learning theory, ecological systems theory, and inclusive education principles to provide a comprehensive understanding of teachers' lived

experiences in holistic IEP implementation. Employing these theories, the study aimed to illuminate the complexities of teachers' experiences and the factors that influenced their practices in inclusive education settings. This framework guided the research design, data collection, and analysis, which ensured a robust exploration of the topic.

Review of the Related Literature

In the Philippines, research focused on the challenges and strategies employed by special education teachers in implementing holistic IEPs. For instance, Macabenta *et al.* (2023) examined the lived experiences of 21st-century teachers, which revealed that effective IEP implementation required not only pedagogical skills but also emotional resilience and collaboration with parents and other stakeholders. Their findings underscored the necessity of professional development programs tailored to enhance teachers' competencies in inclusive education settings (Macabenta *et al.*, 2023). Similarly, Flores and Eludo (2025) investigated the experiences of Filipino special education teachers in the United States, and emphasized the cultural and professional transitions they navigate. The study highlighted the importance of culturally responsive teaching practices and the need for institutional support to facilitate effective IEP implementation (Flores & Eludo, 2025). These studies collectively illustrated the critical role of teacher adaptability and support systems in fostering inclusive educational environments. Internationally, the literature reveals a growing recognition of the importance of holistic approaches in IEP implementation. For example, Ahmed and Chakraborty (2023) discussed the necessity of ongoing professional development for teachers who worked with students with disabilities, advocating for training that encompasses both pedagogical strategies and emotional support mechanisms (Ahmed & Chakraborty, 2023). This aligned with findings from Anindyardhani *et al.* (2023), who emphasized the significance of collaborative communication among educators, parents, and specialists to enhance the effectiveness of IEPs in inclusive settings (Anindyardhani *et al.*, 2023). Moreover, a systematic review by Marsili *et al.* (2023) highlighted the diverse challenges faced by teachers in implementing inclusive practices, including inadequate resources and systemic barriers. The review called for comprehensive policy reforms to support teachers in their efforts to provide equitable education for all students (Marsili *et al.*, 2023). This perspective was echoed by Singh and Pallai (2023), who conducted a meta-analysis of inclusive teaching practices, and identify key factors that contribute to successful IEP implementation, such as teacher training and stakeholder engagement (Singh & Pallai, 2023).

Global Legal and Policy Foundations of Inclusive and Special Education

Inclusive and special education had been strongly shaped by international legal and policy instruments that recognized the rights of learners with disabilities to quality, equitable education. The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education of 1994 called on governments to adopt inclusive schools that accommodated all children, including those with disabilities, within regular education systems (UNESCO, 2024). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

(2006) further affirmed the right of persons with disabilities to inclusive education at all levels, and emphasized non-discrimination, reasonable accommodation, and individualized support (United Nations, 2026). These global instruments encouraged countries to move away from segregated provision and to develop structures and practices that responded to diverse learner needs.

Within this international movement, the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) emerged as a central tool for operationalizing inclusive education. In the United States, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, which was later reauthorized as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), mandated the development of IEPs for learners with disabilities as a condition for receiving special education services (Bateman & Herr, 2026). Across many systems, the IEP functioned as a rights-based planning document that defined the learner's present levels of performance, goals, services, accommodations, and methods of progress monitoring, thereby linking legal entitlements to concrete educational support (Bateman & Herr, 2026; McLaughlin & Nolet, 2024).

Philippine Legal and Policy Foundations

In the Philippines, inclusive and special education were likewise anchored in a growing body of laws and DepEd issuances that recognized the rights of learners with disabilities. Republic Act No. 7277 (Magna Carta for Persons with Disabilities) and its amendment under Republic Act No. 9442 affirmed the right of persons with disabilities to accessible and appropriate education. Republic Act No. 10533 (Enhanced Basic Education Act) strengthened the learner-centered orientation of the basic education curriculum, while Republic Act No. 11650 (Inclusive Education Act for Learners with Disabilities) established a clearer legal basis for inclusive education and support services (Republic Act No. 7277; Republic Act No. 9442; Republic Act No. 10533, 2013^[39]; Republic Act No. 11650, 2022^[40]).

These laws were operationalized through DepEd orders and frameworks that institutionalized SNED within the public school system and required the use of IEPs as a core component of service delivery. DepEd Order No. 26, s. 2020, and subsequent issuances formalized SNED program implementation, while inclusive education policies directed schools to provide individualized support through IEPs for learners with special educational needs (Department of Education, 1997, 2020)^[14, 15]. Within this policy landscape, IEPs were expected to function both as legal safeguards and as pedagogical tools that translated national commitments to inclusion into school- and classroom-level plans.

Purpose and Nature of the IEP

The Individualized Education Plan was widely recognized as a central instrument in special and inclusive education, intended to ensure that each learner with a disability received educational support tailored to their individual needs, strengths, and circumstances (Bateman & Herr, 2026; McLaughlin & Nolet, 2024). At its core, the IEP identified the learner's present level of performance, established measurable goals, specified the services and supports needed, and outlined a plan for monitoring progress over time (Bateman & Herr, 2026). This purpose was consistent with global and national legal frameworks that treated

individualized planning as a key mechanism for realizing the right to education for learners with disabilities (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2021^[17]; United Nations, 2026).

The IEP was understood both as a document and as a collaborative process. As a document, it recorded present levels, goals, accommodations, and progress measures; as a process, it involved sustained communication and decision-making among teachers, school heads, specialists, and families (Friend & Bursuck, 2020; Turnbull *et al.*, 2025). When this process functioned well, the IEP became a “living” document that was regularly revised based on learner progress and professional reflection; when it was reduced to a paperwork exercise, its pedagogical value diminished (Cobb, 2025; Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2020; Shogren *et al.*, 2020).

Philippine Studies on IEP Implementation: From Strategies to Systems

Philippine research on IEP implementation highlighted both the promise of IEPs and the systemic challenges that shaped their use in schools. Several studies examined how division-level strategies, professional development initiatives, and school conditions influenced the way teachers developed and implemented IEPs.

Anora *et al.* (2025)^[2] investigated the effects of professional development on teaching competencies among SPED teachers in Cebu Province. Using a descriptive-correlational design, they found that teachers with higher levels of professional development knowledge displayed stronger IEP implementation, particularly in adapting strategies, despite limited access to competency-focused training and support systems. This study underscored the importance of division-level training strategies as a precursor to strong classroom implementation.

Concepcion *et al.* (2025)^[10] examined SPED teachers in Cagayan Valley and found that teachers generally demonstrated high knowledge and practice in IEP development, especially in interventions, information gathering, and planning, but were weaker in reviewing and revising IEPs and collaborating with specialists. The strong correlation between knowledge and practice suggested that system-level supports that improved teachers’ understanding translated into better implementation.

Karaan Jr. *et al.* (2025)^[27] assessed teachers’ awareness and preparedness regarding IEPs in inclusive settings in Tagbilaran City. It reported moderate overall awareness and preparedness, with specific gaps in monitoring, evaluation, assessment, and goal-setting, but relative strengths in collaboration, parental involvement, and the use of assistive technology. These findings pointed to school and division systems that supported some aspects of inclusive practice while leaving key IEP processes underdeveloped.

Other Philippine studies emphasized systemic constraints that affected IEP work. Mangongon (2023)^[31] reported that SPED teachers in Sarangani maintained positive attitudes toward IEPs and recognized their importance, yet struggled with the IEP process due to limited training, instructional support, and parent mentoring. Donaire *et al.* (2024)^[16] showed that well-implemented IEPs were associated with improved academic outcomes but that time constraints, irregular updates, and collaboration challenges hindered consistent implementation.

Research on inclusive education and leadership further

illuminated how strategies became systems. Dayso *et al.* (2025)^[13], Obcial *et al.* (2025)^[33], and Beltran *et al.* (2025)^[5] documented that although inclusive policies were often reported as “implemented,” schools continued to face resource shortages, uneven administrative support, and variable teacher training. These conditions influenced whether IEPs were used as meaningful planning tools or treated mainly as compliance requirements.

Collectively, Philippine studies suggested that IEP implementation was strongly shaped by division strategies (such as training and supervision), school systems (including leadership, resources, and collaboration structures), and teachers’ own beliefs and capacities. IEP work was widely valued but frequently constrained by systemic factors beyond individual teachers’ control.

International Studies on IEP Implementation: Strategies, Systems, and Practice

International literature likewise examined how policies and strategies translated into school-level IEP practices. Studies consistently identified enabling conditions for effective IEP implementation—such as teacher preparation, leadership, collaboration, and alignment of services with learner needs—as well as systemic barriers related to workload, paperwork, time, and accountability pressures (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2021^[17]; Odom *et al.*, 2025).

Gregory (2025) offered a detailed narrative case study of IEP development in Ontario, Canada, exploring teachers’ beliefs, practices, and experiences in regular and special education classrooms. Drawing on Bourdieu and Disability Studies, Gregory identified themes of knowledge and conceptualizations, IEP pedagogical practices, individualized curricula, and relational influences. The study argued that IEP development involved a dynamic labeling process through which students’ learning identities were constructed, often in ways that reinforced deficit-based narratives and ableist assumptions, despite inclusive policy intentions.

Other studies across North America, Europe, and Australia emphasized that IEPs were more likely to be implemented with fidelity and to yield positive learner outcomes when systems provided coherent guidance, collaborative structures, and sufficient resources and time (Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2020; Shogren *et al.*, 2020; Turnbull *et al.*, 2025). Conversely, monitored systems emphasized document completion over instructional quality, or when standardized accountability pressures conflicted with individualized planning, teachers tended to experience IEP work as bureaucratic rather than pedagogically meaningful. International research, therefore, portrayed IEP implementation as a function of both strategy and system: policies and frameworks defined expectations, but school and district conditions determined how those expectations were interpreted and enacted in daily practice.

Thematic Analysis Across Local and International Literature

A thematic reading of both Philippine and international literature on IEP implementation revealed several cross-cutting themes.

First, IEPs were consistently positioned as central tools for ensuring individualized support in inclusive education, yet their effectiveness depended on the systems within which

they were embedded. Legal and policy frameworks established a formal basis for IEPs but did not guarantee meaningful implementation in classrooms (Bateman & Herr, 2026; European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2021^[17]; Republic Act No. 11650, 2022^[40]).

Second, strategies at the district or division level—such as professional development programs, supervisory practices, and monitoring mechanisms—played a critical role in shaping teachers' capacities and orientations toward IEP work. Where these strategies were coherent, targeted, and sustained, teachers reported higher levels of knowledge, confidence, and implementation quality (Anora *et al.*, 2025^[2]; Concepcion *et al.*, 2025^[10]; Fullan & Quinn, 2026). Where strategies were fragmented, compliance-driven, or weakly supported, teachers experienced IEPs as burdensome paperwork rather than as useful instructional tools (Kurth & Mastergeorge, 2010; Mangongon, 2023; Obcial *et al.*, 2025)^[28, 31, 33].

Third, school-level systems—including leadership, resource allocation, collaboration structures, and school culture—mediated the impact of division strategies on classroom practice. Effective leadership and supportive cultures enabled collaborative IEP teams and sustained use of plans, whereas weak leadership, limited resources, and isolation undermined implementation (Bayani, 2021^[4]; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012^[24]; McLaughlin & Nolet, 2024).

Fourth, teachers' perspectives and sensemaking emerged as crucial in both local and international studies. Teachers did not simply follow directives; they interpreted them in light of their contexts, identities, and relationships. Their narratives revealed how they navigated tensions between policy demands, resource constraints, and learner needs, and how they made moral and professional judgments in IEP work (Clandinin & Connelly, 2020^[8]; Gregory, 2025; Jala, 2025^[26]; Weick, 2025).

Finally, across contexts, IEP implementation was repeatedly described as valued but constrained. Teachers recognized the importance of individualized planning and reported positive effects when conditions allowed robust implementation, yet they also reported heavy workloads, insufficient training, limited collaboration, and uneven support as enduring barriers (Donaire *et al.*, 2024^[16]; Karaan Jr. *et al.*, 2025^[27]; Shogren *et al.*, 2020).

Synthesis, Impact, and Basis for the Present Study

The reviewed literature showed that IEPs had become legally and pedagogically central to inclusive education, both globally and in the Philippines, but that their implementation depended heavily on the interplay of strategies and systems at division and school levels. In both international and Philippine settings, researchers documented that strong leadership, coherent strategies, adequate resources, and collaborative cultures supported meaningful IEP practice, whereas fragmented systems and compliance-oriented monitoring tended to reduce IEPs to paperwork tasks.

At the same time, the literature highlighted that teachers' voices were essential yet often underrepresented in understanding how IEP policies and strategies operated in real schools. Narrative and qualitative studies showed that teachers' stories provided insights into how policies were experienced, where systems supported or constrained practice, and how IEPs affected learners in everyday contexts (Clandinin, 2023; Gregory, 2025; Jala, 2025^[26]). In

the Philippine context, however, most studies focused on knowledge, awareness, preparedness, or general challenges, with fewer examining, in depth, how division strategies and school systems were experienced at the classroom level within a single division.

In particular, no study had been identified that explored how SNED teachers in the Division of Lucena City narrated and made sense of IEP implementation in relation to specific division strategies, school systems, and perceived outcomes. This gap was significant given the division's responsibility for translating national inclusive-education policies into local practice and supporting schools across its four districts. The present study, therefore, was justified as an effort to address the gap through narrative inquiry. Focusing on SNED teachers' narratives of IEP implementation in the Division of Lucena City, the study aimed to illuminate how strategies became systems, how systems shaped classroom practice, and how teachers perceived IEP outcomes for their learners. In doing so, it sought to provide locally grounded, practitioner-centered evidence that could inform division-level decision-making and contribute to the broader literature on the human dimensions of IEP implementation and inclusive education.

Synthesis and Gaps

The exploration of teachers' lived experiences in the holistic implementation of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) was a focal point in recent educational research, particularly from 2020 to 2025. This body of literature revealed a complex interplay of factors that influenced teachers' practices and perceptions in inclusive education settings.

Synthesis of Findings

Commitment and Challenges: Studies consistently highlighted teachers' commitment to inclusive education and to implementing IEPs. For instance, research by Macabenta *et al.* (2023) and Flores & Eludo (2025) emphasized that educators were dedicated to fostering inclusive environments, they encountered significant challenges, including inadequate training, limited resources, and systemic barriers. These findings were echoed in international studies, such as those by Marsili *et al.* (2023), which identified similar obstacles across different educational contexts.

Professional Development Needs: A recurring theme in the literature was the necessity for targeted professional development. Research indicated that teachers feel unprepared to implement IEPs effectively due to a lack of specialized training (Llanos *et al.*, 2024; De Borja *et al.*, 2024). This training gap was critical, as it directly affects teachers' self-efficacy and their ability to meet diverse student needs (Capangpangan *et al.*, 2023).

Collaborative Practices: Collaboration among educators, parents, and specialists was a key factor in successful IEP implementation. Studies by Arias *et al.* (2023) and Alcosero *et al.* (2023) emphasized that effective communication and teamwork enhanced the educational experience of students with disabilities, suggesting that collaborative frameworks were essential for fostering inclusive practices.

Contextual Influences: The literature also pointed to the influence of contextual factors, such as school culture and administrative support, on IEP implementation. Research indicated that systemic support was crucial for sustaining

inclusive practices, as teachers often relied on institutional backing to navigate the challenges they faced (Siton, 2025).

Gaps in the Literature

Despite the rich insights provided by existing studies, several gaps remained:

Localized Studies: While there was a growing body of research on IEP implementation, many studies focused on broader themes rather than localized contexts. There was a need for more research that specifically addressed the unique challenges faced by teachers in different regions, particularly in the Philippines, where cultural and systemic factors may significantly influenced practices (Lebeco & Verano, 2023).

Depth of Teacher Experiences: Much of the current literature employed quantitative methods, which overlooked teachers' nuanced and subjective experiences. There was a gap in qualitative research that deeply explored teachers' lived experiences and the meanings they attached to their practices in implementing IEPs (Macabenta *et al.*, 2023).

Impact of Policy on Practice: Although some studies examined the role of policy in shaping inclusive education, there was limited exploration of how specific policies translated into classroom practice. Future research needed to examine the relationship between educational policies and teachers' experiences to identify effective strategies for implementing policies (Marsili *et al.*, 2023).

Longitudinal Perspectives: Most studies provided a snapshot of teachers' experiences at a single point in time. There was a need for longitudinal studies that tracked changes in teachers' perceptions and practices over time, particularly as they engaged with ongoing professional development and systemic changes in education (Flores & Eludo, 2025).

In conclusion, while significant strides were made in understanding teachers' lived experiences in holistic IEP implementation, addressing these gaps was essential for developing more effective support systems and practices in inclusive education. Future research should aimed to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the localized, contextual, and longitudinal aspects of teachers' experiences in this critical area.

3. Methodology

This chapter presented the study's methodology. It discussed the research design, research locale, participants, data collection procedures, data analysis, ethical considerations, and measures for ensuring trustworthiness. Since the study sought to understand SNED teachers' experiences and perspectives regarding district strategies, school systems, and IEP outcomes, a qualitative narrative inquiry design is the most appropriate approach (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Creswell, 2013) [8, 12].

Research Design

This study used a qualitative research design, specifically narrative inquiry as described by Clandinin and Connelly (2000) [8]. Qualitative research was appropriate when the goal was to understand how people experience and give meaning to a particular phenomenon, rather than to measure or test hypotheses about it (Creswell, 2013) [12]. In qualitative research, narrative inquiry was especially suitable when the researcher sought to access the stories people told about their lived experiences—including how they interpreted events, responded to institutional contexts,

and how meaning accumulates over time through professional practice (Clandinin, 2013) [7].

Narrative inquiry proceeded from the foundational understanding that human experience was storied. People did not simply report facts about their lives; they organized their experiences into narratives that carried meaning, reflected values, and revealed how they understood themselves and the world around them. For teachers, this was particularly significant because teaching was deeply personal and contextual practice, shaped by memory, relationships, professional identity, and the accumulated wisdom of years in the classroom (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) [11].

This design was appropriate for the present study for several reasons. First, the study did not focus solely on surface-level challenges in IEP implementation or on counting the number of schools with complete IEP documents. Rather, it aimed to understand how SNED teachers in the Division of Lucena City narrated and made sense of their experiences of district strategies, school systems, and IEP outcomes. Their stories serve as the primary source of knowledge, and narrative inquiry was the method that took those stories seriously as evidence.

Second, narrative inquiry was appropriate because the study was attentive to context, sequence, and meaning. Teachers' accounts of IEP implementation were shaped by time, by how long they had been teaching SNED, by the changes in district policy they had lived through, and by the specific school environments in which they had worked. These temporal and contextual dimensions were central to understanding what teachers' experiences meant, and they were better captured through narrative than through survey instruments or structured observation (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) [8].

Third, narrative inquiry allowed for the kind of relational data collection this study valued. The researcher, who herself had years of experience in teaching and in SNED contexts, did not approach participants as neutral data sources. She approached them as fellow professionals whose stories deserved to be heard with care and understanding. Narrative inquiry provided a framework for this kind of respectful, collaborative, and meaning-centered research relationship (Clandinin, 2013) [7].

Research Locale

The study was conducted in the Schools Division of Lucena City, specifically among schools within its four congressional districts. These four districts constituted the geographic and administrative context of the inquiry.

Lucena City was an independent component city in the province of Quezon, with its own Schools Division under the Department of Education. As an independent division, it administered its own SNED program, which included training SNED teachers, supervising SNED centers, and monitoring IEP implementation across its schools. This made it an appropriate and complete setting for a study examining how district-level strategies were experienced at the school level.

The four districts within the Division differed in several important respects: school size and learner population, the organization and resources of SNED services, the experience levels of SNED teachers, administrative leadership styles, and access to district support. These differences made the setting valuable for this study by

providing a range of school and district conditions within which teachers' experiences could be understood. By drawing participants from across all four districts, the study was positioned to capture both common patterns and meaningful variations in how SNED teachers narrated their IEP experiences.

The choice of this locale was also grounded in the researcher's familiarity with the context and in the practical accessibility of the setting. Familiarity with the local SNED community helped the researcher establish trust with participants and engage more meaningfully with the stories they shared.

Participants

Sampling Technique

The study used purposive sampling to identify participants. Purposive sampling was appropriate when the researcher needed participants who could speak directly and knowledgeably about the specific phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 2013) [12]. Since the study focused on IEP implementation as experienced by SNED teachers, only individuals actively engaged in SNED practice and IEP-related work were able to provide the rich, relevant, and reflective accounts that narrative inquiry required (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) [8].

Inclusion Criteria

To be included in the study, participants needed to meet the following criteria:

- They were currently assigned as SNED teachers in a public school within one of the four districts of Lucena City.
- They were directly involved in the delivery of SNED services, including the development, implementation, monitoring, or review of IEPs for individual learners.
- They had at least one year of direct experience in SNED-related teaching or IEP work, which was sufficient for reflective and contextualized accounts.
- They were willing to participate voluntarily in narrative interviews and related data collection activities, and to have those interviews audio recorded with their consent.

Number of Participants

Given that narrative inquiry was valued for depth of understanding over breadth of representation, the study involved 10 SNED teachers. This range reflected the typical participant size in narrative inquiry studies, where the richness of individual accounts and the emergence of meaningful patterns across narratives mattered more than statistical sampling requirements (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Creswell, 2013) [8, 12]. The researcher continued engaging with participants until sufficient depth and thematic recurrence were achieved—a point often described in qualitative research as informational sufficiency or saturation.

Where possible, participants were drawn from different schools across the four districts to ensure variation in institutional context. This was not intended to enable statistical comparison, but rather to enrich the study with a range of experiences that reflected the diversity of school conditions within the Division.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection in this study was carried out through three complementary methods: in-depth narrative interviews, reflective prompts, and the researcher's field notes. Together, these methods enabled a multilayered collection of participants' experiences and meanings (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) [8].

In-Depth Narrative Interviews

The primary method of data collection was in-depth narrative interviews. Unlike structured interviews that asked participants to respond briefly to a fixed set of questions, narrative interviews invited participants to tell their stories—to share experiences in their own words, in their own sequence, and with the details and meanings they themselves considered important (Clandinin, 2013) [7]. The researcher's role in these interviews was to listen carefully, follow the participant's lead, and ask follow-up questions that invited deeper reflection rather than redirected the conversation.

The interviews were semi-structured. A set of guiding questions was prepared in advance to ensure the key areas of inquiry are addressed, but participants were free to expand, elaborate, and shape their responses as they saw fit. Interviews were conducted in a comfortable, private setting at a time convenient for the participant. With the participant's permission, interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed for analysis. The expected duration of each interview was approximately 60 to 90 minutes, depending on the depth and flow of the participant's account.

Guiding questions for the narrative interview included prompts such as:

- Can you tell me about your experience in preparing and implementing IEPs in your school?
- How do district directions or expectations shape the way you approach IEP work?
- What school practices or systems have helped or complicated your work with IEPs?
- Can you recall a particular experience that captures the strengths or the difficulties of IEP implementation in your setting?
- How do you know when an IEP is working well for a learner?

Reflective Prompts

In addition to the formal interview, the researcher used reflective prompts before or after the interview to deepen the participant's engagement with their own experience. These were written or oral prompts that invited the participant to reconsider significant events, turning points, or lessons from their practice. Reflective prompts were particularly valuable in narrative inquiry because they gave participants time to move beyond immediate recall and consider what their experiences had meant to them over time (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) [8].

Examples of reflective prompts included:

- Describe an experience that showed how your school supported—or struggled to support—IEP implementation.
- Describe a situation where what the district expected

and what was actually possible in your school did not match.

- What did your years of experience taught you about what made an IEP genuinely useful for a learner?

Field Notes

Throughout the data collection process, the researcher maintained a field notes journal. This journal included contextual observations made during or after interviews—such as the setting, the tone and flow of the conversation, significant nonverbal cues, and the researcher's own initial reflections and emerging insights. Field notes served as an important complement to interview transcripts, as they preserved information about the context and relational dimensions of the data collection process that audio recordings could fully capture (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[29]. Field notes also contributed to the researcher's reflexive practice—helping her track her own responses to the data, examine her assumptions, and remain attentive to the interpretive lens she would brought to the study as an experienced educator.

Ethical Protocols During Data Collection

Before any data collection began, the researcher secured the necessary permissions from the appropriate authorities, including the Schools Division Office of Lucena City. Individual school clearances were obtained where required. All participants received a complete explanation of the study, its purpose, and their role before any interview was conducted.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in this study followed a three-stage process: narrative coding, narrative structuring, and thematic narrative analysis. This process moved from the individual story to the broader patterns of meaning across participants' accounts, while maintaining respect for the integrity and uniqueness of each narrative (Clandinin, 2013; Creswell, 2013) ^[7, 12].

Narrative Coding

After transcribing the interviews, the researcher read each transcript multiple times to become familiar with the full account before beginning coding. This extended immersion in the data was important in narrative inquiry because meanings were often embedded in how things were said—in the sequence of events, the emotional tone, the silences, and the connections participants made between different parts of their experience—not only in the explicit content of individual statements (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) ^[8]. Initial coding involved identifying significant words, phrases, events, relationships, and recurring ideas across participants' narratives. The coding process attended not only to what participants described but also to how they described it—including the meanings they assigned, the emotions they expressed, and the tensions or contradictions they navigated. Codes addressed themes such as district support and guidance, school leadership and organizational practices, documentation burden, collaboration and isolation, teacher agency and adaptation, and perceptions of meaningful learner outcomes.

Research Framework

Narrative Structuring

Following initial coding, each participant's account was organized as a coherent narrative structure. This step involved examining the sequence of events in each story, identifying key turning points and transitions, attending to the contexts in which experiences were set, and analyzing the meanings and lessons participants have drawn from their experiences. Narrative structuring was essential to narrative inquiry because it treated each teacher's account as a whole—a story with a beginning, a development, and a meaning—rather than as a collection of data fragments to be sorted into categories (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) ^[11]. Each narrative structure was organized around the following elements: the context of the teacher's SNED experience; significant experiences and events related to IEP implementation; the challenges and forms of support encountered; the teacher's interpretation of what had happened and why; perceptions of IEP outcomes for learners; and insights or lessons drawn from the experience.

Thematic Narrative Analysis

After the individual narratives had been examined and structured, the researcher conducted a thematic analysis of all participants' accounts. This involved identifying themes and patterns of meaning that appeared across multiple narratives while preserving the distinctiveness of each story. The goal was not to flatten individual differences into a single collective account, but to identify the shared conditions, recurring tensions, and common forms of meaning-making that emerged across the narratives of SNED teachers in different schools and districts (Clandinin, 2013; Creswell, 2013) ^[7, 12].

Possible cross-cutting themes included district coherence and its effects on teacher experience; the role of school leadership in supporting or hindering IEP work; the tension between documentation demands and meaningful instructional planning; the experience of collaboration and isolation; the ways in which teachers exercised professional agency and adaptation in the face of systemic constraints; and teachers' understanding of what constituted a meaningful IEP outcome for learners.

The final analysis moved between the individual narratives and the emerging thematic patterns—honoring both the particularity of each teacher's story and the broader systemic insights that those stories, taken together, revealed.

Ethical Considerations

Because this study involved human participants sharing professional experiences within actual school contexts, ethical considerations were central to its design and implementation. The researcher observed the following ethical principles throughout the study (Creswell, 2013; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[12, 29].

Informed Consent

All participants received a clear and complete explanation of the study before any data collection began. This explanation included the study's purpose, the nature and duration of their expected participation, the procedures involved, and any possible risks or discomforts they may experience.

Participants were asked to provide written informed consent before any interview proceeded. They were explicitly informed that their participation would be entirely voluntary, that they could decline to answer any question, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without consequences.

Confidentiality and Anonymity

To protect participants' identities, pseudonyms were assigned to all participants in transcripts, field notes, and the final research report. Where necessary, school names and other identifying details were removed or generalized. All interview recordings, transcripts, and research notes were stored securely and would be accessible only to the researcher. Data would be retained in accordance with institutional research guidelines and was disposed of appropriately at the conclusion of the study.

Participation in this study was entirely voluntary. No participant was pressured, incentivized, or expected to join the study by virtue of their school or district affiliation. The researcher made clear that neither participation nor nonparticipation affected the participant's professional standing or relationship with school or district authorities.

Institutional Approval

Before conducting any data collection, the researcher secured the necessary approvals from the Schools Division Office of Lucena City and from any other institutional bodies that governed research in public school settings. School-level coordination was arranged in advance and in full consultation with school heads. The study was conducted in a manner that respected school schedules and avoided disruption of regular school operations.

Minimizing Risk and Ensuring Comfort

The study involved minimal risk. Participants shared their professional experiences and reflections, and no personally sensitive health or financial information was sought. However, the researcher recognized that some participants felt cautious about discussing challenges related to school or district systems. To address this, the researcher created a respectful, nonthreatening interview environment, reminded participants regularly of their right to decline or stop, and ensured that the study's purpose was oriented toward improvement and understanding—not toward evaluation or criticism of individuals or institutions.

Trustworthiness

In qualitative research, the quality and integrity of a study were assessed not through statistical measures of reliability and validity but through the criteria of trustworthiness described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) ^[29]: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. The researcher observed each of these principles throughout the study.

Credibility

Credibility referred to confidence in the truthfulness and accuracy of the study's findings as representations of participants' actual experiences. In this study, credibility was supported through several strategies. Prolonged engagement with participants and their stories—reading and rereading transcripts, following up where needed—helped ensure that interpretations were grounded in the full texture

of participants' accounts rather than in surface-level impressions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[29]. Member checking was employed where appropriate: selected summaries or interpretive accounts were shared with participants for verification, giving them the opportunity to confirm, clarify, or correct how their stories were represented.

Transferability

Transferability referred to the extent to which the study's findings were meaningful or applicable in other similar contexts. In qualitative research, this was not established through statistical generalization but through the provision of thick, rich description—detailed accounts of the context, participants, processes, and findings that allowed readers to assess whether and how the study's insights might be relevant to their own settings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[29]. The researcher provided sufficient contextual descriptions of the Lucena City Division, the four districts, and the participants' working conditions to enable readers in other divisions or school contexts to make this kind of informed comparison.

Dependability

Dependability referred to the consistency and transparency of the research process. It was the qualitative equivalent of reliability—the sense that the study was conducted systematically and that the findings did not result from arbitrary or inconsistent decisions. To support dependability, the researcher maintained a clear and detailed record of all research procedures, including the development of interview guides, the data collection and transcription process, the coding decisions made during analysis, and the interpretive steps taken in moving from individual narratives to thematic findings. This documentation constituted an audit trail demonstrating the integrity and coherence of the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[29].

Confirmability

Confirmability referred to the degree to which the findings were clearly grounded in the data—in what participants actually said and shared—rather than in the researcher's own preferences, assumptions, or prior beliefs. To strengthen confirmability, the researcher maintained a reflective journal throughout the study to document her responses to the data, examine her interpretive choices, and remain consciously aware of the professional background and prior experiences she brought to the research (Creswell, 2013; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) ^[12, 29]. Because the researcher benefited from her experience as an experienced SPED educator, this reflexivity was especially important: her insider knowledge was a strength that deepened understanding, but it was balanced with a disciplined openness to what participants actually revealed, including perspectives and experiences that differed from her own. Through narrative inquiry, this study gathered and interpreted the lived experiences of SPED teachers in the four districts of Lucena City regarding district strategies, school systems, and IEP outcomes. By employing purposive sampling, in-depth narrative interviews, reflective prompts, and thematic narrative analysis—and by observing rigorous ethical and trustworthiness standards throughout—the study produced a meaningful, credible, and practice-grounded understanding of how IEP implementation was experienced in actual school settings. The methodology was, therefore,

fully aligned with the study's nature, purpose, and research questions.

4. Analysis and Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents a focused, narrative account of teachers' lived experiences as they engaged with holistic IEP implementation. Grounded in qualitative data from in-depth interviews and reflective journals, the analysis sought to illuminate how teachers perceived, interpreted, and enacted holistic approaches within the IEP framework. Centering teachers' voices, the chapter aimed to render the texture and meaning of their day-to-day practice, the processes by which holism emerged in classrooms, and the factors that facilitated or constrained its enactment.

The analysis unfolded through a phenomenological lens, emphasizing depth over breadth. The structure was organized as follows: first, a concise account of the analytic process; then, a presentation of themes enriched with thick descriptions and direct quotes that illuminated the essence of teachers' experiences. A reflexive stance was maintained

throughout, acknowledging the researcher's interpretive role and the ways in which the analytic lens shaped meaning-making.

Methodologically, the chapter followed a disciplined, iterative analysis:

Data immersion: Thorough engagement with transcripts, journals, and field notes was conducted to recover nuanced experiences.

Coding and meaning extraction: Significant statements and transformative experiences related to holistic IEP practice were labeled.

Theme development: Related meanings were organized into coherent, overarching themes.

Narrative synthesis: Participant-centered narratives were constructed to illustrate how holism manifested in real classrooms.

Trustworthiness: Triangulation, member checking, and transparent reflexivity were employed to support credibility.

Qualitative Findings

Response	Codes (458)	Category (23)	Theme (7)
RGQ1 IGQ1: <u>Could you share a narrative of a typical IEP related day or week? From your perspective, what are the key scenes, who else is present and how do these moments change your understanding of the students' progress?</u> P1: Well, for a typical IEP day, I focuses on the implementation of the specially design instruction and tracking of the real time data. So like for example, in the morning I do focus on routine and data setup like the preparation of visual aids, schedules, data sheets and reviewing individual goals. While during the class, of course, my focus would be on the instruction itself. During small groups, that my focus would be the pull out and push in services. And at the end of the day, my focus would be on the progress documentation. So the other the individuals or persons present on that matter would be sometimes the principal, the school head, sometimes the master teacher, and of course the parent or the caregiver of the child. P2: A typical IEP-related week for me has a rhythm to it, almost like a cycle of observation, collaboration, and reflection. Each part of the week gives me a different lens into the student's progress. One of the key scenes happens right in the classroom. I usually start the week by observing the student during core instruction—maybe a reading block or a math lesson. The general education teacher is leading the class, and I'm off to the side with my notes, watching how the student engages with the material, how they respond to prompts, and what supports they naturally gravitate toward. These moments help me see the student in their most authentic learning environment. I get a clearer sense of whether the strategies in the IEP are translating into real-time success or if adjustments might be needed. P3: Oh, okay. Well, I alternate among classroom observations, like checking in with the students and collaborative discussions with the special education team. The general education teacher, and occasionally relevant service providers on an average EIP or IEP day. I sorry. TMOs include analyzing data during planning, evaluating how the student implements adjustments, throughout instructions, and perfectly discussing with them the progress or issues with your team. This instances enable me to identify trends over time. Relate data to classroom practice and gain a deeper understanding of students intellectual, social, and of course, emotional development. P4: A typical IEP process for me begins with gathering data about the student, through interviews, created evaluations, previews, and current work, and classroom observations. After collecting information, I said appropriate goals based on the learner's needs and abilities, then implement these goals during classroom activities and learning	c12 Implementation of real-time data tracking c1 Preparation c1 Sequence c5 Observation c16 Authenticity c6 Convergence c4 Enactment c20 Comprehension c5 Assessment c4 Differentiation c17 Engagement c17 Interaction c22 Evaluation c22 Understanding	Category 1: Lesson and Curriculum Planning Alignment Synchrony Briefing Deliberation Reliance Preparation Planning Systematic Goal alignment Customization Sequence Guided lesson planning Efficiency Lesson orientation Curriculum alignment Structured support Embedded instruction Flexible planning Flexible goal setting Goal setting Adaptive practice Adaptive implementation Collaborative implementation Step wise independent Guided practice Goal Reactivity Segmentation Revision Anticipation Clarification Observational learning Organization Task modification Expectation Aligned practice Strategy effectiveness Strategy Learning Extension Homeschool consistency Homeschool integration	Theme 1: Planning & Implementation Category 1: Lesson and Curriculum Planning Category 2: Policy and Framework Alignment Category 3: Resources and Tools Category 4: Teaching and Instructional Strategies Category 5: Observation and Monitoring Category 6: Engagement and Collaboration Theme 2: Adaptive Personalization Category 7: Learner-Centered Strategies Category 8: Differentiated Approaches Theme 3: Collaboration and Networking Category 9: Teamwork and Coordination Category 10: Stakeholder Involvement Theme 4: Challenges and Teacher Adaptability Category 11: Challenges and Obstacles Category 12: Adaptation and Problem Solving

sessions. The process ends with reflection and documentation of the students' progress. Um, who are present most of the time are the parents of the learner. And Sometimes, if our supervisor is present in school, Family members, guardians, they're very important because their support helps the child succeed. P5: I alternate between classroom observations, with check-ins with the learner and cooperative discussions with a special education team. General education teacher and occasionally relevant service providers during an average IEP day. K moments include analyzing data during the planning time. evaluating how the students implement adjustments throughout this instructions and discussing progress or issues during a short team discussion. So these instances enable me to see trends over time, release data to actual classroom conduct, and gain a deeper understanding of the learner's intellectual, social, and emotional development. P6: For us, And I get it a rated day, or we just were done with the collaboration of teachers, parents, and if the child is lucky, and can afford therapy, which is not pretty, but we can get a subsidy if they applied for some government offices. They must be present, worse, they are also just, of course, for the success of i.e. for. And it must be, we must have the process. Uh, that, what, what, what, what, what, what, what me our do? Of our goal, is it achievable? Our time frame, can we achieve at that, uh, specific time frame and also, uh, desserts died, then, specifically if the students are still including assuring. Also, the practice at school must be at home. to a check for its potential. Sometimes this is our big problem though, because, um, there are parents now. Um, they cannot continue. What we are practicing in their therapy and successful café. they are not threatened. Or they don't know how to do it at home. P7: IEP week starts with assessment learners needs, their special education teacher, and appearance of the dirt, right? Meet to discuss the result of the assessment in their plan based assessment resort. Those are the brainstorming of how they do is the ID. And the special ed teacher put them in that in performance, they will have to sign in a payment. After school, quarter, or quarter, the parents and the student will have another meeting to talk about achieving goals and whether to retain or redesign another goal for that. P8: In a week, we start on the 1st day setting goals and orienting them of our current lesson. Task to do for the week. On the 2nd day. Oh. I informed them of what to do, what the years you are going to use, like currently, we are learning to do heat press ironing. The their parents or guardians are informed of our activity, and I gauge their capabilities to do the task. Be it needed to be guided or prompted or independent. And then from the 3rd day until the 5th day of the week, We do application of our lesson. Firstly, my guidance until, with my guidance, until they can do it on their own little by little. With this, I am able to see how well they are able to follow my instructions. And if one or 2 learners cannot fully, I then adjust to what is suitable for their needs and ability. P9: Um, a typical IEP will involve gathering information from parents, therapists, assistants, and daily custom observations. I meet with parents to discuss the child strengths, needs and realistic goals at school and at home. I observe how the child uses skills during lessons, routines, and small group activities, while noting behavior and responses to strategies. All these inputs help me understand the child's progress more clearly and plan the next support. P10: Uh, typical IEP related week for me is built around small but meaningful moments in the classroom. For example, each morning I begin with beef check-ins as student arrived. I observe how they transition, whether they follow routines, communicate their needs, or if they show signs of frustrations. My paraprofessional is usually with me and we share quick notes about anything unusual. These early moments helped me assess each student's readiness to learn. During classroom instruction, I work alongside general education teacher. I move around to support students with IEPs, ensuring they use their accommodations, such as visual schedules, graphic organizers, or assistant technology. I pay attention to how independently they work and how they interact with peers during group tasks. This gives me real-time insight into how well they're assessing the curriculum. Later in the day, I conduct short targeted sessions with students. For example, I might work one on one with a student on reading fluency	c9 Equitability c22 Timelines c22 Transferability c3 Collaborative c1 Lesson orientation c1 Guided practice c3 Collaborative data collection c13 Skill tracking c5 Morning observations c9 Classroom support c3 Targeted data collection c9 Collaboration adjustment c19 Shared goal commitment c12 Prioritization c17 Feedback seeking c11 Disruption c4 Objective c8 Approach c17 Influence c13 Ambition c11 Variability c12	Contextual learning Trust building Wholeness Professional Observational learning Vigilance Category 2: Policy and Framework Alignment Policy strictness Predictability Policy Policy over learner focus Policy alignment Policy harmony Policy experience Policy impact Policy issue Policy adjustment Targeted adjustment Policy adaption needed Curriculum pacing Constraint Empowered policies Policy aligned adoption Role reframing Reinforced Independent Framework Routine data checks Teacher preparedness gap Dynamism Teaching framework Learner centered decision Structure Flexible policy Flexible policy use Practical policy implementation Reconceptualization Schedule accountability Standards Symmetry Narrative progress Law supremacy Compliance pressure Policy advocacy Policy aligned adaption Flexible implementation impact Exclusive education policy Systematization Safety priority Operationalization Output based Category 3: Resources and Tools Resources Diversity Progress pressure Resourceful adaption Platform Reinvestment Detection Endorsement Shared data tools Data grounded	Theme 5: Outcomes, Growth, and Holistic Development Category 13: Student Progress and Achievement Category 14: Strengths, Mindset, and Well-being Category 15: Collaboration for Holistic Outcomes Category 16: Reflection and Ethical Practice Theme 6: Teacher to Student Communication Category 17: Teacher-Student Interaction Category 18: Family and Stakeholder Communication Category 19: Professional Communication and Coordination Category 20: Student-Centered Communication Category 21: Holistic Development and Reflection Theme 7: Teacher Assessment Category 22: Data and Evidence Use Category 23: Reflection and Improvement
---	--	--	--

and or behavioral behavior regulation. These sessions are where I collect the most specific data, how many words they read, how long they stay engaged, or whether they can use a strategy with practice. A power professional may join to help take notes or support another student. Throughout the week, I also meet with related service providers, such as the SLP or the OT. We compare observations and adjust strategies when needed. I also communicate with families, sharing progress updates, or asking about patterns at home. But the end of the week, I review all the data, my notes, student, for examples, and team observations. These moments help me see the student's progress, clearly and decide whether we need to adjust sports, celebrate goals, or try an approach. IGQ2: Thinking about your most memorable IEP cycle. What was the plot park from start to finish? Such as initial goals, actions, YouTube, disruptions, and where did you feel the story took a decisive turn? Why did that moment matter to you? P1: Well, for the initial goal, the story usually begins with an IDP that appears solid on paper. But it's too needs to be cautious because it's too ambitious. Goals are technically measurable, carefully aligned with the current levels and designed to create sense of safety. For example, an increase on task behavior from 60 to 75%. Or improve written responses to a paragraph with sentence starters. So all of us, we sped teachers, or even all members of the IEP team would really want a success of that goals. However, that goal seems not achievable. Right? But it also depends on the present level of performance of the child. So the action taken was by the team was we diligently. And how would you call this? We diligently focused on the data collection. The consistency of the data collection accommodation were implemented with fidelity. The progress monitoring meetings happen on schedule. Yeah, I just want to add on that One what in terms of the complication, if there is a disruption, a parent said something like I feel like this work isn't real. Or they can, they can do more at this, they can do more than this at home. Sometimes those kind of comments, it challenges the team's assumption. For a moment the process stops. Not because people don't care, but because the script they've been following no longer works. So really sometimes when the parent or the caregiver give that kind of comment, sometimes the focus of the team or especially the teacher, fades away. P2: One memorable IEP cycle started with goals focused on improving a student's reading confidence and staying engaged during independent work. Things were steady at first, but then the student suddenly began avoiding reading altogether. After meeting with the family and team, we learned he felt embarrassed reading in front of others. The turning point came when I tried having him read privately and listen back to his own recording. Hearing himself succeed changed his attitude almost immediately. That moment mattered to me because it showed how understanding the student's perspective—and making one small adjustment—can completely shift their progress. P3: Initial goals, action, shield, YouTube, disruptions, and where did you feel the story took? a decisive turn. Why did that moment matter to you? In my most memorable IEP cycle, we began with lofty but reasonable goals. implemented targeted accommodations. And small group treatments. Also include negotiated interruptions, maybe. Like intermittent attendance and shifting family priorities. The critical shift came midway through the year, when revised progress monitoring data, in a classroom observation, revealed that the kid was alternal. But no boss, wait, wait, wait, I'm sorry. But, uh, mostly, using skills, we have expressly caught. The moment was important to me because it validated the strategy. Um, was working, strengthened my belief in collaborative decision making and uh, predependence and confidence. P4: One of my most memorable i.e. cycles started with a very simple goals, focus on communication and basic independence, because the student was shy and easily frustrated. I implemented constant proteins and use visual ease. But there were disruptions such as absences and moments of refuse out to participate. The decisive turn happened when the student successfully initiated a simple request without prompting	Adaption c1 Planning c11 Challenges c13 Progress c22 Evaluation c1 Planning c23 Validation c11 Dysregulation c8 Gradualism c4 Implementation c5 Skill retention c4 Independent step completion c7 Learner autonomy c3 Resource challenge c15 Collaborative success c7 Targeted intervention c5 Skill transfer c2 Policy strictness c3 Data use c10 Connection c10 Consultation c10 Reconciliation c2 Reconceptualization Structure c12	discussion Homeschool integration Progression Sustainability Data driven insight Empowered teaching Familiarization Investment Information sharing Recommendation Resource challenge Resource support Resource development Resourcefulness Materials Shared resources Shared tracking tools Provision Bridge Procedure Collaborative Data use Data driven insight Targeted data collection Collaborative data collection Documented adaptation Insightful data use Observation-skill Visual support Significance Diagnosis Result Effect Category 4: Teaching and Instructional Strategies Implementation Individualized focus Factual teaching Interest base learning Learner safety Strategies Honesty Practice improvement Objective preservation Readiness Competence Attainment Synthesis Structuring Behavior strategy collaboration Trustworthiness Priorities clarity Disclosure Communication Power influence Observation based assessment Delegation Literacy focused Alteration Completeness Adaptive implementation Enactment Empowered practice Differentiated instruction awareness Incremental progress
--	---	--

jury a classic activity. That moment mattered to me because it showed genuine confidence and independence, proving that the small strategy sent him work with parents were making a real difference. It shifted my mindset from snow progress to meaningful progress and motivated me to continue refining the plan. P5: So, in my most memorable IEP cycle, we begun softy but reasonable goals, implemented targeted accommodations, and small group treatments, and the shaded interactions like intermittent attendance, and shifting priorities. The critical ship came midway through the year when revised progress monitoring data, in a classroom observations, rebuild that the learner autonomously employing skills we have expressly taught. So the moment important to me because it is validated that the strategy was working, strengthening my belief in collaborative decision making, and the frame the learners, not just the terms of needs, but in the terms of gaining independence and confidence. P6: My most memorable ID recital begun with, of course, purposing on a bowl, basically, and behavior. As the students struggle with self, priggish, short, and really express their needs. I implement that visual support consistently and in close collaboration with parents and therapists. No, because this was slow enough, and the staff that they believe. The decides the turning point came, and the stood back, use a visual card to ask for help instead of having a meltdown. That moment matters to me because it shows real growth and beyond data. It proved that still he was living to communicate. It reminded me that time of the progress, a special education often happens in that small but in a final table. P7: Are, I mean, like, a ghost, conducting assessment, right? assessment result, and then selecting appropriate those. parent, nature, agreement, and finalization of IDP, i.e. the implementation, and then the final is the old people in you. The mention, above the mention, the part of the IEP cycle are equally important. It has a going to pop in the life of the learn. But if implementation is a decisive part of the side will. Whether you learn, if the goals are appropriate and you will be surprised, adjust, or make, or isn't need to change your strategies to achieve the goal. On the other hand, that it may review will give you a different type of fulfillment once you and your learner achieve that. P8: So to summarize, uh, since I teach learners whose age bracket is 18 to 25 years old, uh, so most of them are actually uh, livelihood program students. So my initial goal is that learners are able to follow complex 2 to 3 steps of instructions until retention. So, the action I took is, I do repetitive tasks, like product making for learner to remember, even without prompting, continuous familiarity of manipulatives we use for product making. Uh, task analysis, and then some disruptions that uh, we encounter or I encounter, is when Lerner is not in the mood. Other school related tasks are events like administrative works and non-compliance of the learners. The time it took a decisive term is when the learner was able to do the 1st and 2nd step without my prompt. So, for example, is the learner is aware it is one PM time already. So it is already time to get the materials for product making. And plug the extension for the glue gun. So this mattered to me because I knew the learner knows already the task to be done for the day. P9: One memorable, IEP. cycle started with basic goals for communications and self-health skills because a family had limited access to therapy services, progress was low at 1st due to limited resources, in behavior challenges. So strategies had to be adjusted often. The turning point came when parents became more actively involved and consistently followed simple interventions at home. This mattered because the child showed clearer progress. Proving that strong family support and school collaboration can make a real difference even with limited resources. P10: Hmm? Well, one of my most memorable IEP titles began with a student who struggled with leaving stamina and often avoided independent work. Our initial goal was simple. It's to help him remain engaged for a few minutes. at a time and to build confidence. I began with very short pullout sessions and used tools such as visual timers and positive reinforcement. There were disruptions, days when he shut down or required the plan to be adjusted. What we remain consistent. The turning point occurred during classroom activity, when he	Adaption c2	Differentiation Student centered	
	Framework c4	Emphasis Student engagement	
	Representation c11	Modified instruction Completion	
	Complexity c11	Scaffolding Hands-on	
	Limitation c2	Objective Assistance	
	Teaching framework	Development Targeted goals	
	c2	Knowledge Representation	
	Policy alignment	Independent step completion	
	c8	Independent use Independent practice	
	Flexible scheduling	Guided support Steering	
	c3	Hands-on learning Hands on strategy	
	Documented adaptation	Experimental learning Real life tasks	
	c2	Integration routines Applied learning	
	Policy harmony	Life skill implementation	
	c10	Clear communication Coordinated	
	Involved parties	communication Communication skill	
	c18	development Compliance driven	
	Positioning	communication Transparent	
	c10	communication Creative teaching	
	Contributors	Innovation Entrepreneurial thinking	
	c10	Proactive communication	
	Complementarity	Category 5: Observation and Monitoring	
	c11	Observation	
	Inconsistency	Balancing	
	c7	Balance documentation	
	Focus	Gains	
	c17	Comprehensiveness	
	Engagement	Observed progress	
	c10	Accessibility	
	Participants	Morning observations	
	c17	Direct observation	
	Connectivity	Assessment	
	c16	Performance monitoring	
	Continuum	Progress monitoring	
	c12	Progress tracking	
	Responsiveness	Progress observation	
	c11	Monitoring	
	Limitation	Work monitoring	
	c19	Plateau observation	
	Support network	Outcome	
	c18	Outcomes	
	Family-student impact	Learner recognition	
		Performance	
		Indicators	
		Improved outcomes	
		Reliability	
		Regularity	
		Routine dependence	
		Guided monitoring	

<i>volunteered to read a sentence aloud to his peers. It was a small moment, but it showed that the confidence we built in our one-on-one sessions was finally transferring to the general education setting. That moment mattered, because it showed real meaningful progress, not just in skills, but in self-belief. From there, his growth became steadier and more noticeable.</i> IGQ3: How do you narrate the relationship between district policies in your classroom practices? When implementing IEPs? Can you tell a story that illustrates alignment or attention, and how you navigated it? P1: <i>I once worked under a district policy that emphasized strict inclusion which created tension with the student who needed brief pull out for instructional reading.</i> <i>So what I did is I aligned the policy and practice by documenting the data, collaborating with IEP team and adjusting the schedule.</i> <i>So support state compliance while still the meeting while still meeting the students needs.</i> <i>So that experience showed me that clear communication and data bridge policy and classroom realities. So are you going to itmr? That's it?</i> P2: <i>I see district policies as the structure I work within, and my classroom practices as how I bring those expectations to life for students. One example was when the district introduced a new progress-monitoring requirement. The tool they wanted us to use didn't fully match how my students showed their skills, so it created some tension at first.</i> <i>I talked with my administrator, explained what I was seeing, and asked if I could meet the policy while also using additional classroom-based data. They agreed. That experience showed me that alignment is possible when I communicate early, stay flexible, and keep the focus on what helps students most.</i> P3: <i>In my opinion, the framework serves as the expectations, but plus, in fact, this is where those regulations become tangible and occasionally chaotic. One particularly tense moment was when I headed to strike a compromise between professional judgment and a compliance due to rigorous paperwork, timetable, and my need to modify the course based on daily student reaction. Managing that situation was important because it forced me to advocate more effectively. Align the policy's language with my teaching choices. And view the policy as something that can be carefully understood. In the students' best interests, rather than merely as a restriction.</i> P4: <i>In our context, there are no specific district policies that focus solely on IEP implementation, but we are provided with general guidelines on the IEP format from the national level. This guidelines serve as a basic framework, yet they are limited and often change depending on regional directions. Because of this, my classroom practices rely heavily on professional judgment, collaboration with colleagues and parents, and flexibility to meet each learner's needs. This situation sometimes creates uncertainty, but it also allows teacher to be more adaptive and student centered, implementing IEP.</i> P5: <i>In my opinion, serve as the framework that establishes expectations, but classroom practice is where those regulations become tangible and occasionally chaotic. One particular tense moment was when I had a strike, a compromise between the professional judgment and compliance to the irregular paperwork timetable, and might need to modify course based on daily student reaction. Managing the situation was important because it forced me to advocate more effectively, much the language of the teaching choices, and view the policy as something that can be carefully understood in the best interest of the learners rather than merely a restriction.</i> P6: <i>In the same, mam, we have a memorandum we follow. We abide by the home horizon. And we are being supervised, while we, our month, uh, we're looking by for and let's go and pick up. We are being monetized by our city club, of course, with the, um, of service, of favorite. Um, actually, some of the purposes I like people, so, um, it's hard to, um, navigate.</i> P7: <i>Yeah, we're, um, a republic that, uh, explained, I gave you preparation, but specific part is, part is coming from artistry. Well, we don't have that. No, the law also stated that the multidisciplinary disciplinary team to design the IE because we lack such a... This nature and the period are more likely the person involved, mainly in</i>	c15 Collaborative effect c6 Family insight c6 Collaboration alignment c11 Lack of progress c11 Lack of literacy skills c1 Instruction adjustment c11 Shift c11 Negative shift c23 Refinement c3 Significance c21 Broadening c12 Optimization c11 Difficulty c13 Achievement c17 Guidance c13 Milestone c12 Goal adjustment c1 Step wise independent	Influence use of hierarchy Observation- skill Limited experience Analysis Hierarchy influence Equity Category 6: Engagement and Collaboration Alignment benefit Collaborative evaluation Collaborative monitoring Dual roles Administrative support Standard collaboration Collaboration tool Fair collaboration Collaboration conflict resolution Convergence Collaboration alignment Collaboration need Cooperative planning Collaborative decision-making Flexibility need Inclusive team discussion Team alignment Team based planning Coordinator role Specialist accessibility Shared support Role Therapy collaboration Professional collaboration Partnership Joint accountability Collaborative accountability Family insight Relevance Belonging Goal linked discussion Category 7: Student-Centered Strategies Learner promotion review Abilities Learner focus Student needs Strengths focused Strengths Student centered impact Sharedness Introspection Individualization Individualized success Balanced collaboration Focus Strength focused Balance Self concept Life skills Personalized support Tailoring Targeted intervention Independence building Category 8: Differentiated
--	---	--

exchanging ideas about maybe about you. P8: So, our district and the Department of Education provide a capable curriculum guide for senior high school. So this is what we use, which is we use for guide for our teachings, since I teach transition young adult livelihood programs. So in turn, this also serves as one of my guideposts in implementing IEP goals. P9: Um, I narrate the relationship between policies and my classroom practices as one of alignment guided by shared goals for learner growth, for instance, when implementing an IEP focused on communications and socialization. Policy framework helped me structure clear, insurable goals that were embedded into daily crustum routines. By consistently using these routines for data gathering in progress, monitoring, my instruction remained um, compliant while responsive to the learner's needs. These alignments strengthen both accountability and meaningful support for the child. P10: Um, in my experience, district policies and classroom practices meet most clearly when I'm implementing IUP accommodations. One memorable example was when our district introduced a stricter policy on documenting minutes for pullout services. The policy required highly detailed blogs, but in my classroom, I was balancing real time student needs. Especially for a student who struggled within sessions and often required flexibility. At 1st there was tension, the policy required a fixed schedule, but the students need necessitated on adjusting sessions times based on his level of regulation that day. Rather than choosing one over the other, I work with my administrator to identify a solution. I retained the required documentation, but added brief notes, explaining the rationale for the adjustments and how they supported the IEP goals. The turning point came when the district reviewed my logs and agreed that the flexibility was appropriate because it was tied to student progress. That moment mattered because it showed that policies in classroom realities don't have the conflict. When communication is clear, they can actually support each other. It also reinforced my belief that the students needs should guide the practice. While policies help ensure consistency and accountability. If you want, I can make it even shorter. tailor it to a specific grade or level of this ability. Category. IGQ4: In your storytelling, who are the central characters that influence IEP outcomes? Example, students, family, specialists, general education colleagues, administrators, and how do these relationships share the narrative of the student progress? P1: Of course the center characters would be number one, the learner or the student itself. Second would be the members of the family. Third, the stead teacher and the gen ed teacher because these individuals are components because they collaborate to attain the goals. P2: The main "characters" in IEP work are the student, the family, the specialists, the general education teacher, and the administrator. Each one influences how the student progresses. The student guides the goals, the family gives important background, the specialists add expertise, the general education teacher shows how the student does in the classroom, and the administrator supports the process and resources. When these relationships are strong and everyone communicates well, the student's progress moves forward. When there's less communication, things slow down. The way we work together really shapes the whole story of the student's growth. P3: Um, characters, of course, the learners. At the center of the IAP, And the participation of families. Generally special education instruct stores, associated service providers. And of course, administrators who provide the support environment. These are the main actors in such narrative, I believe. It's relationship shapes the narrative families offer contacts and motivation, specialist contributes, contribute, experience, and data. And of course, coworkers assist in translating goals into daily practice. When these characters are insane, the narrative of students' advanced men. Appears to be consistent and optimistic. When they are not, the storyline gets more intricate, demonstrating how teamwork directly affects results. P4: I often consider the student as the central character, along with the people who are closest and most important to them, such as his or her family members. By focusing on these key relationships, I can better understand the learner's needs, strength, and challenges. This helps	c4 Independent practice	Approaches Differentiated communication Differentiated approach Collegial support Boundaries Real-world application Personal identity Approach Variable strategy effectiveness Flexible goal implementation Flexible scheduling Sequencing Gradualism Recalibration Unified decision making Tuning Adaptability Adaptation Functional Approaches Perspective Insight Perception Aiming Targetting Risk Reality	
	c3 Data driven insight		
	c5 Plateau observation		
	c1 Strategy effectiveness		
	c12 Instructional adjustment		
	c12 Multiple roles		
	c9 Alliance		
	c12 Modification		
	c23 Openness		
	c15 Integrated		
	c16 Continuity		
	c9 Cooperation		
		Category 9: Teamwork and Coordination Coordination Coordinated supports Coordinated support Cooperation Coordinated Planning Team responsibility Team balance Team guidance Parent- engagement Endurance Duty Teamwork Collaboration adjustment Collaboration impact Classroom support Equitability Collaborative feedback Communication Alliance Leadership School leadership influence Leadership support Professional collaboration Support Integration Synchronization Effective leadership impact Professional collaboration Cross team planning Support alignment Synergy Shared leadership Shared accountability	
		Category 10:	

<i>me connect more clearly to my student and ensures that their progress is supported by a strong collaborative network around there.</i> <i>P5: The learner at the center of the IEP, the family, the general, and the special education teachers associated services providers, and also the administrator who provide support environment are the main character in my narrative. So each relationship shaped the narrative. So, family opera context and motivations, and specialists contribute expertise and data, and coworkers assist the translate goals into a daily practice. When these characters are in sync, the narrative of a learner's assessment appears consistent and optimistic. When they are not, the storyline gets more intricate, demonstrating how they work directly affects results.</i> <i>P6: Of course, it was given that the students are the center partners of developing a lively. They are the beginning, they are the goal, and never the end. It always continues. Mainly because we are always up to go well to where they are starting and when they can progress, even though we already achieve IEP, there is always more. After achieving the goal. And How we navigate the IEP mostly base entirely on there? Like,</i> <i>P7: learners and families and intern play important role in the student progress. Of course, the, the IE people coming from the, the learner is, um, Need so, they played a really important part, whether the IE is, um, Is a good one. But is also the support of the family, played an important problem in this life. Whether the learning and um, progress is um, highly independent, but the support they receive from their body.</i> <i>P8: The central characters are the learners, their families, the doctor and the therapist and their previews advisors. Their support presents and thorough follow of procedures is what helps the learners do small, big improvements for themselves. It may not be immediate, but it is evident in weeks or months or within a year.</i> <i>P9: In my IEP story, the central characters are my ASD learners, the family and student, specialist, the school administrators, and myself, as the classroom teacher. The students responses and daily behavior, guide, all decisions, while the family levels of involvement and support strongly influences, consistency, and follow through of interventions. Specialists provide critical assessment insights. Administrators shape, generative by setting, expectations, and providing support. And when these relationships work collaboratively, students progress becomes steadier and more meaningful.</i> <i>P10: In my IEP work, the central characters, whose shaped student progress are the student. The family, the specialist, the general education teacher and my administrator. Each plays a distinct yet important role in the story. For example, I once worked with a student who struggled with behavior or regulation. The family helped me understand patterns at home. The SLP and OT provided strategies for communication and sensory needs. And the general education teacher shared daily classroom observations. My administrator supported scheduling and resources, so the plan could actually work. The turning point came when we all met to adjust the behavior plan together. Hearing everyone's perspectives help us develop a consistent approach across the home, services, and the classroom. After that meeting, the students in progress became steadier because the adults were finally aligned. That experience showed me that IEP outcomes aren't shaped by one person. They are shaped by strong relationships and shared commitment. When the characters collaborate, the students' progress story progresses.</i> <u>IGQ5: describe a moment when a data point or progress, measure, became a turning point in your story about a student's IEP. How did you interpret the data? And how did it influence your subsequent actions?</u> <i>P1: One turning point in my work with a student's IEP occurred during the mid year progress monitoring data for reading fluency. So the student's goal focused on increasing words read to read correctly per minute and for several months the data showed minimal growth despite consistent implementation of intervention. So at first glance the lack of progress was concerning. But a closer look at the data revealed pattern. The student performed significantly better during one on one assessment rather than during classroom based probes.</i>	c9 Support c18 Impact c17 Engagement c9 Synchronization c13 Advancement c16 Continuity c6 Collaboration need c6 Therapy collaboration	Stakeholder Involvement Family perspective Management Intervention Involvement Backing Collaboration Parent-engagement Family learner engagement Collaborative families Consultation Contributors Involved parties Rapport Collaborative problem-solving Participants Stakeholder input Supervision Awareness gap Connection Complementarity Team-based plan Reconciliation Negotiation Advocacy Category 11: Challenges and Obstacles Condition Uncertainty Rapid impact Parity Inequity Deference Hindrance Obstacle Miscommunication Bereavement Disruption Oversight Difficulty Hurdle Friction Disconnect Interruption Weighting Dispute Iniquity Mismatch Barrier Disparity Accommodation Inconsistency Complexity Limitation Variability Incompatibility Conflict Gap Disagreement Dissonance Strain Impactful Moderation Enablement Policy conflict Policy mismatch Pressure	
---	---	--	--

<i>So interpreting this data led me to realize that the issue was not solely the students reading ability but the instructional context and level of support.</i> <i>So the data suggested that the environment factors such distractions and length of task.</i> <i>So this insight became a turning point because it shifted my focus from increasing intervention intensity to just modifying how instruction and assessment should be delivered.</i> P2: For me, a key turning point for me was when a student's math-fluency score suddenly dropped after weeks of steady progress. Instead of assuming they were regressing, I looked at my notes and realized the student had been showing signs of frustration and rushing through work. That data point told me something deeper was going on. I adjusted by giving shorter practice sets, slowing the pace, and adding more guided support. Within a short time, the student's confidence and scores improved again. It mattered because it reminded me that data isn't just numbers—it helps me understand what the student needs and how to change my approach. P3: <i>A vital moment occurred when, despite persistent classroom difficulties, we were concerned about. Quarterly progress monitoring data revealed that the student had achieved the target far sooner than anticipated. The statistics, in my opinion, show that while the intervention technique was successful, the student needed additional opportunities to use the skill in different contexts. Consequently, I collaborated with the team to modify the IEP by adding more independence based resources and more deliberately integrating the objective interregular classroom activities.</i> P4: <i>A turning point came when a student who had been struggling to cooperate, follow instructions, and complete a simple task, like getting a specific item. Finally, did it correctly with minimal prompting. I saw this as proof that collaboration with parents and classmates, along with consistent routines and gentle reminders, was working. This small success encouraged me to provide more structured opportunities for routine practice, showing that even minor progress can guide the direction of instruction.</i> P5: <i>Pivotal moment of word when, despite the persistent difficulties in the classroom, that we are worried about, quarterly progress, monitoring data, reveal that the learners achieving a target far sooner than anticipated. The statistics, in my opinion, show that the well, the intervention technique was successful. The learner needs additional opportunities to use the skill in different contexts. Consequently, I collaborated with the team, that modified the IEP, and by adding more independence, based resources, and more deliberately integrating the objectives into regular classroom activities.</i> P6: <i>In a Philippine public school setting, a key turning point in a student's IEP was with pupils progress, monitoring showed a significant improvement in reading fluency after months of minimal teams. I need to pretend the data is evidence that the local lives intervention and mother mother tongue-based strategies aligned with that inclusive education framework were effective. This lead me terrify the goals, intensify the success strategies, and advocate for continuing support services for the sned.</i> P7: <i>when we see progress from learning as stated in the IP. That is when we change our goals for the better one.</i> P8: <i>So when the learner is able to follow and do a thus successfully, at least 2 steps, I am able to let them do it independently, and then proceed to guide them on to the next 3rd to 5th complex extractions. I see this as a success and note that the learner can proceed to do repetitive one product making without full assistance. All I have to do is monitor the quality of their work.</i> P9: <i>There was a moment when simple progress data, such as increased frequency, reduced prompted requests during routines. became a turning point in a student's IEP. I interpreted this not just as kiosk accusations, but as readiness to increase expectations and adjust goals. This data validated both the classroom strategies and the home interventions shared with the parents. As a result, I revised the IEP to include more functional communications targets and guided the family toward gradually fading supports, making the goal more meaningful and sustainable.</i>	c6 Coordinator role c9 Collaboration impact c3 Data driven support c12 Consistent strategy c6 Team alignment c11 Stagnation c14 Determination	Lack of progress Lack of literacy skills Regulation Rigidity Implication Consequences Negative shift Shift Saturation Miscomparison Stagnation Challenges Dysregulation Suppression Category 12: Adaptation and Problem Solving Adaption Adjustment Precision Professional growth Technique Adjustability Behavior intervention Orientation Comparison Accommodation Arbitration Consistent strategy Practicality Ingenuity Creativity Realignment Translation Modification Reflective adaption Recontextualization Root cause analysis Responsive adjustment Strategic timing Optimization Contextualization Instructional adjustment Multiple roles Impartiality Initiative Execution Application Embedding Real world application Experiential learning Practice integration Implementation of real-time data tracking Visibility Directive Presence Incorporation Adaptation Flexibility Contextual growth Differential pacing Simplification Responsiveness Decision making Prioritization Evidence based consensus Goal adjustment Transformative leadership	
--	--	--	--

P10: One turning point in an IEP cycle happened with a student working on reading fluency. For weeks, his progress, monitoring scores, stayed almost the same. Around 25 to 27 words per minute. Then one day, during a routine check, he suddenly read um, 34, 304 words per minute, with fewer errors. It wasn't a huge jump on paper, but it was the 1st clear sign that strategies we were using, short passages, repeated readings, and visual cues were finally connecting for him. I interpreted that data point as more than just a number. His confidence was increasing, and he was starting to take risks rather than shutting down. After seeing that change, I increased the difficulty slightly and added more opportunities for him to read in the general education classroom with support. That small data point shifted the whole story. It demonstrated that he was ready for the next step, and it helped me adjust instruction in a way that maintained his momentum. IGQ6: Share a story about a collaboration you had, or wish you had, with other professionals or families around the night. What roles did you assume, and how did the collaboration, or lack thereof, after the perceived outcomes for the student? P1: During one IEP cycle, I collaborated closely with a general education teacher, a spatial language pathologist, the psychologist of the child and the administrator and the family of the learner to support the student with ADHD and a language processing delay. So in this collaboration, of course, I assumed multiple roles. First, I acted as the facilitator helping structural meetings so all voices, especially the concern of the family, were heard. I also served as the data interpreter, translating the assessment results and classroom observations into practical implications for instruction. And finally, I took an advocacy role, ensuring that the student strength were centered in goal development rather than focusing on the deficits. I can see that you really are into your advocacy. P2: In my experience, One collaboration that stands out was with a student's family and the speech-language pathologist. The student was struggling with communication in class, and progress on his IEP goals had slowed. I took on the role of coordinator—I brought everyone together, shared classroom observations, and asked the family what they were seeing at home. The SLP added insight about how the student communicated during sessions, and the family shared strategies that worked well outside of school. Together, we adjusted his supports and added a few communication tools that made him more comfortable participating in class. Because we worked as a team, the student's progress picked up quickly. It showed me how strong collaboration can completely change the outcome. When everyone shares their perspective, the plan becomes more accurate and the student benefits. P3: Otter the perceived outcomes for the student. I work closely with the learners, parents, of course, as school, as psychologists. And a speech therapist during an IEP meeting. Serving as an active listener and classroom teacher to help connect classroom observations with family concerns. We linked in academic and behavioral tactics that were consistent, both at home and at school through open communication. And join goal setting. This excellent partnership maybe is a positively impacted the student's progress, resulting in increased engagement and more attainable, realistic IEP goals. P4: In one IEP cycle, I closely collaborated with a student's parents to support a learner who was struggling with following classroom routines. My role was mainly as the implementer of the strategies, while the parents continued the same routines at home. There were times I wish we had more access to specialists, but even with limited team members, the shared effort and tier roles help improve the learners' confidence and task completion. This experience showed me that strong family and teacher collaboration, even in a small IET team, can significantly shape positive student outcomes. P5: I work closely with the learner's parents, the school guidance, and there is speech therapist during an IEP meeting. Taking on the roles of the active listener and classroom teacher to assist a connect classroom observation with the family concerns. We link academic and behavioral tactics that were consistent, both at home and at school, through open communication and joined goal setting. So the learner's entire progress was positively impacted by this excellence partnership, which resulted in increased learners' engagement and more attainable,	c12 Goal adjustment c11 Disparity c12 Adjustability c4 Objective c17 Behavioral guidance c22 Understanding c22 Patience c3 Diagnosis	Category 13: Student Progress and Achievement Learner reflection Progress Participation Appreciation Success Independence Milestone Achievement Improvement Positive change Observable growth Independent achievement Independent performance Skill retention Skill tracking Skill transfer Better student outcome Behavior improvement Stability Autonomy Learner autonomy Student breakthrough Consistency Progression Ambition Performance Effectiveness Real-life outcomes Goal connection Progress & confidence Genuineness Targetted adjustment Targeting Advancement Development Category 14: Strengths, Mindset, and Well-being Dominance Behavior guidance Emotional professionalism Inclusive perspective Self concept Values Strengths Inclusive mindset Activation Empowerment Strength-based self regulation Belief in potential Optimism Morality Integrity Balanced Encouragement Sensitivity Recognition Awareness Veracity Humility Professionalism Diligence Persistence Capacity
--	--	--

realistic IEP goals. P6: After, the perceived outcomes for the student. I will, uh, we have a collaboration with a student, uh, educational. He's very informative, comprehensive, and very specific about the students, needs and interests, so we can have a, um, consensus about how can we achieve the fullest potential of the learner? Although I wish I had a collaboration and face-to-face meeting with the student therapies. If we, if we, I have a chance to collaborate with them, I can discuss that development and the changes or regression of the child in school and how it affects in the therapy and how it affects at home. P7: But I always wish to have other professionals to work with me in developing the IEP because of the learner. Because here in our school, we have 16 learner with special needs, and we are only 2 special education teachers. We don't have other professionals to work with, so it is difficult for me to develop a night eating alone. It is only me and the teacher, the parent, and the child who work with the IEP. I wish I could have more special education teachers, so we can divide the work for 16 learners, and I wish we have other professionals as stated in the law, such as the speech therapies or the other professionals to help us in developing the idea. Oh, I understand 16 is a lot for 2 people. P8: So for context, I'm actually have been teaching in the sped setting for 2 years now and ongoing. So the collaboration that I wish I had in my current setup is a nearby and partner therapy center for our learners, because a lot of recommended medical specialties, our learners need are from different cities. Sometimes this cause of financial restraint for our learners or parents or guardians because these are located farther from their own residences. P9: I recall an IEP where collaboration with the family and psychoeducational consultant, though limited in frequency, played across your role in the student's progress. I assume the role of coordinator translating assessment results into classroom strategies. And explaining them to the parents in practical, culturally appropriate ways. When communications was consistent, the child showed tear, uh, carry over of skills across settings. When collaborations was interrupted, progress slowed. This experience made me believe that even simple well coordinated collaboration can significantly improve outcomes. P10: A one meaningful collaboration I experienced was with the general education teacher and the student's family. The students struggle with task completion and often became unresponsive during writing activities. In my role, I collected data, observed patterns, and implemented various support. However, progress was slow. The turning point occurred when the family, the general education teacher, and I met, met to review the same data together. The family shared that the student felt overwhelmed by long writing tasks at home. So, and the teacher explained how the student avoided writing during class. I suggested breaking assignments into smaller chunks and adding visual steps. And the team agreed to try it consistently across home in school. Within a few weeks, the students' engagement improved noticeably. Um, and what made this difference wasn't just a strategy. It was the alignment. Everyone's understood the plan and used the same approach, which helped the student feel more supported and successful. That collaboration demonstrated how shared communication and consistent strategies can significantly altered the trajectory of a student progress. IGQ7: Tell me about the time when an IEP goal or accommodation did that kill the expected outcomes? What happened in the narrative? How did you interpret the results and what lessons did you take forward? P1: There was a time when a student had an IEP goal for writing longer paragraphs, but even after several weeks, the work wasn't improving. At first it seemed like the student wasn't trying, but when I looked closer, I realized the goal was too big and overwhelming. I interpreted the lack of progress as a sign that we needed to break the task down. We changed the goal to focus on writing one strong sentence at a time with clear structure. Once we did that, the student started making steady progress. The lesson I took forward was that if a goal isn't working, it's usually the goal or strategy—not the student—that needs adjusting. P2: In one case, an IEP goal was focused on improving reading	c12 Optimization c11 Disruption c11 Bereavement c23 Goal revision c4 Hands-on learning c17 Needs based observation c1 Flexible goal setting c12 Root cause analysis c1 Task modification c12 Reflective adaption c14 Strength-based c2 Standards c14 Sensitivity c14 Optimism c14 Morality	Resilience Self efficacy Confidence Fidelity Identity Joy Determination Student joy Mindset Inclusive belief Insight driven Category 15: Collaboration for Holistic Outcomes duality Responsible reporting Inclusion leaded success Integrated Collaborative success Collaborative adjustment Consistent support Consistent intervention Instance Trajectory Cohesion Collaborative effect Support alignment Inclusion Integrated support Inclusive success Unified support Growth Measurement Category 16: Reflection and Ethical Practice Ethical decision making Potential Increased initiation Authenticity Ethical communication Confidentiality Discretion Constructive Respectful assessment Moral communication Personal audit Credibility Bias mitigation Reflexivity Perspective adjustment Self-reflection Receptiveness Applicability Responsibility Truthfulness Transparency Accuracy Reporting pressure Obligation Accountability Compliance pressure Standardization Benchmarking Fairness Principles Policy tension Continuum Continuity Category 17: Teacher-Student Interaction
--	---	---

<i>comprehension by giving extended time on text, but the learner scores didn't improve. So the narrative showed that the student was struggling more with the coding and vocabulary than with the time pressure.</i> <i>So, interpreting the results. The accommodation didn't match the route needed the root knit.</i> <i>The lesson was to assess data quickly and just adjust the goals and the support to target the actual skill deficit rather than keeping a well intended but ineffective accommodation.</i> P3: In one case, an IEP accommodation for additional time on activities did not improve the students' performance, because of the underlying obstacle was difficulty understanding directions. Not task completion speed. After evaluating progress, statistics, and classroom observations, we identified the need for accommodations to focus more on simplified instructions and visual aids. I learned from this experience the importance of monitoring the effectiveness of IEPs, and being flexible when modifying objectives, and resources to meet students act one needs. P4: <i>There was a time when an IEP goal for post mainly on behavior, specifically helping a learner remain seated for a longer period during class activities. But that's expected improvement did not happen right away. In the classroom, the students frequently stood up, wondered or become restless despite reminders and taking arrangement. I interpreted this not as disobedience, but as a sign that the child might have sensory needs or difficulty with long sitting task. The lesson I learned was that behavior goes needed gradual steps and supportive strategies, such as shorter activity, intervals, movement breaks, and positive reinforcement, rather than expecting immediate compliance. This experience taught me that behavior progress is often slow and requires understanding the reason behind the action. Not just correcting it.</i> P5: <i>In one case, an IEP accommodation for additional time on activities, did that help the learners' performance? Since the underlying of stuff, I was really difficult, these understanding directions. Not the test completion speed. After evaluating progress statistics and classroom observation, we recognize the accommodations needed to focus more on simplified instruction and visual assistance. I learned from this experience, the importance is to keep an eye on the efficacy of IEP, and to be adjustable when modifying objectives and resources in accordance with the actual needs of the learners.</i> P6: <i>I mean, if the goal and accommodation were not achieved or not achievable. If the students family have an internal family problems that lead to lack of support and access to services. For example, is that one of our learners have, um, his mother, I diagnosed with, um, cancer. So just a few months ago, she died, so the learner cannot go, cannot come to school and therapy. So it causes regression to the child. So we have to step back because we observed that the regression of losing his mother has a large impact on the child. Even though the child is nonverbal, you can see, you can feel, and you can express, or, you can find, and on his face, now he's really looking for his mother, even though he cannot express it, everybody. So, you know, mom. So, well, it is one of our, uh, mind or my colleagues problems. that, um, that lead to problem also, but, you know, tapak, well, it's a family. It's not very, they didn't want, and we have talked that, with data for the children, or our learning, cannot, uh, move on, as well. It's either, it's hard to explain to them, and they cannot express freely. verbally, of course. Yeah. They are grieving, they are still grieving, and the child is missing the, you know, the love. Mm-hmm, the loss of a loved one. It's difficult for them to understand it.</i> P7: <i>When the IEP goal and the computation did not answer the expectant outcome, I tried to research for more strapped in use to reach the goal and be evaluate the goal if it is really achievable.</i> P8: <i>So narrative became stagnant. So I use different approaches of instruction until I find what is suitable to the learner. For example, the learner was not able to comprehend certain kitchen utensil scenes as he tends to forget them easily. I try to name them with pictures for familiarity, but it still did not register to him immediately for a month. So I tried again to introduce them by application in the kitchen, and it worked more than just naming them on a weekly basis.</i> P9: <i>And there was a time when I set the goal, a focus on academic</i>	c4 Emphasis c12 Intergrity c14 Balanced c14 Encouragement c12 Orientation c14 Integrity c9 Integration c1 Systematic	Engagement Interaction Instruction Guidance Student centered lens Needs based observation Influential communication Facilitation Influence Connectivity Feedback seeking Demonstration Active participation Social engagement Dialogue Behavioral guidance Student safety Category 18: Family and Stakeholder Communication Authority Involvement Consideration Vision Family input Discussion Family as data Family support Family-student impact Impact Family involvement Parental perspective Parental empowerment Parental involvement Authority Impact Positioning Advocacy Compromise Ownership Conflict resolution Sharing Sensitive communication Acknowledgement Category 19: Professional Communication and Coordination Dominance Evidence based communication Familial communication Predictable communication Consistent communication Expertise Homeschool partnership Structured collaboration Professional collaboration Uniformity Shared goal commitment Peer consultation Mediation Support network Support alignment Enabling structures Contribution Data driven advocacy
---	--	--

readiness, did not yet, um, did not yield the expected progress, despite consistent implementation in the classroom. In observing the students more closely, I realized that underlying communication and sensory needs, we're limiting the child's ability to engage with the task. I interpreted the outcome as a mismatch between the goal and the student's development, developmental readiness, rather than a failure of effort. The experience taught me to prioritize foundational and functional skills 1st and to remain flexible in revising goals based on the child's actual response. P10: I once had a student with an IEP goal focused on increasing on-task behavior during independent work. We implemented accommodations, such as visual schedules, a timer, and frequent breaks. But after several weeks, the data showed almost no improvement. His on task time remained approximately the same percentage, and on some days it even decreased. At first, it seemed like the strategies weren't working. But when I look closer at the data in my nose, I realize the issue wasn't motivation. It was a task, it was the task where still too overwhelming for him. The accommodations provided structure, but they didn't address the root cause. The work needed to be broken down further. I adjusted the plan by giving him shorter, more manageable steps, and adding quick check ins to celebrate small wins. Once we made that shift, his engagement started to improve. The lesson I took forward was that when an accommodation doesn't work, it's not a failure. It's information. It reminded me to look beyond the surface, interpret the data with curiosity, and be willing to redesign support so they truly match the student needs. IGQ8: How do your personal beliefs, professional identity, and ethical consideration shaped away? You tell stories about IEPV progress and student outcomes. Can you give an example of a narrative you tell yourself or others that reflect this? P1: My belief in the learner's dignity and growth shapes how I frame IAP stories around progress, not the deficits. For example, instead of saying the student failed to meet the goal, I narrate it like make steady gains with current supports and need adjustment strategies. It reflects my ethical commitment to hope, accuracy, and continuous improvement. I see that you're applying the appreciative inquiry approach. P2: My personal beliefs and ethics guide me to talk about IEP progress in a way that is respectful and focused on the student's strengths. I see myself as someone who supports and advocates for students, so I try to tell their stories in a way that highlights growth, not just challenges. For example, if a student is making slow progress, I don't say "they're behind." Instead, I say, "They're growing steadily, and here's what's helping them move forward." That kind of narrative reflects my belief that every student deserves to be seen in a positive, fair, and hopeful way. P3: My personal belief in student dignity and growth combined with my professional obligation as an educator. Motivates me to interpret IEP. Well, I APTails with a strength based, an ethical perspective rather than focusing only on weaknesses. When when discussing progress, I emphasize effort, small gains, and contextual factors such as saying, or telling the student is developing independence with support instead of the student is behind. This approach helps ensure that my narratives remain respectful. Accurate, and motivating for families and professional involved. P4: My personal beliefs, professional identity, as a snag teacher, and ethical consideration guide me to tell, i.e. stories with honesty, respect, and a focus on the learner's strength, rather than just their challenges. I view progress not only in academic terms, but also in behavior, effort, and self-regulation. For example, instead of saying the student cannot stay seated, I would narrate it as the student is gradually able to remain seated for short periods and response well to gentle reminders, which acknowledge improvement in entertaining. This approach helps parents and colleagues take small but meaningful growth, and it reminds me to focus on supporting the learner's potential. rather than enabling their difficulties. P5: My personal belief in learners, dignity and growth combine with my professional obligation as an educator. Motivates me to interpret IEP tales with a strength base and ethical perspective rather than focusing only on a weaknesses. When discussing progress, I emphasize	c3 Sustainability c14 Recognition c14 Belief in potential c7 Strengths focused c21 Holistic progress c5 Indicators c13 Independence c1 Revision	Advocacy communication Professional contribution Home-based learning Category 20: Student-Centered Communication Centeredness Students prioritized Student advocacy Student-centered lens individuality Individual progress Personalization Differentiated approach Targeted strategy Effective practices Supportive effectiveness Comprehension Comprehensibility Support given Mentoring Inclusivity Supportive structures Category 21: Holistic Development and Reflection Holistic progress Holistic success Holistic outcomes Strengths framing Confidence Functional Assumptions Behavior Joy Broadening Independence building Narrative of growth Opportunity highlighting Self concept Individualized success Skill integration Individualized focus Skill application Independence focus Positive collaboration Progress assumptions Resolution Story driven Category 22: Data and Evidence Use Data driven insight Data driven support Data informed support Timelines Transferability Understanding Patience Evidence Evidence based narrative Evaluation Tracking Records Documentation Clear documentation Accurate reporting Precise reporting	
---	---	--	--

<i>independence with support, instead of student is behind. This approach helped me to ensure that my narrative remains respectful, accurate, and motivating for both families and...</i> P6: <i>My personal beliefs, personal, 1st professional, identity, and ethical consideration, shaped the way I felt story about IEP, my focus, focusing on advocacy, especially during the Philippines. Um, we have a lot to work, so that even the teachers in the regular class, nah, they will embrace the linen. Now, with special education, it's in their classroom. We have so much think to do. And to identify these services that we are offering, and that equity rather than just compliance. That's about, we have score, formative exams that we are, that are the standards. Now, Majo Mahirap for the learners, with special education moods. So, I often frame students outcome as a reflection of systematic support, not just individual effort, and I tell myself, and others that meaningful progress happens when the learners with special education rates are generally integrated into mainstream education. This narrative reflects my beliefs that in the building, there is a strong need to further integrate, intensify inclusive practices. And a lot in bigger budget, to be on sustainable service, that's for learners, not just the subsidy itself.</i> P7: <i>I'm using my personality, professional identity, and is the kind of continental relation. I have to make sure that the stories I put in the Pupus, IE, will reflect the Pupus, authentic performance. I always believe that the progress, no matter how small it is still a progress. So I make it a point that the IEP of the learner celebrate those small victories.</i> P8: <i>Um, if you do not mind, I would like to skip this question.</i> P9: <i>Um, I believe every child with ASD can make progress with dignity, patience, and the right to support. Um, right support, I mean, this belief shapes how I interpret and share IEP stories, when experience since 1997, I focused on growth, over limit, or over time instead of deficits. I ensure minorative are fair, respectful, and based on observable data. I often frame, progress as celebrating small wins, like more engagement or independence while advocating for the child's best interest. She got lost.</i> P10: <i>Of my personal beliefs and professional identity, shape how I discuss IEP progress. As I always aim to honor the student's dignity and to focus on growth rather than deficits. Ethically, I believe every student deserves to have their story told in a way that highlights their strengths and potential. Even when the data shows challenges. One example is a narrative I often share about a student who struggled with behavior regulation. Instead of saying he was always off task, I I framed the story around his effort. He worked hard to use his break card and stayed engaged longer than last week. That shift reflects my belief that progress is not just numbers. Small steps, persistence, and students lived experience. This mindset guides how I communicate with families and colleagues. I make sure the story I tell is honest, databased, and respectful. It helps build trust and keeps the focus on what the student can do and how we can support them moving forward.</i> IGQ9: When you reflect on the impact of the instruction and accommodations, what elements do you highlight as evidence of growth or ongoing challenge? Please describe a concrete scene in which you recognize student improvement or stagnation. P1: <i>I focused on observable behaviors and data such as independence, accuracy, and consistency over the time. In one scene, a learner who previously did sentence starters completed a writing task independently with a clear structure.</i> <i>It shows growth of course. However, in contrast, another student showed the repeated errors across so it signals stagnation and the need to adjust instruction</i> P2: <i>When I look for evidence of growth or ongoing challenges, I pay attention to how independently a student works, how consistent their performance is, and how confident they seem.</i> <i>A clear moment for me was during a writing activity. A student who usually needed help to start a sentence picked up their pencil and wrote the first line on their own. That showed real improvement. But when it came to writing the second sentence, they stopped and waited for support. That told me the challenge was still there.</i> <i>Seeing both the progress and the struggle in that moment helped me understand exactly where to adjust my instruction.</i>	c5 Observation c5 Performance c13 Improvement c13 Effectiveness c13 Positive change c5 Monitoring c13 Progress c13 Stability c23 Reflection	Transparent reporting Verification Outcome based Category 23: Reflection and Improvement Context Reflection Instructional reflection Insightful monitoring Self reflection Reflective practice Critical self awareness Humble reflection Perspective awareness Feedback Feedback integration Refinement Gatekeeping Goal Revision Openness Mentorship Appraisal Restriction Review Validation	
--	--	---	--

P3: This describe a concrete scene. in which you recognize the student improvement or stagnation. I use data from progress tracking, observed behaviors, and the student's degree of independence over time. So reflect on instruction and accommodations. I remember a day in class when a learner who had previously required continuous reminders, was able to finish a routine task. Utilizing a visual plan with just one reminder, demonstrating a noticeable improvement. However, ongoing difficulties during unstructured activities reminded us that focused assistance was still required in less predictable environments.	c13 Observable growth		
P4: When reflecting on the impact of my instruction and accommodations, I highlight both observable behaviors and participation as evidence of growth or ongoing challenge. For example, I remember seeing during a morning life skill session where a student who usually left their seat multiple times, was able to stay succeeded for an entire 10 minutes. Activity with only one gentle reminder. I recognize this as clear evidence of improvement in self-regulation and attention, showing that consistent prompts and positive reinforcement were effective. At the same time, I also note moments when the student still struggles, such as standing up during longer group activities, which signals the need for continued support and skill building.	c13 Independent achievement		
P5: I use data from progress tracking, observed behaviors, and the degree of independence, the learners exhibit over time to reflect on instructions and accommodations. I remember a day in a class when a learner who had previously required continuous reminders, was able to finish a routine task, utilizing a visual plan with just one reminder. So, demonstrating an official improvement. However, continuing difficulties during instructed activities served, as a reminder that focus assistance was still required in a less predictable environment.	c5 Work monitoring		
P6: I highlight independence, engagement, and the learner's ability to apply the skills, as the key evidence of growth, while ongoing challenges often show in consistency or general inattentiveness across that is. A conquered sea that stands out was when the learner who previously needed constant prompts. Completed the task entirely on their own, independently for the 1st time. That moment clearly shows progress, in foreseeing the textiness of danger destruction. and accommodation. but also highlighting areas that still need support. As I said earlier, mam, although we achieved the goal in the given time frame that we have, there is always a lot more that we need to do in the for the students with special education. Oh yeah, we never run out of what we want them to learn. It's always a lot.	c12 Responsive adjustment		
P7: It is describe a concrete scene in which you recognize student improvement or instagnation. But my few people who are shy started to participate in group activity without quite overhand assistance. I believe that is a progress with the pupil, the problem, and find motor, and finally, hold lease or her pencil, I consider it a progress.	c23 Instructional reflection		
P8: Uh, come here thing in which I recognize student improvement is independence to do classroom tasks without my assistance. So during our product making practice, some of my learners are able to do pipe cleaner flowers without my assistance anymore. So they can do this from start to finish. I just monitor the quality of their work to see if they were able. They were indeed able to do all these steps correctly.	c4 Independent use		
P9: Um, I closely observe student engagement, independence, and responses to routines to uh, gates progress. For example, a students who once need a full physical prompts could follow every, uh, retained with minimal verbal cues, showing improvement. At other times, this engagement signals a need to adjust sensory or communication supports. This observation guides medications and remind me that progress is gradual and may differ from person to person. Okay, thank you for that.	c14 Veracity		
P10: When I reflect on my instruction and accommodations, I look closely at small observable behaviors. How independently a student uses a strategy, how long they stay engaged, or whether they can transfer a skill from our small group work to the general education classroom. One scene that stands out was during a writing block. A student with an IEP go for task initiation typically required several prompts to initiate the task. That day, I placed his visual checklist on his desk and stepped back. Instead of waiting for me, he looked at the 1st step, picked up his pencil, and began writing on his own. It was only a few sentences, but it was the 1st time he initiated without adult	c15 Trajectory		

<i>prompting. That moment showed clear growth. Accommodation was finally becoming a tool he could use independently. It also helped me adjust my next steps. Fading prompts, increasing expectations slightly, and giving him more opportunities to practice independence. Scenes like the, like that, help me um, both see both progress and areas that still need support. And they guide how I refine structure moving forward.</i>	c15 Cohesion		
IGQ10: <u>Looking ahead, what is the ideal story you hope district leaders and stakeholders hear about IEP implementation and student outcomes. What changes in front of this? Policy or support, we do place into your narrative to improve how a story is of success, I told.</u>	c18 Vision		
P1: <i>The ideal story is that IEPs are living documents that lead to a meaningful measurable growth for students, not just like compliance. I would highlight the stronger collaboration collaboration time for teachers,</i>			
<i>better progress monitoring tools, and flexible policies that would allow the team to respond quickly on the data so the students success stories are accurate, equitable and sustained. Okay, we go to the part Research Guide Question number two in what ways?</i>	c9 Cooperation		
P2: <i>The ideal story I hope district leaders hear is that IEPs are being implemented well and that students are truly growing—not just on paper, but in confidence and independence. I want them to see that when teachers, families, and specialists work together, students make real progress.</i>			
<i>To make that story stronger, I would include more time for collaboration, clearer guidance from the district, and better training and resources for staff. With those supports in place, it becomes easier to tell honest, positive stories about student success.</i>	c18 Acknowledgement		
P3: <i>In the future, I hope district leaders understand that IEPs are living documents. that guide day-to-day instruction and lead to significant students centered development. In this narrative, teachers are well supported with time for collaboration, access to specialists, and ongoing learning to apply accommodations with fidelity. I would highlight policy and practice improvements, the tension data informed, reflection with the familiar partnership. And shared accountability. So success stories represent continuous growth rather than isolated successes.</i>	c2 Dynamism		
P4: <i>Looking ahead, the ideal story, I hope, district leaders and stakeholders here is one where IEP implementation truly truly reflects each student's growth, not just in academics, but in behavior, independence, and confidence. supported by a consistent and collaborative team. I would highlight a narrative where teachers, parents, and administrators like our principal, work closely together, where progress is celebrated in small steps, and where accommodation are flexible to match the learner's needs. To improve how stories of success are told, I would include clearer guidelines and consistent frameworks from the national, more access to specialists, or training for teachers and better communication channels. So achievements, big or small, can be recognized and shared accurately.</i>	c14 Persistence		
<i>Showing the real impact of our efforts on the learners' life.</i> P5: <i>In the future, I hopefully there's here about how IEP are living documents that direct day-to-day instruction and result in significant learner center development. So in this narrative, teachers are well supported with time for collaboration, access to specialists, and ongoing learning to apply accommodations with fidelity. I would highlight policy and practice improvements, the tension data in form reflection. Family, partnership, and shared accountability to so act success, story represent continuous growth, rather than isolated successes.</i>	c17 Engagement		
P6: <i>And hope the leaders and the stakeholders feel the success story that highlights meaningful students grow. And independent. And possibly being part of inclusive practices, not just, um, we always hear the, uh, people of Manala. It's. Okay. Spend the mañana. Pero, papping for nutrition special education. We always, um, palong dehydrated type of, we purchase the type of time going up to Denver. Although not the inclusive educational, which is not Kailan, the Nikupa, Ganikupa. So, there are students, the next and the same, the same person education, and I hope the teachers, the practitioner, the stewards, um, special education, especially the stakeholders, even the LG. Um, But in Ignila. So, not just speech, project, and budget. And also, um, IRR, Yon pong, Paano Bagagaguinamanga pictures. That's</i>	c14 Capacity c3 Progression c3 Resource support		

it, parents, um, parents always see the evidence of the pictures. But we also support service that here. Although we want work for our learners. Use services, and hit up on that, because we're gonna slowly sleep for them. But we can give advised for the parents. That's the only thing we can do, but after that, well, you cannot be involved in anything more. Just advise. And Shanamariniku in a mama stakeholder, it's not enough. Kyapala, although, mera, nakuma, ibangsi, pristitas, I have been little subpoenas, na, mera, na, telagasila. We have a lot more to do, Papo. We can up the private entities for support. I did that. So you try, and you'll be able to get support from them. They just need to be tough because sometimes they do not know. They want to help, but they don't know how to help. But it's out, you will be able to be supported. So, um, no, for that agent. P7: I am hoping that our district would hire professionals that will help us develop the learners through IET. Such as the behavioral therapies, the location of therapies, because it is stated in our law. Developmental brain generations such as Them who gives free consultation and provide us a team that we can talk about the development of the learners, i.e.p A. I also wish for the district of developing classroom, which are friendly to children, with this ability, where they don't have to. In my part, I don't have a toilet inside the classroom. So they go out. They go up, find the cluster, find toilet for their nature's needs. So it is difficult for me to find the children, the children when they are, um, when, uh, when they roam around our compass because it is a very big up. So that's why I wish I could have the, uh, ideal design of the classroom. This problem I eliminated. P8: So what I would like is post support and recognition of special needs learners. Although we have this, it is not just 100% as not all specialists are available, and not all teachers and administrations are aware of what importance I.E.P. hold for each learner. So there are not enough seminars or sessions done on a yearly basis to educate or refresh facilitators on how IEP should be done uniformly. So, this facility just could be in both the setting of the general education. Department and the special education department. So, not a lot of variety of specialists as well, like the occupational therapies, physical therapies, speech therapies, or behavioral therapies, and other more, are closely accessible in our district, as some are located a few cities away from the learners' residences. P9: Um, the ideal story, I hope, leaders and stakeholders here in is one where IEPs are a blueprint to help the students learn and succeed, regularly reviewed, realistically implemented and supported by adequate training and resources. I hope leaders hear a story of honest, clear, and meaningful student progress that reflects both successes and challenges. In this story, success is ensured not only by academic targets, but by functional independence and quality of life. P10: Looking ahead, the ideal story, I hope, district leaders hear about IEP implementation is one where students are truly supported. Teachers have the time and the tools they need, and families feel like equal partners. In that story, IEPs aren't just documents. We see them as living plants that guide meaningful instruction and view of progress. If I could shape their narrative, I would highlight a few changes. First, I'd want more protected time for collaboration, so teachers, especially specialists, and families can align strategies instead of rushing through meetings. Second, I'd hope for clearer, more flexible policies that allows us to adjust support based on student needs, without getting stuck and rigid schedules or paperwork demands. And finally, I'd want stronger access to training and resources. So accommodations are implemented consistently across classrooms. In the story, I imagine success is measured not only by data points, but by students gaining confidence, independence, and a sense of belonging. That's the kind of narrative I'd want district leaders to hear. One where system supports the work happening in classrooms, and every student's progress is recognized and celebrated.	c5 Learner recognition c10 Awareness gap c3 Shared resources c6 Specialist accessibility c21 Holistic outcomes c6 Partnership c2 Flexible policy c21 Holistic success		
RGQ2: IGQ1: Can you tell a story about a time when a district IEP policy or procedure felt at odds with what you could realistically implement it in your classroom? What choices did you make, and why? P1: A district procedure required daily documentation of the accommodation that wasn't realistic during an active instruction. So I prioritized delivering the accommodations consistently and			

collected brief weekly data instead. Then I communicated it with the admin administrator. So I made that choice to protect instructional time while still honoring the intent of the policy and the students. P2: There was a time when the district required a specific progress-monitoring tool every week, but it didn't match how my students learned. Using it exactly as written would have taken too much time away from teaching. I chose to follow the rule by submitting the required data, but I also collected my own classroom data that was more useful. I explained this to my administrator so they understood why I was doing both. I made that choice because I wanted to stay compliant, but I also needed information that truly supported my students' learning. P3: To create flexible classroom routines that better meet students immediate needs. features frequently reinterpret IEP palysis. This can result in more useful and responsive education. I remember a period when a mandatory accommodation called for one on one assistance, which was not always available. The preserve may be access to learning. I changed my strategy by using peer help and visual scaffolds. These toys help the student remain engaged. And make progress. Showing how smart adaptation and may positively impact results even within policy limits. P4: There was a time and fallacy emphasized using the inclusive learning resource center from RA11650 to support net learners, but our division did not have one. Implementing the policy as written was impossible, so I had to adopt by creating a small resource reach corner in my classroom or an area near my classroom where learners could access materials, visualties, and learning things. I also coordinated with the parents to provide additional support during classroom activities. This choice allowed me to follow the spirit of the policy, providing targeted support while making it realistic and practical for a school setting, ensuring that the learners still receive the guidance they needed. P5: So, in order to create, flexible, classroom routines, that better meet the learners' immediate needs, teachers, frequently reinterpret the IET. So this can be resolved, is more useful and responsive education. So I remember a period when I mandatory accommodation called for one-on-one assistance, which was not always available. So in order to preserve access to learning, I changed the strategy by utilizing peer help and visual couples. This choice helped the learner may engage and make progress. showing how smart adaptation may positively impact results, even within the body limits. P6: Um, there's a, there was a time that the, if everybody involved, nah, there will be a palace really mandated, 3 point painting stuff, it is that didn't match my student abilities for PC, making it hard to follow or plan exactly. I will always choose to follow up a life and start where are my students. That's a, that's, that's the beginning for, yeah, an advance against a whole, voila la, and I just followed blindly, and it's not acceptable, especially for students with special education. So, I always choose to lock a line. And, um... The instruction must be specific. Even though we have a uniform policy, we can always have a specific for them. And that is called accommodation and and it's so important. I'm starting with the students and adopting activities that, um, really, there is, this approach allowed me to stay through to the spirit of the idea, while ensuring the need, colder, enrichment in the process. Yes, ma'am. So, yeah, right. P7: From there are other advocates here, in the building, who interpreted the law, that all learned there, regardless of disability, be put inside the classroom where there is full age. Of course, I, as a spread teacher, wish them this, but again, the reality, there are children that do not benefit in this practice. When I place one of my learner, we notice it in this, in this year, I had numerous report that he goes out of the class to use the toilet and never came back. So this is out of stress, the regular teacher, because our school is speaking up, as I mentioned earlier, our response is being that she had difficulty in finding the child. We have all the personnel teacher involved in search of the child. And because of this, in spite of all the intervement without doubt, We only put him in danger when he is in typical learners environment. It wasted so much resources to keeping them safe. But in spite of my love, we finally decided that he be placed in fashion education plus with a smaller group, by a special	c13 Student needs c11 Dissonance c8 Adjustment c14 Balance c12 Responsiveness		
--	--	--	--

and big for their monitors, to wear about... P8: So, we have our have 12 curriculum, which should be followed accordingly. So our sned teachers, our special needs education teachers, pointed out that it can be followed, but it cannot be done at the same pace as a general education department. As our learners have a diverse multi-instructional approach for them to understand it. So school principles, in turn, understand and are aware that our lesson loves have different PCs. So because they were informed and we talked with our school principal about it, they also know that as long as these goes are achievable and clear, then it is all right. P9: Um, the district IEP policy was generally supportive and clear. However, limited time and resources sometimes made full implementation challenging. I adjusted by focusing on the most essential goals in incorporating them into the daily routines. This allowed me to follow the policies while still meeting my learners need. P10: There was a time when our district required very strict fixed schedules for pullout minutes. On paper, it made sense for accountability, but in my classroom, it didn't match the needs of a student who struggled with transitions. If I pulled him out at the exact schedule time every day, he often became dysregulated, and the session wasn't productive. I felt the policy and the reality didn't align, so I made a choice. I still met the required minutes, but I adjusted the timing slightly based on when he was most regulated. I documented everything clearly, why the change was needed, how it supported his IEP goals, and what progress I observed when the title was flexible. This approach ensured compliance with the policy while honoring the student's needs. It taught me that when procedures feel at odds with good practice and clear communication and thoughtful documentation can reach the gap. The student made better progress, and this trick ultimately supported the decision because it was grounded in data and student will be. IGQ2: When you encounter policy practice dentures. What is your difficult decision making process for prioritizing student needs versus adhering the district procedure? Walk me true, a concrete example. P1: Walk me through a concrete example. I start by identifying the students immediate instructional needs, then check on the non negotiables of the policy. For example, when a pacing guide conflicted with the learner's IEP reading goal, I slowed the instruction for the child Document I document. I document the rationale with data and collaborate with the team to stay compliance to stay compliant while prioritizing the progress. P2: When policy and practice don't match, I focus on two things: what the student needs and what the district requires. I try to follow the rule, but I also look for flexibility so the student doesn't lose support. For example, the district once required a certain reading check every week. For one student, the tool caused stress and didn't show their real skills. I looked at the policy, talked with my administrator, and learned I could still submit the required data while also using my own classroom checks. This let me stay compliant while giving the student what they actually needed. P3: Pictures often reconstruct IEP policies by converting them into practical routines, but respect the plants objective while beating classroom reality. When I meet policy practice tensions, I prioritize the students' immediate learning needs by discussing the IEP team. Documenting my revisions and adapting alternative support. That achieve the same aid. For example, when, um, requested accommodation could not be provided exactly as a specified due to staffing limitations. I used visual aids and structured peer support, which kept the student engaged and demonstrated continuous progress. P4: When I counter policy practice tensions, my 1st step is to ask what will most directly benefit the students' learning and well-being. Then I consider how to meet policy requirements without compromising that support. A concrete example is the district policy or the national policy encouraging the use of inclusive learning resource center to support SNED learners. But RCT does not have one. So following the policy exactly was impossible. So I prioritized student needs by, again, creating a small resource area in my room with visual aids, learning materials, and structural activities. I also reached out to stakeholders, including parents, colleagues, and our principal, to provide additional	c12 Creativity c11 Limitation c4 Innovation c2 Practicality c12 Responsiveness c11 Limitation		
--	---	--	--

support and resources that will normally be available in an ILRC. This approach allowed me to follow the intent of the policy while providing realistic student centered support that could actively be implemented in our session. P5: Pictures often reconstruct IEP policies by converting them into practical proteins that respect the plan's objective while fitting classroom reality. When I meet policy, practice tensions, I prioritize the learners' immediate learning needs by discussing the EP team, documenting my revisions, and adapting alternatives support that achieve the same aim. For example, when I requested accommodations, could not be delivered exactly as specified over the staffing limitations, I employed visual aids and instructed fear support, which resulted in the learners being engaged and displaying continuous progress. P6: Lock me to, I can't critics. Oh, Teresa Levard. They're like encounter part. I stay calm, to assess the situation, because we're not, we cannot assess, uh, tension, it where also tends. Discussing the options with my colleagues and supervisor, violent students need, with, um, the leaders. For example, when a palace you require a standard assessment, my students were that my students weren't playing for it. I adhered to the documentation requirement. Well, starting lesson with the current level. This approach ensures compliance while still meeting my students needs. Posters, both growth, and accountability. P7: For example, I have given earlier, um, I will always consider the safety of the people. What is the need of the pupil? We always make sure that the pupil is the center of all the planning, of all the decision making that we are going to do. P8: So when we encounter, sorry, when I encounter policy practice tensions, so I, along with others, not teachers, discuss it with our master teachers and faculty. Once concerns are laid out and alternative solutions or methods are discussed, the matter teacher in turn discussed, discuss this with our school principal. Most of the time, it relates to the capable curriculum guide, topics, and objectives. Example, I follow the entrepreneurship curriculum guide. Objective sellers are divided according to the ability of the regular learners from the senior high school department. So I modify this lessons in a much slow-paced teaching, as one objective may take a week to teach compared to 2 to 3 objectives that is indicated to be achieved within a day or two. My school principal, in turn, approves of this understanding that this is what my learners can achieve. P9: When IEP requirements conflicted with a learner's readiness, I 1st assessed the child's immediate needs and adopted my approach. For example, if a child couldn't follow a one-stop command, I focus on building the skills through modeling and reputation. While still documenting progress according to IAP, the guidelines, this ensured the child's grill growth without neglecting neglecting district procedures. P10: When I face tension between district procedures and what student actually, my decision making process always start with the student, then moves to compliance. I try to honor both, but I begin by asking, what approach will help this student make real progress right now? When I then I look for a way to stay aligned with the policy, through documentation and communication. A concrete example was when our district required pullout minutes to happen at the same time every day. One of my students, however, became dysregulated during that exact time because it overlapped with a difficult transition in the general education classroom. If I follow the schedule strictly, the session wasn't productive. The process was, um, First, observe the problem. The student wasn't benefiting from the scheduled time. And in 2nd, collect the data. I noted patterns in behavior and engagement. Third, just adjust for the student. I shifted the pullout session by a few minutes, So when he was more regulated. Ford, I documented everything. I recorded the minutes, the reason for adjustment, and improvement in engagement. And in 5th, communicate. I inform my administrator and the general education teacher so everyone understood the rationale. This approach allowed me to meet the student's needs while still honoring the district's expectations. The student made better progress, and the district supported the decision because it was grounded in data and clear communication. IGQ3: How do you narrate the moment you recognized a misalignment between policy and practice? What indicators (data,	c12 Ingenuity c11 Mismatch c20 Personalization c14 Fidelity c2 Policy issue		
--	--	--	--

observations, feedback) signaled to you that adaptation was necessary? P1: Well, I narrate it as a moment when the learner data and daily observations stopped matching the intent of the policy. Indicators like slow progress and slow progress monitoring in your students frustration and feedback from the support staff signaled the mismatch. That combination is made it clear that adaptation was necessary to better serve the student while still honoring compliance. P2: I usually notice a misalignment when the policy says one thing, but the student's progress or behavior shows something different. For example, a required assessment once showed a student making "no progress," but in class I saw them working more independently and completing harder tasks. The indicators were clear: Their classwork was improving, they needed fewer prompts, They were more confident and The general education teacher also noticed growth When the formal data didn't match what I observed, I knew the policy tool wasn't capturing the student's real progress. That's when I realized I needed to adjust how I collected and used data so it better reflected what the student could actually do. P3: By transforming formal requirements into adaptable student centered classroom routines, that are better suited to everyday learning environments, instructors reconstruct district level, IEP regulations. When progress monitoring data and repeated observations revealed, that are required accommodation was done racing, the students engagement, or performance, as in anticipated, I identified, A misalignment. I modified the prose while maintaining the IEP goals in response to feedback from the student and support staff, resulting in greater student improvement. P4: I usually recognize misalignment between policy and practice when the intended support cannot be realistically implemented in the classroom. For example, the policy recommended using the inclusive learning resource center to provide additional to support, support to Ned learners. But our city did not have one, indicators that adaptation was necessary, included my observations, that students were not receiving the targeted support, feedback from parents about learners still struggling at home and in school. And data showing minimal progress on IED objectives that were supposed to be reinforced in the ILRC. This signals made it clear that I needed to adopt by creating a classroom base or source corner and seeking support from parents and colleagues to ensure that the learners still had access to the intended interventions. P5: Data, observations, feedback, signal to you that adaptation was necessary. By changing formal requirements into adaptable, Learner centered classroom routines that are more responsive to everyday learning environments, instructors, reconstruct, the IEP IEP regulation. When progress monitoring data and repeated observation, reveals that a required accommodation was not raising the learner's engagement. Or performance as anticipated. I identified misalignment. I modified the approach while maintaining IEP goals, is response, stupid back, from the students and support staff. which led to more significant learning, learners improvement. P6: I just want to recognize misalignment between policy and practice, but we will be titled observing my student outfits. Looking for gobs that will expect it outcomes and actual performance. For instance, with assessment results and password consistently show that learners struggle with past prescribed by the policy, it signals that adaptation, accommodation, is necessary. This indicators that I need to adjust strategies while still aligning the overall IDP goals. Where you have the money. Although we are following, because we are temporalized. One challenges in the race, school, this I... is technician. We have policy series. Regulation, we need to plan, but we can always accommodate and modify. So everybody will not be yet rewarded. They cannot just follow up a plan, because you're moving in. For example, if the policy states that the learner must pass the formative exam, But the problem is that the formative exam is given for this kind of art that we need to finish for at least one art, and they need to have examination for 8 subjects. In the industry, time, for exclusives, spectrum education, even the learner have an I, I, I, I, SQ. So usually, uh, we follow by, the students deal. He still go through the exam, but... I mean, within his own facing, we are the ones now. Um, Nepapa exam Sunday, at his own pace. He doesn't...	c2 Curriculum pacing c4 Differentiated instruction awareness		
---	--	--	--

P7: <i>When I see the learners struggle, following the plan, we always consider the welfare of the learner. Example, I have a learner who bites himself when prostrated or irritated. When the law says, all children must be put in regular classroom. And when I see that he has difficulty in adopting a regular class, of course, I have to pull him out. This is to secure the safety of the child in this classmate.</i> P8: <i>I would like to skip this question.</i> P9: <i>After 28 years of teaching ASD learners, I recognized a policy practice, misalignment when mandated IEP targets and teachers, teacher pupil ratios did not match my students. actual developmental needs. And available resources. Daily observations showed increase dysregulation. Slow goal, mastery, and fatigue while progress, monitoring data, and anecdotal records reflected minimal gains despite strict policy, compliance, feedbacks from parents, part of professionals, and fellow sped teachers, confirm these patterns, signaling the need to adapt strategies while still honoring the core intent of the policy.</i> P10: <i>Recognized the misalignment between policy and practice during a time when students pull out minutes were scheduled strictly according to district guidelines. On paper, the schedule looked fine, but in the classroom, I noticed this student was consistently dysregulated during that exact time. My data showed low engagement, frequent refusals, and little progress towards his IEP goals. The indicators were clear. Observation, my observation, he shut down almost every time I pulled him out of the scheduled minute. The data, his progress monitoring scores stayed flat for weeks. Feedback, um, the general education teacher shared the transition between before the pullout was especially hard for him. Those patterns told me that the issue was in destruction. It was the timing. That's when I knew adaptation was necessary. I shifted the session slightly to a calmer part of his routine, documented the reason, and communicated changes to my administrator.</i> IGQ4: <u>In what ways do you reinterpret district procedures to fit your classroom context? Without compromising the core intent of the policy, then you share a specific modification in which rational?</u> P1: <i>I reinterpret procedures by focusing on the policies purpose rather than its most rigid form.</i> <i>For example, when the procedure required a frequent written documentation, I shift to concise weekly data summaries tied to instruction. So this modification preserved accountability and compliance while making the progress sustainable instructionally meaningful.</i> P2: <i>I try to keep the core purpose of a district policy, but I adjust the way I carry it out so it actually works for my students. I don't ignore the rule—I just make it more practical for my classroom.</i> <i>For example, the district required daily behavior tracking using a long digital form. Filling it out during class wasn't realistic, and it took my attention away from students. So I kept the intent—consistent data—but changed the method. I used a quick paper checklist during the day and transferred the information into the digital form after school. The rationale was simple: the district still got accurate data, and I was able to stay focused on teaching and supporting students in real time.</i> P3: <i>To ensure the, that the fundamental goal, equitable access and documented support, is mentored while education remains responsive. I reinterpret district policies as guiding principles rather than, you know, flexible prescriptions. For instance, to adapt instruction in real time, while still reporting data as needed, I added Informal weekly check-ins aligned with the same goals. When a progress monitoring schedule felt too infrequent for my uh, students' needs. This change was significant because it respected compliance while maintaining the emphasis on significant. Ongoing student development rather than than just the paperwork.</i> P4: <i>I interpret district procedure by focusing on the core intent of the policy, supporting student learning while adapting the method to fit my classroom context. A specific example still is the recommendation to use the inclusive learning resource center, horse ned learners, which we don't have one. So to address this, I created a small, it's an organized resource corner. We, we name it, um, as a project also in my classroom with visual is manipulatives and learning materials, and I coordinated with parents and even general education teachers. some from the community to provide additional support that would normally</i>	c2 Practical policy implementation c2 Flexible implementation c12 Practice integration c11 Weighting c18 Discussion c2 Operationalization c8 Adaptability c12 Prioritization c12 Adaption c10 Collaboration c12 Translation c12 Creativity c12		
--	---	--	--

be available in an ILRC. The rationale was to maintain the policy's goal of providing targeted, individualized force, while making it realistic and actionable in our setting. Ensuring that learners still receive the intended benefits. P5: In order to ensure that the fundamental goal or the equitable access and documented support is maintained while education stays for fancy. I interpret the policy by treating them as a guiding principles rather than inflexible prescriptions. For instance, in order to adapt the instruction in real time while reporting the data as needed. I added informal weekly check-ins that were in line with the same goals. When a progress monitoring schedule failed to impreguent for my learners' need. These changes was significant because it respected compliance while maintaining the emphasis on significant, ongoing, learning development, rather than just paperwork. P6: Well, the question number four mam. I interpret the procedures by adopting the activities at my students' level. And context or life yet while keeping the car goes, and the value is to lose. So we are still following the policy while, uh, I am assisting for my business. For example, I modifies the standardized, really fast, if there is more faculty than steps. So the learners could succeed independently, ensuring the skill development, compromising the diabetes, objects, and also following still, the procedure, with just simple modification and complication. Who knows. P7: The, I, the 2 cases I already mentioned, I always follow the policy words. I always, um, adhere to what the law says, but then there are positive, uh, we have to consider the learners where they're in the environment of the general. Um, that's what I have to modify the, uh, the implementation of the district life. P8: So, uh, a way that to interpret the, the internet, the district, uh, procedure to fit my passion for the custom context is adapting to the context. So in the classroom, I reinterpret procedures by adjusting how they're implemented, so they meet the unique needs of my students without continuing the purpose. So through ethical lens, I make sure modifications still uphold parents, student dignity, and transparency. P9: Um, I reinterpret district procedures by maintaining the required IAP goals and documentation while adjusting how they are implemented to match the learning piece and individual needs of my ASD learners. I also imbeded skills check into the little teens and play based tasks to reduce anxiety and captured more authentic performance. These modifications stay through the policies intent or monitoring progress while making the process developmentally appropriate and realistic for my classroom context. P10: One week I ever interpret district procedures is by keeping the core purpose of the policy intact while adjusting the implementation to fit what actually works in my classroom. For example, our district required pullout minutes to be delivered at the same scheduled time every day. The intent was consistent and accountability, which I fully support, but in the practice, one of my students became very highly dysregulated during the exact same time, because it followed a difficult transition. To stay aligned with the policy, I still provided the required minutes, but I shifted the session slightly to a common part of this routine. I documented a change, explained the rationale and shared data, showing improvement engagement. This modification honored the policy's intent ensuring services were delivered consistently, while making the support meaningful and effective for the student. This experience reinforced what thoughtful adjustments, paired with clear communication, can keep us compliant while still meeting students where they are. IGQ5: How do you assess the impact of your policy driven adaptation? On student outdoors? Tell a story that links a particular reinterpretation to observe progress or setbacks. P1: I assess the impact by comparing the progress, the progress data and classroom behaviors before and after the adaptation. In one case simplifying a mandated accommodation logged into a weekly instructional check ins free time from targeted reading support and the students fluency scores began to rise. So that link between the interpretation and improved outcomes confirmed the adaptation supported both policy intent and the student growth. P2: I check the impact of my policy adjustments by watching how the student responds afterward. If they become more focused, confident, or	Modification c7 Balance c4 Student centered c10 Collaborative problem-solving c20 Students prioritized c8 Flexible scheduling c22 Clear documentation c5 Observation c17 Demonstration c4 Implementation c12 Optimization c14 Awareness		
---	---	--	--

successful, I know the change helped. If they stay stuck, I know I need to rethink it. For example, when I switched from a long digital behavior form to a quick paper checklist during class, the student improved right away. I could give support in the moment instead of typing on a computer, and their behavior and engagement got better. That showed me the adaptation made a positive difference. P3: I monitor changes in student performance data, along with the observed engagement and independence in the classroom, to evaluate the effects of my policy driven adjustments. Instead of isolate, isolating, um, district mandated accommodation, I reinterpreted it by integrating it into the fabric of everyday education. Over several weeks, the student demonstrated measurable improvements and increased confidence in their ability to use the skill independently. I was reminded that a careful flexibility can significantly improve results when it is aligned with policy aims. As evidenced by the link between adaptation and observable progress. P4: I assess the impact of policy driven adaptation shown by closely observing student behavior. Tracking progress on my IET goals and gathering feedbacks from parents, and even my co-Ned teachers. For example, when I created a small resource corner or even it's an area in my classroom, in a nearby space, to replace the absence of ILRC. I noticed a student who previously struggled to complete a life skill task, independently was now able to follow steps with minimal prompting. I documented this in their progress notes and shared observation with the parents who confirmed similar improvements at home. This showed that the adaptation, though not exactly what the policy described, was effective in helping the learner develop independence, and it also highlighted which strategies still needed reinforcement. Linking their interpretation directly to real observable progress. P5: I monitor changes in learning, learner performance, information together with observe, engagement, and independence in the classroom to evaluate the effects of my driven, policy driven adjustments. Instead of isolating the mandated accommodation, I reinterpreted by integrating it in a more natural, into everyday education. Over the course of several weeks, the learners demonstrated when defiable improvements, increase, and increase confidence in their ability to use skills on their own. I was reminded that carefully flexibility can significantly improve results when it is in the line with policy aim, by the link between adaptation and observable progress. P6: I assess the impact of policy driven other patients by comparing students, output, and progress data before and after the chambers. As we all know as a teacher, learner is a change of behavior. So if there is a change of behavior, We can say that the learned is learning. For example, after breaking a mandated writing test into their steps, a learner who produced this struggle began completing the assignment, and then cleaning, showing clear growth, while highlighting the effectiveness of contextualizing adaptations. P7: Those instances are quiet, rare. So when they say that they be placed with their full age, where, of course, we follow some children with special needs. Adapted and benefited in this policy. So we try, we try it 1st, before we make an adjustment, even if there are setbacks, like, things B, the channel is always lost in the big classroom, on the charging bites, the channel will back his head, the whip, you know, we always follow the, uh, The same thing first, of the time. The learn. P8: So, uh, particular the interpretation to observe progress or set pass is that the learner behavior, class of observations, and feedback from teachers, parents, and learners. I have one special needs, early childhood learner, who I shadow teach, basic 5 motor and gross motor skills. In the beginning, he wasn't able to write his name nor call her properly despite his age. He is 7 years old. So I focused on improving 1st his grip on pencil. And line racing as advised by his teacher. I used activities that improve his motor skills like coloring, tracing, cutting, squeezing of, uh, glue bottle, writing, and pasting. So and have him join school events and Friday activities based on his adaptability to sensory. After 6 months, which is from June to December of last year, I noticed the improvement on his writing skills as he was able to write a bit legibly the 1st 3 letters of his name by January 2026. Although he is still not able to articulate his emotions and opinions, he responded one step instructions and identification of colors, names, objects, and other	c12 Directive c4 Innovation c14 Awareness c12 Realignment c12 Adaption c7 Individualization c2 Safety priority c2 Policy adaption needed c5 Progress monitoring c1 Adaptive practice c14 Fidelity c11 Challenge c13 Stability c20 Inclusivity		
---	---	--	--

more. When I tell him it to him. P9: I observe closely the changes in the learner's functional skills, engagement, and behavior over time rather than relying solely on reports. In one case, I interpreted the requirement for frequent measurable targets by breaking a year-long communications goal into flexible cluster routines, such as requesting during snap time and term taking during play. Without formally changing, I eat I eat this structure. As a result, the learner showed increased spontaneous communication and reduced frustration. Which was consistently observed both in school and a home. Based on parent feedback. This experience affirmed that adopting procedures to feed the classroom context lead me to more meaningful progress, even though the games were gradual and not immediately reflected in standard documentation. P10: To assess all the impact of any policy adaptation, I look closely at student engagement, progress monitoring data, and daily observations. One example was when I adjusted the district's fixed schedule for a student who struggled with decisions. The policy, the sorry, the policy required a strict time, but the student consistently shut down during that period. After shifting the session slightly, while still meeting the required minutes, I watch for changes. Within a week, his engagement increased, and his progress monitoring sports improved because he was calmer and more focused during instruction. The data showed fewer refusals, and general education teacher reported smooth, smoother transitions. That experience taught me that even small interpret, right interpretations of policy can have a big impact. When the adaptation is grounded in student need and supported by data, it yields better outcomes and underscores why flexibility matters in special education. IGQ6: Describe a situation in which attempting to align practice with policy, create attention among team members. such as teachers, specialists, families, or administrators. How much the tension resolved, and what were the outcomes for students? P1: Tension arises when aligning a strict district inclusion policy when the students need for specialized instruction led to different views among CO teachers and specialists. Through a data sharing collaboration during meeting revisiting the IEP goals, the team agreed on a blended model to that implemented inclusion while providing targeted support and resulting in improved students engagement and progress. P2: There was a time when our team disagreed about how to follow a district rule for delivering IEP minutes. The policy said support had to happen at a specific time each day, but the classroom team felt that time didn't match when the student actually needed help. This created tension between teachers, specialists, and the administrator. We resolved it by meeting together, explaining our concerns, and asking for a small schedule change. The administrator approved a more flexible plan that still met the policy. Once we made that change, the student got support at the right moments and became more successful in class. The team also felt more united because we found a solution that worked for everyone. P3: I thought the learning learner would benefit more from in-class support. But of course, specialists insisted on a rigorous pullout program, which cost is stress during an IET meeting. By working together to test a hybrid strategy that combined short pullout sessions, with supervised in class practice and the routine evaluation of progress data. We were able to resolve the dispute. The student remained engaged, made of observable progress, and as a result, team members gained more confidence in collective decision to make it. P4: In our school, tension once aroused when we were aligning practice with the policy of educating learners with disability in regular classroom, alongside their peers, whenever possible. This is one of the tension. It's not about ILRC, but the goal was inclusion with proper accommodation and support. Some regular teachers and master teachers were hesitant to fully accept learners who required significant adjustment and assistance. I address this by initiating discussion, sharing student progress, data, and terrifying the accommodation. We're meant to support learning rather than add burden. Gradually, through collaboration, small trial integration, concerned, lessons, and teachers were became more open to inclusive practices. As a result, students gain more opportunities for social	c8 Tuning c1 Reactivity c12 Decision making c4 Implementation c16 Principles c12 Flexibility c7 Focus c12 Contextualization c12 Simplification c2 Policy adjustment c4 Adaptive implementation c4 Adaptive implementation c2 Flexible implementation c5 Monitoring c8 Recalibration c12 Presence		
--	--	--	--

<i>interaction and participation in regular class activities or even schoolwide activities, activities which improve their confidence and sense of belonging.</i> <i>P5: I thought that learner would benefit more from in-class support, but a specialist insisted in a regular pullout program, which caused stress. During an IEP meeting, by working together, the test a strategy that combines short pullout session with a super bise in-class practice and... Routinely evaluating progress data. We are able to settle, dispute. The students stayed involved, made observable progress, and the team members gained more confidence and collective decision making as a result.</i> <i>P6: And of course, as I said earlier, if there is attention, there is calmness. We installed it only by hearing everyone's perspective. So, learners are sometimes different when they are at home, when they are with special needs or the therapist, and especially in school. Most of the time we hear the parents saying, Mom is very good in his therapy. He's very good in it, uh, with his special, and as we always say, of course, well, that's the goal of being there to be very good. So, I'll push a done with very calculated environment while in school. As much as basketball, we always have a guided socialist station. So we can see if the student can be, um, out in the others. If they will get triggered, or they can have a melt on that, if they go with others, especially to useful programs. And learners are also different in or at home. So that's why it's very important that we see the company by hearing everyone's perspective. We cannot say that if the child is very good, uh, in, uh, therapist, uh, specifically, papacinabina therapist, uh, he's very good. Sometimes we need to hear, what's the impact? It's a house and a spoon. Weekends, actually. Me as a teacher. I'm very good on child, tapad, young... The real learning is done through application. You are very good in your therapy. Can you apply it at school? Can you apply it at home? Because if you can apply, if you can apply me. But the problem will happen, R-O-I-N-P. My return of investment. It is not tangible. It is it is not tangible, but it is it is deliverable. We can, we can see it through. As I said earlier, therapy is 20 years. One therapy calls one sack of rice. Some students need to attend therapy twice a week. And the wages in the Philippines is not too competitive for that. So. Um, the feedback, non therapy, is considered true and effective. It, it, only, not life, a school, a bad high, bonus, snap, up, and up, like both sides. Love us.</i> <i>P7: ---is now only on digital. When the night... inappropriateness. Ancient coming from my body chair arrives. They argue that they don't have the necessary training to handle this kind of learners, and there are special education people who should handle them. In spite of this, tension through focus group discussion, we believe in the law and extended our help to the teacher, full of difficulty in handling learners with special needs. We gave assistance when the time comes and they extend all their airport and It does.</i> <i>P8: So far, I have not encountered any attention regarding policies with my team members or posters. Though we do discuss the learner's current process before promoting him or her to the next level off for me in our our school.</i> <i>P9: When we implemented inclusions, guidelines that required increased time in general education classroom for learner with ASD, Sned teacher, co teacher, and parents observe highlight, heightened anxiety and frequent behavior meltdowns. Deferring views emerge between strict policy, compliance, and responding to the learner's readiness and sensory needs. We resolve this through a case conference, a teacher observation, and the therapist recommendations, leading to a gradual inclusion plan with added supports. As a result, the learner became more regulated, participated, more meaningfully during inclusions, and showed steady progress in social and deheberal goals.</i> <i>P10: I experienced experience tension when our team tried to follow what this district policy that required all accommodations to be delivered exactly as written. With no flexibility. One student had an accommodation for extended time on writing tasks, but the general education teacher felt it disrupted her pacing and made group activities harder to manage. She wanted to limit the extra time, while I knew the student needed it to stay regulated and complete work. The tension grew during a planning meeting because we were both trying to follow the policy, but had different interpretations of what consistent</i>	c22 Tracking c13 Progress c5 Monitoring c5 Observation c11 Impactful c12 Incorporation c13 Consistency c5 Assessment c4 Scaffolding c2 Policy adjustment c5 Progress observation c5 Direct observation c8 Flexible goal implementation Student engagement c4 Flexible policy use c11 Incompatibility c13 Effectiveness		
---	---	--	--

implementation looked like. To resolve it, I brought in concrete data showing how the students work quality drop when rushed and how his behavior escalated when he felt pressured. The teacher shared her concerns about classroom flow, and together we agreed on a compromise. The student would start working with would start writing with the class, but finished during a quiet block later in the day. Once we aligned, the students work improved and his frustration decreased. The teacher also felt more supported because the plan fit her classroom routine. That experience taught me that open communication and shared problem solving can turn policy practice tension into a more effective plan for the student. IGQ7: How do power dynamics within your school influence how you interpret or resist district policies? Who tends to shape the narrative of permissible adaptations, and how does that affect a student? Success? P1: Administrators and district leaders often shape the narrative of what adaptations are allowed while we teachers contribute on the ground data that justifies them. So when a leader ship values the input of the teacher, adaptations are more responsive and it benefits more the students. When power is more up to down, innovation is limited and the students needs are harder to meet. P2: Power dynamics in a school affect how much flexibility teachers feel they have with district policies. Usually, administrators and specialists decide what kinds of adaptations are acceptable, because they are responsible for compliance. When leaders are open and supportive, teachers feel comfortable making small changes that still honor the policy but better fit student needs. When leaders are strict, teachers may feel they have to follow the policy exactly, even if it doesn't work well in the classroom. This matters for students because when leaders are flexible and supportive, teachers can adjust policies in ways that actually help students learn. But when leadership is rigid, teachers often feel stuck following rules that don't fit real classroom needs, and students may not get the support that works best for them. P3: Because decisions are often based on administrators, priorities, priorities, and experts authority, power relations in my school and school shape, which district policies teachers, feel free to reinterpret. The story of authorized change is just what is shaped by team leaders or senior employees. Who determine who its modifications are considered appropriate while maintaining compliance. This can affect student performance by either constraining creativity with rigorous adherence, is um, also emphasized over individual needs or by enabling flexible responsive supports when cooperation is valued. When district timelines are reporting requirements, conflict with the realities of the classroom. Schedules schedule an example scheduling, progress monitoring cadence. P4: In our school, power dynamics influence how I reinterpret district policies or national policies, because decisions often depend on the support and priorities of our principal, our supervisor, our administrators, the input of parents, the collaboration of co-teachers. Administrators tend to shape the narrative of what adaptation are considered permissible, while parents also strongly influence expectation for their child's learning. As a sned teacher, I navigate this dynamics by presenting evidence from observation, student data, and practical classroom realities to justify adaptation, life priority, prioritizing key IEP objectives or creating a classroom resource corner instead of a formal ILRC. When these discussions are collaborative and respectful, it allows adaptation that are realistic, yet aligned with the policy's intent, which directly benefits student success by ensuring instruction. Is both achievable and meaningful. P5: Because decisions are frequently based on the priorities of the administrators and the authority of experts, power relations in my school affect which the policies, teachers feel free to interpret. The story of authorized change is usual shape by team leaders or the senior employees. Who direct the what modification are considered appropriate while sustaining compliance. This can have an effect on learners performance by either constraining creativity, when rigorous adherence is emphasized over individual needs or enabling flexible, responsive supports when cooperation is valued. P6: Let's say picture and a part of my. I actually don't persist a policy because policies are given. by the people who are more knowledgeable	c11 Disagreement c21 Resolution c11 Conflict c11 Barrier c18 Advocacy c13 Improvement c18 Compromise c22 Evidence c23 Context c23 Feedback c5 Observation c21 Behavior c8 Perspective c18 Impact c20 Support given c2		
---	---	--	--

than me, so I respect that. If they given me a policy, which it's questionable, true practice, maybe I can suggest alteration, but I need to find a verse. And if I cannot do it by practice, I can suggest true past and outcome through my classroom experiences. That's a theory is different from applied practice. Curious, different from the experience. So that's why I need to hear their feedback because they are expert in that field. And all sorts, respectfully, they must need our feedback as the practitioner. So we have the most effective dynamic, uh, not policies and programs, plus the different special evolutionists. The developing industry this potential doesn't go just by the following policy and not hearing the feedback. We need to hear everyone's feedback, including the members that they are the M. Italian of what we are doing, everything we do is program. So, If the pharmacy is beneficial, again, very good, but beneficial. Pero, in the effective... That's why... And I think it is okay. It is okay in a policies are some time. Not there, but in poor.. P7: uh, problem about how they are going to follow the law. But then again, we believe that above our school administrator, above all of us, in spite of our education, spites of our rank, law is above all of us. So we need cheers, always identify the law. P8: So if you don't mind, uh, I would answer this question. So most of the time the one who holds more school influence is our school principal and our master teacher. So with their consultation, for example, if I'm going to promote a student to the next level, I see to it that I consult with my master teacher, and also with my great litter, if this learner is suitable. If, uh, if, or do we have to retain him on the grade level? So for me to at least meet the IEP goal intended to be done for the school year before he is transitioned to the next level. P9: In my school, administrators and sped supervisors often shape, which adaptation are considered acceptable. So teachers carefully align their decisions with leadership expectations. I usually reinterpret district policies through collaborative discussion rather than open resistance. When school leaders support flexible, learner centered adaptations, teachers feel empowered to adjust instruction meaningfully. This shared understanding leads to more consistent support and better outcomes for students. P10: Power dynamics definitely influence how I reinterpret or push back on district policies. In my school, administrators and beat specialists usually shape the narrative of what kinds of adaptations are acceptable. Their interpretation often sets the tone for how flexible or rigid can we be? One example was when a district policy required a strict documentation of service minutes. Some teachers felt pressured to follow the schedule exactly, even when it didn't work for certain students. Because I had strong relationships with my administrator and specialist. I felt comfortable advocating for small adjustments based on student regulation and engagement. Not everyone on the team felt that they had the same voice, which created some hesitation at first. Once I shared data, how the flexible timing improved a student participation, The administrator supported the adaptation. That approval shifted the dynamic. Other teachers felt more empowered to make student-centered adjustments to. In the end, the students benefited because the team felt safer making decisions grounded in real classroom needs, rather than the fear of breaking policy. It showed me how important it is for leadership to create space for professional judgment so that policy support rather than limit students' success. IGQ8: When district timelines or reporting requirements conflict with the realities of the classroom? Example, scheduling, progress monitoring, cadence. How do you navigate the tension? What trade offs did you make? And what were the observable effects on students? P1: I do prioritize instruction and the access of the learners first. Then after that I adjust reporting practices to be more efficient and data focused. P2: When district timelines don't match what's happening in the classroom, I try to meet the requirement without taking time away from students. I focus on what must be done right away and what can be finished later. For example, when progress-monitoring reports were due during a busy week, I collected quick data during class and completed the detailed reporting after school. The trade-off was extra work for me, but the students benefited	Policy experience c7 Learner promotion review c6 Team based planning c16 Policy tension c10 Supervision c17 Guidance c1 Customization c23 Gatekeeping c23 Restriction c14 Dominance c10 Negotiation c11 Oversight c14 Empowerment c18 Consideration c19 Expertise c15 Inclusion		
---	---	--	--

because I stayed focused on teaching and supporting them during the day. P3: I managed the conflict between district schedules and classroom realities by prioritizing meaningful progress, monitoring, over rigid deadlines and documenting modifications for accountability. For instance, I traded off immediate reporting for more precise evidence of progress by extending the time frame for gathering data on a student's skill development. The students showed real progress, thanks to this method. leading to improved instructional decisions and more appropriately matched support. P4: When this trick or division timelines or reporting requirements conflict with classroom realities, I navigate the detention by prioritizing meaningful student progress while still meeting essential reporting obligations. For example, when IEP progress reports were due partly, but some learners were frequently absent or needed more time to show measurable growth. I focus on documenting observable behaviors and small skill improvements, rather than trying to force all objectives to show full mastery. The trade off was spending less time stressing over completely, completing every goal perfectly. But the observable effect was the student continued receiving instruction at their own pace. Routines were maintained and the reports reflected real, meaningful progress. This approach allowed me to comply with our division requirements while keeping student leaves at the center of decision making. P5: I feel among students. I managed to conflict between schedules and classroom realities by putting meaningful progress monitoring ahead of digit deadlines and recording modifications for accountability. For instance, I traded off immediate reporting for more precise proof of progress by extending the time. The time frame for gathering data on learners skills development. So the students was able to show real progress. Thanks to this method, which is led to improved decisions about instruction and more appropriately, much supports. P6: When the are reporting requirements, completely request them, we are replaced. I found a request for more time. Homely, respectful, political, formal time. We have more time. Not everybody can follow that specific things. We are, we are catering for everyone, despite of their abilities and disabilities. So, I am requesting for more time for patients, or more clarification to ensure that we have an accurate and meaningful product money for everyone. That's the, if I deliver on the right side, but the students are, didn't deliver their best. So it's not a true progress report. It is just a... in our... It must, it is not the Pradesh it works. So sometimes I adjust like be seeing lesson and assassinate, but much my students are doing it. Even if it means extending their blades. If they are allowed to. This approach allowed their hands or students to engage fully, and show atomic glow without compromising the activity outside. It's always begins and starts and never ends with it. P7: Family support really work best in this time when there are conflicts about the, um, reporting, moving up their requirements. We use other modes of teaching to keep, uh, like modular to keep up with that timeliness. They're learning, it's going inside their household so that not only the teacher, but also the family, monitor the... It isn't... Wait, in developing a monitoring the progress of the child, the support of the family and the environment is very important. P8: So I identify which reporting performance are non-negotiable, like mandated progress monitoring, deadlines, and which can be flexibly interfitted. So I keep administrators informed when adaptations are necessary, framing them as ways to preserve instructional integrity while still meeting policy intent. Excuse me. I always keep my objective goals one to 2 only in a week, as this is what my learners are capable to achieve. And it helps them keep more focused and less distracted before proceeding to our next week objectives. P9: When district timelines conflicted with classroom realities, I prioritized the child's actual learning base while still meeting, reporting requirements. For instance, I extended skill building over several weeks. Instead of forcing weekly mastery documentation, incremental progress in the IEP. This trade-off reduced learner frustration, increased engagement, and allowed admissionable growth while administrators still receive the necessary updates. P10: There was a period when our district required progress	c22 Evaluation c2 Law supremacy c9 School leadership influence c6 Collaborative decision-making c3 Empowered teaching c5 Influence use of hierarchy c4 Empowered practice c7 Focus c3 Procedure c3 Result c4 Steering c13 Success c5 Balancing c11 Accommodation		
---	--	--	--

monitoring to be submitted every Friday by noon. In theory, it ensured consistency. In practice, Fridays for the most unpredictable day in my classroom. Assembly shorten schedules and students who struggle with routine changes. I often found myself choosing between rushing through progress monitoring or giving students the com structured instruction. They actually need it. The tension came to a head with one student who needed very predictable routine to stay regulated. On a Friday morning, when the schedule was already disrupted, I realized that forcing progress monitoring would likely lead to a shutdown. Instead, I prioritized instruction and collected the data later that afternoon. Even though it meant submitting slightly past the preferred window. The trade off was intentional. I protected the students emotional regulation and instructional time. But I had to communicate clearly with my administrator about why the data came in late. I shared notes, how the students' engagement stayed high because I didn't force an assessment to bring a dysregulated moment. The observable effect was positive. His progress is remained steady, and I avoided creating a negative association with assessment. That experience reinforced the timelines matter, but students readiness matter more. Which transparent communication and solid rationale, I can honor the spirit of the policy while still doing what's best for the students. Good job.	c16 Continuity c4 Student centered c8 Sequencing c1 Extension c13 Effectiveness		
IGQ9: Have you ever encountered a policy update that you believe would harm or help student outcomes? Describe how you interpreted the update, the changes you implemented, and the resulting students' effects. P1: I encountered a policy update that increased emphasis on inclusive practices which I personally believe could help the learner if implemented thoroughly. So I interpreted it as a full call for a stronger collaboration in order for me of course to adjust my instruction with more co teaching and scaffolded supports. P2: Yes, I've experienced policy updates that clearly affected student outcomes. One example was when the district introduced a new rule requiring shorter, more frequent progress-monitoring checks. I believed this would actually help students because it allowed us to catch learning gaps sooner. I interpreted the update as a shift toward quicker, more responsive data. To implement it, I adjusted my routine by building short check-ins into transitions instead of doing long assessments once a month. The effect on students was positive. I noticed issues earlier, adjusted instruction faster, and students showed steady improvement because support came at the right time instead of weeks later. P3: A modification to policies, I came across all 4 shorter, more frequent tests, which I thought might overload certain students and interfere with their ability to learn. I interpreted the update by weighing its purpose against learners. Needs and um, by substituting informal examinations, with the mini assessments integrated into everyday tasks. By memory, anxiety, and maintaining compliance, this modification helps, Students demonstrate more precise progress and remain interested in their Students. Or should I say studies? P4: Yes, I once encountered a policy update that strongly promoted inclusive placement of learners with disabilities in regular classrooms whenever possible. I believe it would help student outcomes because it encouraged social interaction and equal learning opportunities. But I also saw challenges when adequate support and accommodation were not yet fully prepared. I interpreted update as a positive direction that required careful planning rather than immediate full implementation. I gradually introduce learners to regular class activities, coordinated with general education teachers and provided modified tasks and close monitoring. As a result, students show it improved confidence, where interaction, and participation, although it also highlights the need for continuous teacher, support, and clear communication. They make inclusion very effective. I remember we used our last quarter to include our students in regular class. One for every class. Then for an R, then for 2 Rs, and then, and the last part, we were, um, we try to make them feel that they can participate for half of the, um, base, even though they were in a self-contained class. So at the following year, they were able to hope, and they, they started to go and attend the full	c2 Compliance c16 Accuracy c13 Performance c12 Adjustment c18 Family involvement c2 Policy aligned adaption c4 Incremental progress c2 Schedule accountability c5 Routine dependence c12 Strategic timing c11 Regulation c4		

<i>inclusion class in regular class. That's great. I did it too. So I used to have my blind students. They are, they get mainstream in the regular classes, and that was fun, because the teachers are really very cooperative, and they really care.</i> <i>P5: A modification to policies I came across called a shorter, more frequent test, which I thought may overload certain learners and interfere with their ability to learn. I interpreted the update by waiting its purpose against the needs of the learners and substituting informal examinations with many assessments. Incorporated into everyday task, by lowering anxiety and maintaining compliance, this modification helped the learners demonstrate more precise progress and remain interested in their studies.</i> <i>P6: Honestly, update that could harm my students. Not yet. Because I said earlier, those persons, professionals, specialists that are developing policies are expert in this field. That's why, It is impossible or nearly impossible that they develop a policy that could harm the students. It can cause chaos, love. In my perspective, why would you develop a policy that could harm the learners? And to help the student, yeah. Yes, ma'am. Um, usually, if there is a, New policy ball. If my negative in fact, surely for our boys, we'll be heard. For money, informal writing, in... Hello Yeah, continue. Oh. Yeah. Um, is it the people, my mom, I'm not black enough, find a different device? Hola, on speaker. Ah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Sorry for... It's okay, no problem. It happens. No, like, mom. Are you with some months? Yes. Number nine, if I have encounter, uh, polishing that food harm my letters, of course, not. And if there will become a time now, they will develop a policy like that, of course, as a teacher, our voice will be here. And it will apply by. In every corner of the beauty page. And of 1st of all, before, before we went, and we always followed. They already followed. That's why I think my 3 month is based on experience and practices.</i> <i>P7: Yes, we open, yeah, moment when the body is updated, affect how we serve learners, especially in, especially in the pollution, and in inclusive. What matters most is how we interpret and how we apply the parties is approved.</i> <i>P8: So, um, recent, uh, policy update we have encountered is the Depend Memorandum 43 series of 2025 or the Inclusive Education app, which ensures that learners with disabilities have access to quality, inclusive education in regular schools, supported by appropriate services and accommodations. So this helps boost access of learners for disabilities to be able to enroll in mainstream setups. However, if a teacher's training is not enough, uh, sorry, I mean that the general education feature is not enough. Uh, in terms of training. They are not active properly. They may feel frustrated and unprepared to manage their diverse needs. That is one of the hard part, as they are not as prepared and equipped like the sned teachers are, or the regular teachers who are exposed to handling these kinds of learners. So some of them may refuse to accept these learners in their classrooms with the feeling of they can, and it is not part of their job description. Some are forced to accept, but will take a long time to be able to properly address their diverse needs.</i> <i>P9: Yes, I encountered a policy update that emphasized individualized, miserable IAP goals in closer monitoring, uh, of learner progress. Which I believe would benefit my AST students. I interpreted the update as encouragement to make goals more functional and observable. So I refined IEP targets to focus on communication. Helps, self-help and behavior regulation, embedded in daily routines. I also adjusted my teaching by using consistent visual schedules and routines based assistments aligned with these goals. As a result, students show theater, progress, improve, engagement, and smoother translation across classroom activities.</i> <i>P10: I once experienced a district policy update that genuinely helps student outcomes. The district shifted from requiring partly progress monitoring to a biweekly cadence. At 1st, it felt like an added workload, but I interpreted the update as an opportunity to catch learning gaps earlier and adjust instruction more responsibly. I implemented the change by creating a simple, consistent routine for quick data checks during small group time. One student in particular, who struggled with reading fluency, Benefited almost immediately. With more frequent data, I noticed the pattern. His accuracy dipped whenever passages were too long. Because I caught it early, I adjusted his materials and added repeated reading practice. Within a few</i>	Alteration c13 Progress c11 Saturation c17 Engagement c12 Directive c1 Strategy c5 Outcome c9 Integration c5 Accessibility c11 Hurdle c1 Customization c19 Expertise c23 Reflection c8 Risk c2 Policy impact c2 Exclusive education policy		
--	--	--	--

weeks, his fluency scores begin to rise steadily. The more frequent monitoring didn't just provide numbers. It provided insight into when and why he struggled. That enabled me to intervene before frustration escalated. The experience taught me that policy updates can support students when they're interpreted through a practical instructional lens. Even when a change feels demanding at 1st, aligning it with classroom routines can turn it into a tool for better outcomes. IGQ10: Looking across multiple IEPs, what recurring patterns have you observed in policy practice tensions? How do these patterns inform what district leaders should know, or change to better support effective alignment, and student outcomes? P1: Across multiple IEPs, a recurring pattern is that policies are often designed for consistency while classroom requires flexibility. Tensions commonly arise around documentation, the demand of documentation, the kind of expectations and the services being delivered. P2: Across many IEPs, I see the same tensions repeat. Common patterns include: Policies expect perfect schedules, but classrooms change constantly, Data and reporting requirements are heavy and time-consuming, Timelines are rigid even when student needs shift, Teams don't always have enough shared time to coordinate These patterns show that district leaders sometimes design policies without fully considering daily classroom realities. What leaders should know is simple: Teachers want to follow policy, but they also need flexibility to do what works for students, Clearer guidance and lighter, more realistic expectations would help. And When policies match real classroom conditions, students get better, more consistent support P3: I've seen repairing patterns in several IEPs where strict guidelines or uniform practices. Conflict with the varied demands and learning rates of different learners. These kind of flakes emphasize the need for district administrators to provide educators with flexibility. Explicit guidance on uh, acceptable modifications and uh, Time, set aside for discussion. In the end, closing these gaps would lead to more significant and reliable student outcomes by aligning policy and classroom practice. P4: Across multiple IEPs, I've noticed recurring patterns in policy practice tensions, such as expectations that are difficult to implement, given high student to teacher ratios, lack of specialized resources like an ILRC, and requirements that emphasize documentation over practical individualized support. This pattern show that while policies are well on intention, they sometimes overlook the realities of classroom implementation, making it challenging to provide meaningful student centered instruction. This informs leaders that to better support alignment and student outcomes, policies, should be flexible, provide clear guidance for adapting to limited resources, includes realistic teacher to student ratios, and consider ways to give teachers access to specialist and practical support rather than just procedural compliance. P5: I've seen frequent trends in several IEPs, where strict guidelines, or uniform practices, conflict with the various demands and speed, speeds of different learners. This conflict. Sorry, Mom. So, this conflict emphasizes the necessity of the administrators to give educators flexibility, explicit instructions, on acceptable modifications and time set aside from discussions. So in the end, closing these gaps would be enable more significant, and reliable learner outcomes by bringing the policy and classroom practice into alignment. P6: Across multiple, i.e., I have hobbies, recurring interests, interests when they sometimes win, rigid policies, clashes with students, their own studies, levels, and perpetual roots. This pattern suggests that the leadership allow more flexibility, provide practical guidance and allocate resources that support you at some level at the page. So, um, if I have a single figure in a regular class and the policy, um, sometimes for, Um, we have, we need to sub, to submit reports at this kind of day, so we need to finish the exam. In a volume, meaginary happen because I need to condition my venues. Sometimes I need to, um, create a exam through, through a mobile device. Paramatapos lamo, I say... So sometimes... So, um, mobile app, paramatapos lamo. So, Palamatra's Vietnam teacher. I am a Fabrizu child. We, we followed the formative exam, but we're just a little bit of, uh, accommodation and how the potential. I mean, that people have	c2 Teacher preparedness gap c4 Targeted goals c2 Routine data checks c23 Insightful monitoring c8 Reality c11 Disconnect c13 Autonomy c6 Alignment benefit c11 Rigidity c6 Convergence c2 Constraint c11 Gap c11 enablement		
---	--	--	--

people... Is some unwell subject. For us, it has. Yeah, and that's the best time to use the accommodation that you need to provide, which is included in the IEP. If this is written in the I... P7: Why does the, um... What is that I, um, okay, is the empire, um, standard decision versus individualizing, insured. For example, the policy expected that my EP Plano expanded them played by bibliness and 3 point format. While in classroom realities, too, that with special needs, so highly individual and learning profile, that the map always speak, that uniform format. In observing some pattern, pictures sometimes fit the student into present goals structure. The, Rather than the defining fully personalized rules because they will pick, they have a lot of work, so they will just pay the same thing that, uh, gold that will fit all these buildings, but that is that in the I will do. It's still that have their own way of rebelling. So, it does that fit at all. Some IEP becomes And stock human instead of living instructional problems. That's how I've been pursuing it, especially that the generalizes that. P8: Um, so far because I have only been teaching for a short while in the Sned, in the Sned setting. I have not yet come across such a diverse and multiple IEP. So I was not able to encounter that much. So I sorry that I cannot fully answer this question. Thank you. It's okay, no problem. P9: Across multiple IEPs, I've noticed recurring patterns where a policy requirements like inclusion schedules, conflict with learners, developmental readiness, communications, abilities, and sensory needs, distensions often place teachers in the position of choosing between compliance and student center practice. Creating stress and inconsistent implementation. The pattern also shows that when teachers are empowered to adopt procedures thoroughly, and when collaboration with specialists and parents is prioritized, student outcomes improve significantly. It is good that district leaders recognize that flexibility, clear guidance in adaptations. And ongoing professional support are essentials to breeds, policy and practice effectively, ensuring that IEPs remain meaningful tools for learner rather than for learning, rather. Uh, rather than just administrative exercises. P10: Looking across multiple IEPs, I've noticed recurring patterns in the tension between policy and practice. The most common pattern is that policies are designed for consistency, but classrooms require flexibility. For example, fix the schedules, fixed service schedules, rigid progress, monitoring timelines, and uniform accommodation expectations often don't match the realities of student regulation, classroom facing, or staff limitations. Another pattern is that policies assume ideal conditions, like predictable routines, uninterrupted instructional blocks, and full staffing, which really exists in day-to-day practice. These patterns indicates that district leaders need to understand the extent of the invisible problem solving that teachers undertake to make policies workable. When policies don't account for real classroom rhythms, teachers either um, quickly adapt them or struggle to implement them with fidelity. Both situations affect student outcomes. Thoughtful adaptations usually help students while rigid adherents can sometimes hinder progress. Looking across multiple IEPs, I've noticed recurring patterns in the tension between policy and practice. The most common pattern is that policies are designed. Oh. Oh, yeah, oh, this should be it.	c11 Conflict c1 Alignment c23 Context c2 Compliance c7 Individualization c11 Policy mismatch c5 Limited experience c11 Policy conflict c6 Flexibility need c2 Implementation impact		
RGQ3 IGQ1: Can you share a narrative of collaborative IDP meeting or planning process that will particularly effective? Who let the conversation? How decisions were made, and what about the dynamics contributed to, or detracted from student outcomes. P1: In one particular IEP meeting, the case manager facilitated the discussion while teachers, specialists and family members all contributed to data and observations. Decisions were made collaboratively around collaboratively grounded in the progress of the students rather than the hierarchy. The respectful student centered dynamic build a shared ownership while it led to clear goals and consistent implementation. P2: One of the best IEP meetings I've been part of worked well because everyone stayed focused on the student. The special education case manager guided the meeting, but each person—teacher, specialist, and family—had space to share what they were seeing. We looked at the student's work, talked about strengths and	c7 Balanced collaboration c20 Centeredness c7 Balanced collaboration c10 Rapport		

challenges, and made decisions together. No one dominated the conversation, and everyone listened. Because the team worked so well together, we created a plan that actually fit the student's needs and schedule. After the meeting, the student became more confident and made steady progress. The positive teamwork directly helped the student succeed. P3: I remember a cooperative IEP meeting where the school psychologist guided the discussion and ensured that all team members, like the teachers, parents, especially, As I say, indecision making, discussion of student data, shared observations, and agreement on reasonable and measurable objectives, and accommodations, were used to make decisions. The inclusive dynamics promoted polarity and trust, leading to more consistent support, implementation, and observable improvements in students' abilities and participation. P4: What particularly effective IEP meeting I experienced in my self-contained SNED class involved me as the SNED teacher. And the student's parents with occasional input from the administrator or our principal. Sometimes, if our supervisor is available, because She is within the compost, her office. We talk together and I led a conversation presenting observations, data, and suggested rules. While the parents shared insights about the learner's strength, routines and challenges at home. Decisions were made collaboratively, focusing on a few priority objectives that were realistic and meaningful for the students. The positive dynamic, open communication, trust, and shared focus on the learner help us create an actionable student centered plan, which led to noticeable improvement in the student participation, independence, and overall engagement. P5: I remember a cooperative IEP meeting where the school guidance guided the discussions and made sure all the members of the team, the teachers, the parents, had a say in how the decisions were made. Discussion of learners' data, shared observations, and agreement on reasonable, measurable objectives, and accommodations were used to make the decisions. The inclusive dynamic promoted the clarity and trust which led to more consistent support, implementation, and observable improvements, and the learners' abilities and participation. P6: During, uh, IE, feeling, or to that very short, teacher, lead, teacher, lets a person, show. We always squeeze the picture like on bricklings, and because, um, she knows the liver, she knows the parrot. She is the closest one. To the learner. After the period, so she knows the learner, she knows the parents. She understands the parents and the learners, and She also understands the policies. So here in the Philippines, it is most of the time teacher led conversation because she knows the client and she knows the privacy accident. Okay. Um, Golden, could you please excuse me? I believe you need to use the bathroom. Well, excuse me. I apologize for the interruption. I really can uphold it. I should have gone to the. P7: The sped teacher and the parent meet once I clear to adjust the strategies together. When something doesn't work, where we design it as a team. Me and the team. That's how that's the dynamic we have here in our school. P8: Oh, okay, sorry, I'm sorry, the wrong one. So a collaborative IEP planning process that felt effective was when the teacher, the parent, and the learner were all heard in the conversation. So it helped the teacher identify properly what needs should be targeted within a few months to the whole school year. So. Communication breaks down to heavily towards compliance. So the IEP becomes a checklist instead of a roadmap. So the most effective plan emerges when relational dynamics are balanced. And the student's voice remains central. P9: On one particularly effective IAP meeting involved a learner with autism, struggling with communication goals. The conversation was led by me, the special education teacher. But all team members, including parents, good teachers, and administrator. Were encouraged to share observation and suggestions. Decisions were made collaboratively with its recommendation tied to concrete classroom data and therapy. Therapy reports. The open, respectful dynamics allowed us to create realistic, individualized goals and as a result, The learner showed noticeable progress in attention. Participation in communication. Okay. P10: Well, um, one of the most effective IEP meetings I've participated in was for a student who struggled with writing stamina and often	c9 Coordination c5 Outcome c1 Deliberation c3 Familiarization c4 Knowledge c19 Mediation c9 Teamwork c4 Compliance driven communication c7 Balanced collaboration c6 Inclusive team discussion c6 Collaborative decision-making c12 Evidence based consensus c1 Briefing c20 Comprehensibility		
--	--	--	--

became disengaged during longer assignments. What distinguished the meeting was how collaborative and balanced the conversation felt. The school psychologist facilitated a meeting, but the discussion was shared, everyone's voice was carried, voice carried weight, including the families. We began with the data. I presented word samples and progress monitoring notes. The general education teacher shared classroom observations, and the OT explained how fine motor fatigue contributed to the student's avoidance. The family provided important context regarding homework struggles, and how prolonged writing tasks affected the student emotionally at home. Decisions were made through a mix of evidence and consensus. Instead of jumping straight to new goals, we pause to identify the root issue. The student needed shorter, more structured writing tasks, with built in brakes. The team agreed to adjust the accommodation, add a visual writing sequence, and introduce a call taught writing blog. IGQ2: Describe a situation where communication among team members, such as special education staff, general education teachers, families, and administrators, succeeded in landing goals and practices. What messages, channels, and timing facilitated that alignment. P1: In one case, alignment succeeded when the case manager shared a clear progress progress data before the IEP meeting, right? Followed by a focus meeting with the teachers and family and a brief written summary afterwards. So using a consistent messaging across emails and meetings and timings communication around data checkpoints, it helps everyone to agree on goals and implement supports consistently. P2: A time when communication really worked was when a student was having trouble with transitions. The special education teacher sent a short email to the team explaining the concern, and the general education teacher and family added what they were seeing. We met briefly after school that week, talked through the issue, and agreed the student needed the same routine and support from everyone. Because the messages were clear, shared quickly, and followed up with a short meeting, we all aligned on one plan. Once everyone used the same strategy, the student became calmer and more successful during transitions. The strong, timely communication made the difference. P3: In one case, all team members were kept aware and actively involved in matching goals and practices through scheduled parent teacher conferences, short weekly team meetings and frequent email updates. Everyone was able to anticipate requirements and maintain consistency across setting tanks to settings. Thanks to clear communications about student development. Upcoming educational adjustments and common strategies. The student receive coherent assistance as a result of his of this prompt and open communication. which helped them make consistent behavioral and academic development. P4: In my self-contained net class, communication succeeded when planning a student's behavior and life skills goal for the IEP. I shared classroom observation and progress notes with the parents during in-person meetings, and informal conversations prior to the formal i.e. in meeting. During the meeting, we discussed the learner's needs openly, agreed on realistic priority objectives, and clarified how routines and support will be implemented both in class and at home. The clear messages, face-to-face discussion, and timely sharing of information allowed everyone to align goals and practices, resulting in consistent support, and noticeable improvement in the student independence and participation. P5: In one case, all the team members were kept aware and actively involved in matching goals and practices through a scheduled parent teaching conferences, short weekly meetings, and frequent email updates. So everyone was able to anticipate the requirements and maintain consistency across setting. to clear the communication regarding the learning, the development of the students, impending the educational adjustments and common subjects. So, this is the learner to save coherent assistance as a result of this prompt and open communication, which help them to make consistence, to make them consistent behavior, academic development. P6: That's a go issue where everybody listens and speaks first, report them to me a goal. So everybody must be heard and speaking. I think	c5 Outcome c17 Engagement c9 Support c16 Transparency c1 Alignment c3 Information sharing c5 Reliability c13 Participation c11 Condition c4 Clear communication c2 Reinforced Independent c4 Transparent communication c4 Coordinated communication		
--	--	--	--

about students are different. In, in their house, the therapist, and the school. So we need the consensus. About other people. Okay. So China, most of the, I think, most of the... Okay, continue, continue. P7: Effective communication amount, special education, features, and families was demonstrated during the planning and implementation of learners' IDP. Before the meeting, assessment reports and progress records were shared through printed copies to help everyone prepare. During the conference, each member that does met teacher and uh, um, parents openly shared observation, concerns, and suggestion. And respectful and supportive manner. Updates were regularly sent through group chats, emails, and quarter limit, meetings to monitor the progress, adjust strategies, because the messages were clear, timely, and consistent, teaching practices at school and supported school, where, aligned, sore doesn't do. P8: So, I'm going back to my one-on-one early childhood learner. who I was, who I am Shadow. So a simple that's successful, but that we have achieved within the time period of June, June 2025 to now, February 2026 was knowing his routine. So his 1st one is greeting his teachers and blasphemous good morning. So he does a nonverbal cue of waving upon arriving in the classroom. Second is getting his chair independently and placing it in front of his table. The 3rd one is getting a chair for me. his teacher, and then the port is putting his bag down and then is sitting down and wait for his activity sheet. So this was done successfully with repetition of prompts to do tasks still done independently. So, The reminder of the parents, verbal praise from early childhood teachers who know him especially, his advisor and me. P9: In one case, a learner with autism was not progressing on the IEP goal. Communication succeeded because the team held a scheduled meeting where teachers and parents shared details, observations, and progress notes. Clear messages about the learner's readiness and needs were communicated burly during the meeting and followed up. With written summaries, allowing everyone to agree or adjusted, achieving goals. Timely updates, and consistent check-ins skipped instruction align, resulting in steady improvements in the learners, engagement and skills development. P10: One situation in which communication effectively aligned our goals was during planning for a student who struggled with reading comprehension and often became withdrawn during whole group lessons. What made the progress effective was how intentional and coordinated the communication was across the team. The general education teacher 1st contacted the teacher of the students with disabilities via email, to share concerns and specific samples of the students' difficulties. I followed up with progress monitoring data and notes from small group sessions. The family was invited to share their perspective through a phone call before the meeting. Which helped us understand how the student reacted to reading tasks at home. Our administrator also checked in briefly to clarify available support and scheduling options. By the time we met for the IEP planning session, everyone had the same information and a shared understanding of the students' needs. The meeting itself was smooth because the groundwork has already been laid. So the messages were clear. Everyone focused on the students' trends, challenges, and patterns. Um, channels for varied, um, email for documentation, calls for nuance, and the meeting for collaborate indecision making. The timing was also intentional. Communication happened before the meeting, not during it, which prevented surprises and defensiveness. As a result, we agreed on a consistent set of strategies. Scaffolded tasks, preteaching vocabulary, and quoted reading blocks. twice a week. Because the team was aligned, implementation was consistent across settings. Within a month, the students' confidence improved, and he began participating more during whole discussions. The alignment didn't just make the adults feel coordinated. It directly supported the student's progress. IGQ3: Tell me about the time when power dynamic influenced an IEP decision or implementation. Who had influence? Who, how was input solicited from others? And what impact did this have on student progress? P1: In one situation, an administrator strongly influenced service delivery decisions due to scheduling constraints, the teacher and the specialist input was shared through data and discussion, but of course	c4 Proactive communication c1 Aligned practice c2 Constraint c11 Interruption c11 Implication c18 Authority c19 Mediation c5 Outcome c11 Suppression c21 Resolution c17 Influenc c17 Guidance c10 Intervention		
--	---	--	--

<i>the final decisions reflected on the administration's priorities. While the plan remained compliant, the student's progress improved only after ongoing data and team advocacy led to a later adjustment that better match the need of the students.</i> <i>P2: There was a time when an administrator had the most influence during an IEP decision. The team wanted to increase a student's support, but the administrator was worried about staffing and pushed to keep things the same. Because of their position, their opinion carried more weight than the teachers' or the family's.</i> <i>Everyone was still asked for input, but it was clear the final decision followed the administrator's preference. As a result, the student didn't get the extra help right away, and progress was slower than it could have been.</i> <i>This showed how power dynamics can shape decisions and sometimes delay the support a student really needs.</i> <i>P3: In one instance, I encounter the special education coordinator had considerable control over IEP choices. Prioritizing all out services over in class assistance. Teachers and parents were asked for their opinions, but their recommendations were 1st downplayed, which led to conflict on the student's best course of action. The combining pullout sessions with focused in class health. Demonstrating how power dynamics may influence both obstacles and solutions in IEP implementation.</i> <i>P4: In my self-contained med class, there was a time when a student IEP goal setting was influenced by my supervised source preference for more measurable academic objectives, while I and the parents felt behavior and life skills go were more urgent. My supervisor or health influence in approving the plan, but I solicited input from the parents to discussion and shared classroom observation, to explain why certain objectives were prioritized, through compromise, we included both academic and behavior focus goals. This approach ensured the student receives targeted support in the lab routines, which improve participation and independence, showing that balancing influence with collaborative input can positively shape students' progress.</i> <i>P5: In one instance, I encountered, uh, the special education coordinator had considered considerable control over the IP choices. Prioritizing pullout services above in class assistance. Teachers and parents were asked for their opinions, but their recommendations were 1st dumb played, which led to conflict on the students' best course of action.</i> <i>So the students engagement and the skill development improved once a compromise was struck, combining full obsessions with popos in class help.</i> <i>Demonstrating how the power dynamics may influence both obstacles and solutions in implementation.</i> <i>P6: Mainly, the teacher is the good influence in steward. Of course, I am a teacher. So, let me entire purple one, man. Maybe the picture is the good influence and the word. She's that vice, Felicitar, in influencing, um, or having a comprehensive I.E.P. Having a rich, achievable, I think, festival. Sometimes the parents, they have big expectations. So we need to unpack those expectations, to have a specific goal, so we can reach that expectation that they have in mind. That's my picture is the good influence because we can discuss it or deliver that expectation is really high, so we need to unpack it in a most possible way that they are, they will not meet you. Here for again. So as much as basketball, the expectation I find, so we need to unpack it. That's a... Sometimes, as a period in the mawala, they will compare their child to the other child, and that's not healthy. For them and also for the learner. That's why expectation grows. Uh, Mejo Mahila. We will achieve that goal. Positively, we will achieve that goal, but 1st we need to achieve this specific and objective. The format. Yeah, you're right. And it's not fair to compare the students to each other because there is individual differences, right? Right, mom. Sometimes the parents are not, um, they are not aware that they are comparing only everyone. It's the same for the child to be compared to other kids, because they have different learning styles. They have different learning phase, you know. And it's really not fair to compare. It's like a normal family mom. In special education, final normal family there, sometimes now they are being compared to their siblings. Yeah. Especially to the, uh, if you go out. Much younger, topero, achiever, shading, and then, nah, Hindisha healthy. Sorry for my...</i>	c1 Goal setting c20 Individuality c12 Comparison c18 Authority impact c4 Observation based assessment c1 Collaborative implementation c5 Hierarchy influence c22 Data informed support c6 Goal linked discussion c9 Cooperation c6 Convergence c2 Symmetry c11 Moderation		
--	--	--	--

So... Yeah, you're right. P7: There was a time when an administrator strongly influenced, and I made the decision, by prioritizing limited resources over the individual needs of the learner. Which made some deepers inherent, hesitant to voice their concern. Although input was requested during meetings, many suggestions from the special education teacher and family were gently set aside, leaving them unheard and discouraged. As a result, the student's progress was slower at 1st until continued advocacy and his conversation eventually lead to the adjustment that better support the child's growth. P8: So when I 1st came to this school where I in parent be teaching, because I do not have a full background about my learners, information relied from what I have observed. From their previous class advisors or subject teachers. Parents and guardians of the learners, and my master teacher. So their share knowledge helps shift the implementation of unaffactive and suitable IEP for each of my learners. Excuse me. So goals were changed once I was able to know them even more. P9: In the IEP meeting, the teacher, therapies, psychoeducational assessment results, and parents' observations are the strongest influences in shaping the goals and supports. This balance ensured the goals were highly individualized and responsive to the child's needs at school and at home. As a result, interventions were implemented, more consistently and the students showed steady progress across seating. P10: A moment with power dynamics clearly influenced an IEP decision happened during a meeting for a student who need more, who needed more flexibility, behavior, support strategies. The assistant principal held the most influence in the room, and her priority was to ensure that all interventions align closely with district discipline guidelines. While the rest of the team, including the general education teacher, the school psychologist, and myself, saw the need for more individualized support, and the administrators' interpretation of policy initially narrowed the options on the table. Input from others was solicited, but in a way that felt more like checking the box than genuinely weighing perspectives. The family shared that the student became overwhelmed by large group settings, and I presented data showing that he was more successful with brief sensory breaks. Still, the administrator pushed for a more standardized plan that mirrored what other students received. The turning point came when the school psychologist reframed the conversation around the students' regulation patterns, and connected them directly to the district's stated goal of reducing behavioral escalations. That shift opens space for the rest of us to reintroduce individualized supports without appearing to contradict policy. Once the administrators saw that flexibility still aligned with the district intent, she agreed to a modified plan that included scheduled breaks and co-regulated transitions. The impact on the student was immediate. We were shut down, smoother transitions, and more consistent engagements. That experience taught me that power dynamics don't disappear in IEP meetings, but when the team members use data, shared language, and student centered framing, they can redistribute influence in ways that lead to better outcomes. IGQ4: How do you perceive and navigate differing professional perspectives? Example, special education versus general education. During IEP planning. Can you recloud a turning point where dialogue shifted towards more productive collaboration? P1: Having a different perspective, I see it as a complementary rather than a competition. A turning point often comes when the data of students is shared in concrete terms such as work samples or progress graphs which shifts dialogues from opinions to a problem solving in one meeting. The shift helps the gen ed and spend teachers agree on a shared strategist and it improves consistency and the students progress. P2: I try to respect both special education and general education perspectives by listening first and looking for the shared goal: what will help the student succeed. A turning point happened in one meeting where the general education teacher thought the student didn't need extra support, while the special education team felt they did. The conversation shifted when we looked together at the student's work and behavior notes. Once we focused on the actual evidence instead of opinions, everyone started to agree. From that moment, the collaboration became smoother, and we	c9 Cooperation c8 Perspective c9 Synergy c12 Arbitration c5 Observation c6 Shared support		
--	---	--	--

created a plan that balanced support with independence. The student made better progress because the team finally worked together. P3: I manage conflicting professional opinions by listening, respecting everyone's views, and directing conversations toward the student needs, rather than personal preferences. The team came up with a more workable solution after a general education teacher presented classroom observations that made it clear. Why just suggested adjustment was useless. This change in communication fostered respect for one another and teamwork resulting in and uh, IEP plan that was easier to implement and uh, more beneficial for the students' development. P4: In my self-contained sned class, differing professional perspective usually come only from Paris and our supervisor. And from teacher who, from, yes, there's no teacher, um, who sometimes focus on academic goals. Because we're following some competencies. While I always emphasize functional behavior and life skills. I navigate this by sharing classroom observations, student data, and practical strategies that show how this goes support overall learning and independence. A turning point happened when parents and um, Our supervisor were hesitant to prioritize a life skill goal. But after I demonstrated how progress in this area helped the student participate more successfully in daily routine, the discussion shifted to a collaborative plan. This alignment allowed the student to receive consistent support, resulting in noticeable improvement in engagement, independence, and confidence. P5: In my self-contained sned class, differing professional perspective usually come only from Paris and our supervisor. And from teacher who, from, yes, there's no teacher, um, who sometimes focus on academic goals. Because we're following some competencies. While I always emphasize functional behavior and life skills. I navigate this by sharing classroom observations, student data, and practical strategies that show how this goes support overall learning and independence. A turning point happened when parents and um, Our supervisor were hesitant to prioritize a life skill goal. But after I demonstrated how progress in this area helped the student participate more successfully in daily routine, the discussion shifted to a collaborative plan. This alignment allowed the student to receive consistent support, resulting in noticeable improvement in engagement, independence, and confidence. P5: I manage conflicting, professional opinions by paying attention, respecting everyone's opinion, and directing conversation towards the needs of the learner rather than personal preferences. So, the team came up with a more workable solution after a general education teacher presented the observations from the classroom that made it clear why a suggested adjustment was useless. So these changes in communication encourages respect for one another and the teamwork, which produce an IEP plan that was more practical to carry out and beneficial for the learners' development. P6: P7: I do different professional perspective during I even planning as volvable because they would have left the unique experiences and expertise of each team member. I remember one of our conversation with the general education classroom because the child keeps on biting the crayon, the pencil, so, um, the teacher have a problem about, um, um, not beating through the class because she also handled 24 more learners. So she cannot focus solely to that child without a support. So we ask if, um, if it is okay for the teacher to have a parent partner that will settle in the classroom to, um, um, guide the child or support the child and the teacher and release. But to some extent only, but limited only, not the whole session. So that's it. That's how we know about Jolita's conversation. P8: So, a more productive collaboration in regards of IEP planning, that I have encountered was what other methods are approaches that I can use to address a learner certain behavior case. So this was a fixation behavior. So my master teacher gave me a few suggestions to help me and my learner to remove that behavior. So I in turn took note of them and thought of what may be suitable for him. Until this fixation behavior was slowly removed from his routine. P9: Um, I approached differing perspectives by actively listening. Validating teachers' observations and linking suggestions to student data. Um, the turning point occurred when a general education	c4 Behavior strategy collaboration c12 Behavior intervention		
---	--	--	--

teacher initially questioned, showing, uh, slowing a learner's progress, but after reviewing the class, some observations, and the therapy reports together, the team agreed on small achievable steps. This dialogue shifted from debate to problem-solving, leading to a collaborative plan that improved the learner's engagement and skills development.

P10: I often observe differing professional perspectives emerging during IEP planning, particularly between special education and general education teachers. One notable situation involved a student who required frequent check-ins and scaffolded tasks to remain engaged. As the sped teacher, I emphasized the need for structured support and gradual release. The general education teacher, however, was concerned that too many accommodations would limit the students' independence and disrupt the flow of full group discussion or instruction. At first, the conversation felt stuck. We were both advocating for a student, but from different angles. The turning point came when we shifted from debating strategies to examining together the students' work samples and behavioral data. Seeing the same evidence simultaneously changed the tone. The general education teacher observed that the student's output improved when tasks were chunked and I acknowledged her valid concern regarding classroom placing, facing. Um, that shared moment of looking at data refrain the dialogue. Instead of my approach versus yours, it became what combination will help him succeed across settings. We agreed on a plan where I would model scaffolds during small group time, and she would gradually integrate similar support into whole group lessons.

We also built in a weekly check-in to adjust as needed. The collaboration became more productive because we honored each other's expertise. The student benefited almost immediately. There were shutdowns, more completed assignments, and a noticeable increase in confidence. That experience reinforced for me, that differing perspectives aren't obstacles. They are opportunities to build a more complete understanding of what the students needs.

IGQ5: In what ways do families participate in the IEP process? And how do their voices shape, what gets prioritized in goals? Accommodation, and progress monitoring. Here a story that illustrates meaningful family engagement.

P1: Families participate are the participation of the family are most meaningful when they are treated as partners and asked for their opinions or insights. In one case, a family shared concerns about homework frustration at home which led the team to adjust the accommodation and progress monitoring to focus on independence. So their input helped align school goals with real life needs and it results to improve consistency and it also improves the confidence of the learner.

P2: Families take part in the IEP process by sharing what they see at home, explaining what matters most to them, and helping the team understand their child's strengths and needs. Their input often shapes which goals are chosen and what supports feel realistic.

A clear example was a student who struggled with writing but loved drawing. The family shared that drawing helped the child get ideas out at home. Because of that, we added an accommodation allowing the student to sketch before writing.

This small change made writing less stressful and helped the student make real progress. The family's voice directly shaped the plan and improved the outcome.

P3: Accommodations and progress monitoring. Share a story that illustrates meaningful family engagement. To help that team prioritize relevant, achievable goals and adjustments, families engaged in the IEP process by providing information about their child's strength, difficulties, and daily routines. We included graphic schedules and uh, Progressive exposure techniques in the IEP after a family highlighted their child's fear during transitions.

Smoother transitions and steadier progress at home, and a school resulted from their active participation in creating supports that directly addressed students' needs.

P4: In my is not class, families participate in the IEB process by sharing observations about their child's routine, strength, and challenges at home. And by giving input on what skills they most want their child to develop. They also provide histories and other, um, medical, um, backgrounds of the, of my PPS. Their voices often shape,

c8
Unified decision
making

c10
Advocacy

which goes and accommodation are prioritized, ensuring the plan is meaningful and achievable. For example, one parent emphasize that their child needs to learn personal hygiene and independent feeding. First, before more academic task. By including this perspective, we focus the IEP on functional life skills. First, incorporated support both at home and in class. And we're able to track progress in ways that reflected the learner's daily experience. This engagement led to noticeable improvements in independence and confidence, showing how meaningful family input can directly guide successful outcomes.	c8 Perception		
P5: So in order to help them, the team prioritize goals and adjustments that are relevant to the achievable family engaged in the IEP process by giving information about their child's demand. Difficulties and daily routines. We included graphics schedules and progressive exposure techniques that IEP. IEP after a family highlighted that their child appears during, during transitions. Smother transaction, transitions, and more steady progress at home and in school resulted from their active participations in creating supports that directly address the learners' needs.	c13 Achievement		
P6: Families participate in the continuation of the REP process. Families participate by sharing inside about the child's strengths, challenges, and baby routines, which helps the which helps shapes the realistic goals and affecting accommodation. And I remember a parent suggesting a communication strategy that aligned with house or home routine. So, Me said, Mom, very, very, very... Okay, accept it.	c13 Participation		
Paracontinuous, your practice abai, at practice at school, and continuously, and practice at school, Tubahi. That's the most important thing called beneficial amount. Yungalin Salbahayi strategy, why not? We will adopt it. And if we need to balance routine and strategies, for school, I am going to buy, it is for the learners. They must have a routine. So, They can learn. Does it, my focus, no. So as I said earlier, learning is a change in behavior. Very good. It's collaboration between school and home. Most of the time, not.	c11 Accommodation		
P7: Families participate in the IEP process by sharing insights about their child's thread, challenges and routine at home during the interview. Helping the team set realistic goal and choose appropriate accommodations. Their input shapes, priorities by highlighting what skills are most meaningful. For the child's daily life and long-term growth. One family emphasized that their child struggled with morning, repeats, and transitions, which led the team to include visual schedule and gradual task support in the ID. During follow-up meeting, the period shared observation of small improvement at home, which guided adjustment to instruction, and enforce progress money garden. Because the family's voice was valued, the IDP became a truly collaborative plan, reflecting both academic and practical goal that support the child's success.	c5 Outcome		
P8: So when I was doing my IEP interviews with the parents or guards of my learners, they tell me about what the learners can do and cannot do. So they also tell me about certain experiences and situations that shape them to become who they are right now. And what they think or hope could be improved with them, even though it may take a while. It somehow helped me further understand my learners and think of what I can do to help them achieve that. An example is a learner of mine who has forgotten how to read basic words because he was not exposed enough anymore for the past, for the past 3 years. So when he was promoted to my to my class, uh, we had a duration of 3 months. So I asked the learner to come and I'll to come an hour early so we can practice a marunko approach. So this is a reading technique in, in our, uh, step bed. Yes, a Filipino marongo. So after 3 months, he was able to recall how to read certain syllables to which his guardians expressed gratitude that at least he was able to regain that sense of he was able to read certain syllables until now. He's actually reading 2 syllable words and instead of syllabic reading. He's reading short towards the composes composing of 3 to 5 letters already.	c8 Insight		
P9: Families participate by sharing daily observations, concerns, and insights about their child's strengths and challenges. With directly influence goal setting, accommodations, and progress monitoring. For example, a parent of a child with autism, notice, frustration, during group activities, which led us to prioritize social, emotional goals and introduce small group sessions. Their inputs ensure that the IEP address real life challenges, resulting to improve or improve participation, confidence, and overall engagement for the learner.	c3 Effect		
	c7 Focus		
	c12 Modification		
	c8 Insight		

P10: Families play a central role in shaping IUV goals and accommodations and progress monitoring because they bring insight into the students' lived experience. What motivates them, what overwhelms them, and what patterns we may not see at school. One moment that stands out was an IEP meeting for a student who struggled with task initiation, and often froze during independent, independent work. Before the meeting, the family reported by phone that the shame shutdowns were occurring at home. Particularly when students felt unsure about the 1st step of an assignment. They describe how he would sit on his with his pencil in his hand, staring at the page and quietly saying, I don't know how to start. That detail refrained the entire conversation for the team. During the meeting, the follow Millie's voice informed our prioritization. Increased of focusing solely on increasing work completion, we shifted the goal toward building independence with task initiation. The parents suggested a simple strategy they used at home, having him verbalize the 1st step before beginning. We adopted that idea into visual checklist, and a quick teacher check in at the start of each task. The input also shit how we monitored progress. We added a measure of time to start up after receiving directions, which we hadn't previously tracked. But that directly reflected the student's challenge. Within a few weeks, we saw meaningful improvement. The student began using the checklist independently and it's time to start decreased steadily. The family reported that the homework time became less stressful too. That experience reminded me that when families are treated as true partners, not just attendees, the IEP became becomes more accurate, more humane, and more effective. Their voice doesn't just inform the plan. It transforms it. IGQ6: reflecting on the challenging collaborative moment. What strategies did you use to repair relationships or reframe roles so that collaboration supported better IEP outcomes? What size indicated improvement? P1: I focus on repairing trust by listening first, clarifying shared goals and reframing roles around collective responsibility for students. Follow up check ins and transparent data sharing help resemble the collaboration. So the science of improvement includes a more open communication. P2: There was a time when a team disagreement made collaboration difficult. To repair things, I slowed the process down, listened carefully to each person, and checked in with team members individually so they felt heard. I also reminded everyone of their roles and strengths so the focus shifted back to helping the student. Things improved when people started listening to each other again, interrupting less, and building on each other's ideas. The IEP plan became clearer and more realistic, and the student's progress picked up once the team was working together again. P3: I used active listening, addressed concerns, and reframe rules by identifying person's area of expertise and contribution to the IEP at a difficult collaborative moment when team members couldn't agree on the best course of action. For a student. To restore trust and focus on student needs, we develop um, systematic check-ins and predetermined tasks. More positive communication, prompt application of established tactics, and the noticeable improvements in the students, involvement, and skill growth were indicators of progress. P4: In my class, a challenging collaborative moment occurred when parents were concerned that focusing on behavior and life skill goals would limit their child's academic growth. Prepare the relationship, I use strategy such as sharing clear classroom observation, demonstrating how this goal supported participation in learning, and inviting their input on routines and priorities. I also clarified my role as both teacher and coordinator of supports, showing that their involvement was essential to success. Signs of improvement included more open communication, agreement on realistic objectives, and consistent follow through at home and in class. Which led to better engagement, independence and measurable progress for the student. P5: I use active listening, addressing the concerns and thread frame roles by identifying each person's area of expertise and contribution to the IEP at a difficult, collaborative moment when the team members couldn't agree on the best course of action for a learner. Also, in order	c5 Regularity c1 Organization c10 Family input c13 Learner reflection c19 Homeschool partnership c18 Parental perspective c1 Homeschool integration c10 Collaborative families c11 Dispute c9		
---	---	--	--

to restore trust and concentrate, the needs of the learners, we develop the systematic check-ins and predetermined task. More positively, communication, from applications, of established topics, and noticeable improvements in the learner's involvement, and the skill growth were indicators of progress. P6: I referred or attest a challenging collaboration by actively listening and clarifying nose, and focusing on discussions with its needs. Rather than the personality differences, that they, we always need to focus on, so they can develop to their fullest protect child. Improvement was evident when the team members contributed ideas. Openly and student progress became more consistent for setting. As I said earlier, we need to be here every morning. They said the child is conferent in a deep thing. Sometimes the child is different when they are in a bigger city. That's why we have to hear everyone. It's very, uh, willing collaboration, right? We need... deeper, calmer, and a restaurant. So, really, so we can have a concluded goal that is attainable. and achievable. P7: To repair the relationship, I scheduled a one-on-one conversation to listen to their concerns, and depray my role as supportive partner rather than an enforcer of requirements. I suggested practical strategies that could be easily integrated in their classroom routine, and offered ongoing check ins to troubleshoots, challenges together, improvement became evident when the teacher began proactively implementing accommodations, and sharing student progress without prom being. Over time, the team developed a stronger sense of trust in our collaboration lead to more consistent support and noticeable need for the student. P8: So for, um, I have not encountered such challenging collaboration, this kind, uh, because, uh, most of the time, I really consult with my master teachers and who teachers of, of the same grade level. And so at least we find, I get to have different advices, uh, to know how to address the, uh, this kind of challenge in the IEP. So I can still attain it. May it not be in a month, but at least within the year. Oh, yeah. P9: After a challenging IEP discussion, I focused on repairing collaboration by clarifying rules. Acknowledging its team members' expertise in reframing disagreements around shared students' goals. I initiate follow-up check-ins with their regular teacher and parents, online expectations, and adjust strategies, collaboratively. Over time, communication became more open in solution focus. Improvement was evident in more consistent implementation of the IEP in observable gains in the students' engagement and skill development. P10: One challenging collaborative moment happened when the general education teacher felt overwhelmed by the accommodations listed in the student's IEP. She expressed frustration during a planning meeting. saying the supports were too much to manage. Which created tension between us. I could tell she felt unheard, and I realized that if we didn't repair the relationship, the students support would suffer. Tougher. My 1st strategy was to reframe roles rather than defend them. Instead of reiterating compliance requirements, I approached her privately and acknowledged her workload and the pressure she was feeling. That shifted the tone, she no longer saw me as some one adding tasks, but a partner trying to make the plan workable. Next, I invited her to walk through the accommodations with me, one by one, and identify which ones were the most challenging in her classroom context. Together, we streamlined the implementation by clarifying what was essential, what could be embedded into existing routines, and what I could support more directly during small group time. I also offered to model a few strategies in her classroom so she could see how they looked in real time. The science of improvement were subtle at first. Her emails became more collaborative. She asked clarifying questions rather than expression frustration, and she began sharing small successes. She observed. Within a few weeks, the student's engagement improved as the accommodations for implemented more consistently and with greater confidence. That experience taught me that repairing collaboration isn't about correcting someone. It's about creating space for shared problem solving. When relationships are restored, the student feels the difference long before the adults do. IGQ7: How do administrators influence the collaboration and communication patterns around IEVs? Can you describe an instance in which administrative leadership is strengthened or constrained, team effectiveness, and student outcomes?	Support c19 Contribution c10 Intervention c13 Improvement c11 Friction c9 Communication c12 Multiple roles c5 Outcome c4 Clarification c1 Systematic c17 Facilitat c13 Improvement c8 Targetting c1 Trust building c6 Standard collaboration		
---	---	--	--

P1: Effectiveness and Student Outcomes Administrators shape collaboration by setting expectations for communication flexibility and shared decision making. In one instance, a supportive leadership protects the time for IEP collaboration and emphasizes data informed dialogue which strengthen the team alignment and improve the progress of students. In contrast, when leadership focus mainly on compliance, the collaboration becomes limited and the students outcome of improvement is shows more slowly. P2: Administrators affect how well IEP teams work together because they set the tone and decide how much time and support teams get. One time, an administrator helped the team by giving us extra time to meet and encouraging everyone to share openly. This made the team feel supported, and we created a strong plan that helped the student make progress. Another time, an administrator limited services because of staffing concerns. Even though the team shared data showing the student needed more help, the decision followed the administrator's preference. The student's progress slowed until the plan was changed later. These moments show that administrators can either strengthen teamwork or make it harder for the team to do what's best for students. P3: Our constrained team, effectiveness, and student outcomes. By, um, stop changing communication guidelines. Scheduling team meetings. And demonstrating respect for all the stakeholder opinions. is the colors, opinions. Administrators, influence IEP collaboration. One example that comes to mind is an administrator who arranged frequent planning meetings and promoted candid communication among educators, experts, and families, thereby enhancing team unity. The students progress and involvement significantly improved as a result of the supportive leadership, which also led to a more coordinated application of adjustments. P4: Yes, in myself, contains net glass, our principal influence, IEP collaboration by guiding what adaptation are acceptable and supporting teachers' initiatives. For example, I plan life skill activities that require going outside the classroom or even off school grounds. The administrator, my principal, agreed with my intention and provided support and dietetes. So, He accepted my request that we are going outside, even it's very dangerous, but with supervision. This strengthened team effectiveness by validating the approach and ensuring safety and resources, allowing students to practice real world skills like gardening, cooking, and navigating community spaces. As a result, students showed increased independence, confidence, and engagement, demonstrating how administrative support can directly enhance collaboration in student outcome. P5: By establishing guidelines for communication, scheduling team meetings, and demonstrating how all stakeholders' opinions are respected. Administrators have an impact on IEP collaboration. One example that comes to mind is when the administrators arrange frequent planning meetings and promoted candid communication between the educators and the families, thereby enhancing team unity. So the learners progress and involvement, significantly improved as a result of supportive leadership, which also led to a more coordinated application of adjustments. P6: Administrators, monitor, monitory, shape IE collaboration by setting expectation. If we set an achievable goal, so they will look forward for it. So, it's like, we need to do this because number one, we are monitored. We need to do this, we need to push through this. So providing, they also provide the items. They mode that open communication and in one instance, a very supportive administration. Administrators, our leadership encouraged regularity check-ins. Which threatens coordination and lead to more consistent student progress? Having an having a supportive administrator is not to doesn't have to be a pressure, but another support services. It's like a warm embrace now. You are being accepted. I am the leader of this institution and I will be in, in that kind of collaborative meeting. You are being embraced, you are belonged here in this. Okay. It's a number eight. But you want to continue? Do you... You want to see something? P7: Administrator, she, collaboration, communication around i.e.ps, by shaping expectation for meetings, providing resources, and	c6 Collaboration conflict resolution c2 Role reframing c4 Student centered c11 Oversight c17 Engagement c11 Hindrance c1 Planning c5 Result c18 Authority Facilitation c1 Organization		
---	---	--	--

modeling our culture of respect and share responsibility. For instance, in a, in this school, the principal scheduled regular protected time of i.e. to meetings and encourage open dialogue between special and local education nature. They support certain team effectiveness and improve the persistency and accommodation in the classroom and lead to clear progress monitoring, resulting in better outcomes for students. P8: So just takes what analysis, our administrators took into our observations, and IEP plans, and see to it how they can help based on the immediate needs of our learners. Since our district provide MOOE for this net department, we interned receive manipulatives and materials that are suitable to our learners' needs and great level. So this helps us address their needs more efficiently. So, um, an example of this is, uh, I recently requested hit bus irons, just uh, just a few units. So it could practice, so they could continuously practice their own their own skills. And in this manner, we were able to follow the curriculum guide. So they may not, they may not be able to notice this immediately, but they are able to at least apply the competencies, although in a different pacing. P9: Administrators influence i.e.P. collaboration by setting expectation, Providing guidance and approving adaptation in one instance, a supportive principal encouraged regular team meeting and welcome parents input, which strengthen communication and aligned goals across teachers and therapists. These leaderships fostered cohesive planning, resulting in clearer strategies in the classroom and noticeable improvements if students, engagement, and skills development. P10: Administrators play a major role in shaping how teams collaborate around IEPs because they set the tone for what is prioritized. Compliance, flexibility, or student centered problem solving. One instance that stands out was when our administrator actively strengthened team effectiveness during a challenging IEP cycle for a student with significant behavior and regulation needs. The general education teacher felt overwhelmed. The family was frustrated by inconsistent implementation, and the specialists were unsure how much flexibility they had within strict guidelines. The tension was building, and the communication had become fragmented. Our administration stepped in not to take over, but to create structure. She scheduled a short, focused pre-meeting with a core team, clarified the district's non-negotiables, and then explicitly named where Professional judgment was allowed. She also encouraged each team member to bring one piece of data and one concrete observation, so the conversation would stay grounded rather than emotional. During the actual IEP meeting, she modeled balance facilitation. She invaded the family to speak first, signaling that their voice mattered, and then she directed the conversation when it drifted toward blame. She also validated the general education teacher's workload while still centering the student's needs. And she encouraged the specialist to explain the why behind recommended support. Because of her leadership, the team shifted from defensiveness to shared problem solving. We agreed on a clear, clearer behavior support plan, streamlined accommodations, and a communication routine that work for everyone. The impact on the student was noticeable within weeks. Fever escalations, smoother transitions, and more consistent implementation of all settings. The adults felt more aligned too. Which made the plan sustainable. The experience showed me that how administrators can either constrain or empower collaboration. When they created psychological safety, clarify expectations, and elevate all voices, the entire IEP process becomes more effective. And the students feel the difference. IGQ8: How do you balance accountability and shared decision making within themes? Tell a story about the time when collective responsibility led to a more effective IEP, or when the fusion of responsibility hindered progress. P1: I balance accountability and shared decision making by clearly defining the roles while keeping the goals collective. In one case, shared responsibility with assigned roles for instruction and progress monitoring led to a consistent implementation and steady student growth. However, in contrast, if responsibilities were not clear, supports were applied inconsistently and progress is stalled, highlighting the need for explicit accountability within collaborate collaborative teams.	c10 Involvement c18 Impact c9 Leadership c16 Obligation c17 Interaction c14 Encouragement c6 Belonging c9 Team guidance c3 Resource support c9 Effective leadership impact c9 Leadership support c3 Data grounded discussion c12 Transformative leadership		
---	---	--	--

P2: I try to balance accountability and shared decision-making by making sure everyone knows their role but also feels responsible for the whole plan. A time when shared responsibility helped was when a student had behavior challenges. Instead of leaving it all to the behavior specialist, the whole team agreed to use the same simple strategy. Because everyone followed through, the student improved quickly. A time when lack of responsibility hurt progress was when no one clearly owned progress-monitoring. Each person assumed someone else was doing it, so the student didn't get the adjustments they needed. Once we assigned clear roles, things got better. These moments showed that teamwork works best when everyone knows their part and follows through. P3: By outlining each team member's responsibilities precisely, and um, encouraging open communication. And the cooperative problem solving. I achieve a balance between accountability and shared decision making. I recall one instance in which the team worked together to monitor the students' progress and modify treatments based on observations. Resulting in an IEP that successfully supported the students' reading development. On the other hand, delayed follow up on accommodations hinder the pupils development in another situation where duties were unclear. underscoring the importance of coordinated accountability. Okay. P4: In my class, again, I imbalance account. This is accountability and shared decision making by clearly defining my role while involving parents and administrators in goal setting and progress monitoring. For example, when planning a student's life skills and behavior goes, we coordinated support and shared observation, which led to consistent routines and noticeable improvement in independence and participation. In contrast, when roles are unclear or communication is limited, progress slows and student mis opportunities for consistent support. A number 9 question. When relational practice, example, regular meeting, share data tools, go planning, join professional development. Have you found most effective for implementing IEPs across diverse classroom? Why did these practices work in your context? In my night class, the most effective relational practice says have been regular in person meeting with parents, shared progress, checklists, and collaborative planning of routines and activities. This practices work because they ensure everyone understands the student needs, align support across home and school, and allows timely adjustment to those, our strategies. The face-to-face discussion and shared tools help build trust, keep communication clear, and ensure that instruction remains practical and student center, which leads to more consistent progress. I, I remember I try my best not only to communicate through, through phone or through, through, um, through letters, but I really push through that parents should, um, visit the school and see what's happening inside the classroom and have the opportunity to, uh, to work with their child, even at least once a month, to be part of the classroom activities. P5: So by outlining them, each team member's responsibility precisely and encouraging open communication and cooperative problem solving. I achieve a balance between accountability and shared decisions making. I recall one instance where the team worked together to monitor the learner's progress and modify treatment based on observations resulting in an IEP that successfully aided and the learners reading development. On the other hand, delay follow up on an accommodation, delay the pupils, development in another situation, where duties were unclear, emphasizing the significance of coordinated accountability. P6: I balance accountability by sharing the decision making process, but clearly by clarifying with a clear, defining rose. While encouraging input from all the team members. When everyone took responsibility for implementing strategies, students, I.E.P. goal, were met, uh, were met faster, or it is met earlier than we expected. But in another case, lack of ownership to the given rose, is load the progress until the laws. Um, sometimes for, we cannot, um, We give rose to the parents, mommy, you need to do this at home. You need to be firm. We need, you need to be the authority at all because he can manipulate you. Um, the routines were gone if he can manipulate you. But the problem, and	c9 Duty c15 Growth c11 Miscommunication c16 Transparency c9 Coordination c16 Responsibility c11 Disruption c9 Teamwork c17 Engagement c13 Stability c22 Evaluation c18 Ownership c4 Completion c4 Delegation c8 Boundaries c1		
---	---	--	--

<i>I can understand, as a parent also, now, even though, uh, you are building a routine, not that, but, you need to know, nano is a no. Sometimes, EBB game mode, just... to ease. So you can go on with your, um, activities at the parent. So, if you have a word, if you are working from home, and the child is, um, expecting you to do this, Tahik Bawal, expecting you to give him that, Kahet Bawal, because we already talk about it. Sometimes mobile, like I say, there are circumstances, nah. We cannot, uh, do us them. So nice. Okay.</i> <i>P7: A balance accountability, insurance, decision making, making by clearly defining each team member's role. But ensuring everyone's input is valued in shaping the IP. I remember a case when team were team collectively monitored a learner's behavior, goes with general education, teacher tracking, classroom behavior, the especially Japanese, uh, providing intervention in the parents' enforcing strategies at home. Because each took responsibility of their part. We noticed that improvement and were able to adjust, support, quickly resulting in a more effective and responsive ID.</i> <i>P8: So, I balance accountability and shared decision making within teams, by taking into consideration and sound, the class advisor and my input on how to improve my one-on-one learners writing. So, uh, I'm sorry, I'm taking the example, my, the learner that I shadow teach. So, and sensory sensitivity behavior. So we talk about how we continue to see practice at home, like the tracing and line writing can aid his improvement. As well as reminding him of what his classroom routine is to avoid him in doing his negative behavior inside the classroom as well.</i> <i>P9: Mm, I balance accountability and share decision making by clearly defining a team, members role while encouraging inputs from all. For example, when creating an IEP for a learner with autism, teacher, therapies, and parent took responsibility for specific goals. And we help regular check-ins. This shared sense of responsibility supported consistent implementation, and noticeable improvements in students' engagement and skills development.</i> <i>P10: Balancing accountability and shared decision making is something I think often, because in an IEP only works when everyone feels responsible for implementation. But not so responsible that no one takes ownership. One moment that stands out in vogue, the student needed consistent behavior supports across settings. The IEP team had agreed on a plan that included visual cues, predictable transitions, and a quick check in before independent work. Everyone nodded in the meeting, but in practice implement implementation became inconsistent. The issue was in resistance. It was diffusion of responsibility. Each adult assumed someone else was handling the check ins. The general education teacher thought that Para was doing it. The pair I thought I was doing it. I assumed that the classroom team had a routine in space. The result was predictable. The student's behavior escalated, and his progress monitoring data. The training point came when we met again and looked at the data together. Instead of assigning blame, I reframe the conversation around shared responsibility and clarity. We created a simple, visible implementation map. So there's the general education teacher would initiate, would initiate the visual cue, and the para would do the check-in, and I would monitor data weekly and adjust support. We also agreed to a quick Friday debrief, 10 minutes standing, no agenda, just to check alignment. The science of improvement were immediate. The student's transitions moved out, his work, completion increased, and the adults began communicating more productively. The parish started sharing small wins, the general education teacher asked for additional strategies, and the student began participating the routine, um, with more confidence. That experience taught me that accountability doesn't mean assigning tasks. It means creating structures where everyone knows their role and feels ownership. When responsibility is shared intentionally rather than assumed vaguely, the IEP becomes a living plan that actually supports the student growth.</i> <u>IGQ9: What relational practices? Example, regular meetings, shared data tools, go planning, join professional development. Have you found most effective for implementing IEPs across the diapers came from? Why did this practice work in your context?</u> <i>P1: Well, in my experience the most effective relational practices that have been this has these are the regular team champions, chair, shared progress monitoring tools and co planning time.</i>	Anticipation c9 Team balance c6 Collaborative accountability c9 Team responsibility c9 Shared accountability c19 Structured collaboration c6 Collaboration tool c6 Procedures c1 Efficiency c3 Platform c1 Investment c9 Coordination c13		
--	--	--	--

<i>Because this work this work because they created consistent communication, a shared understanding of the data of the students and the collective ownership of IEP goals, allowing the team to respond quickly to the need of the student.</i> <i>P2: The practices that helped most were regular short check-ins, shared data sheets, and quick co-planning moments. Regular check-ins kept everyone on the same page. Shared data tools helped us all see the same progress. Quick co-planning made sure supports looked the same in every classroom.</i> <i>These worked because they were easy to use, didn't take much time, and kept everyone connected. The student got more consistent support and made better progress.</i> <i>P3: I've discovered that the best ways to implement IEPs in diverse classrooms are through regular team meetings, goal planning sessions, and shared digital data tools.</i> <i>Because they promoted a sense of shared ownership among educators and experts. Enabled real-time adjustments based on student success. And uh, ensured, consistent communication, And this techniques were effective in my setting. As a result, interventions were implemented more uniformly across settings and the children received more coordinated support.</i> <i>P4:</i> <i>P5: I've discovered that the best ways to implement IEPs in diverse classroom are through the regular team meetings, co-planning sessions, and shared digital data tools.</i> <i>Because they promoted a sense of shared ownership among the educators and the experts allowed for real-time adjustment. So based on the student success and guaranteed consistent communication, so these techniques were effective in my setting. and I thought as a result, uh, interventions were implemented, more uniformly across settings and children receive more coordinated support.</i> <i>P6: Regular meetings and co planning sessions were, in my experience, was the most attentive, and being attacking, along with shared data tools that keep everyone informed. This process really works because they prospered clear communication, clear goals, and responsibilities. And it is consistent, strategies, and collaborative problem solving a heart fiverse classroom.</i> <i>P7: Okay, I found that regular team meetings, your digital, data tools, and co planning session are most effective relational practice for implementing ideally. In my context, these practices work because they create consistent opportunities for teachers, especially in families to communicate, review, progress, and adjust status together by having a central platform or data and instruction and to collaborate. Everyone stayed aligned on goals and students received more coordinated and perspective.</i> <i>P8: So a relational practice that I have found most effective for implementing IEP across saver's classroom is doing regular meetings. So, student center dialogues and family partnership building. It helped me keep up to date where the learner is in progress and if you are still on check with our IEP goals. When it seems going off track due to personal simple senses or negative behaviors, I see to it if I can address it alone or if I need expertise of my colleagues.</i> <i>P9: I have found regular meetings, progress tracking tools, and complaining sessions to be most effective for implementing IEPs. These practices work because they create consistent communication, ensure everyone understands is learner's needs. And allow timely adjustments to strategy, the strategies. In my experience with poster collaboration among special education teachers, General education educators, therapists, updated reports, and parents, resulting in more coordinated instruction and improved student outcomes.</i> <i>P10: The relational practices that have been most effective for implementing implementing IEP across different classrooms are regular crossing check-ins, shared data tools, and intentional co-planning. These practices work because they created predictable communication, reduced misunderstandings, and kept everyone focused on the same student centered goals. One example was a year when I supported several students across multiple grade levels. To keep implementation consistent, our team established a weekly 10 minute IEP huddle every Friday morning. It wasn't a long meeting, just a quick touch point where the general education teacher, Para,</i>	Participation c19 Uniformity c9 Coordination c14 Persistence c9 Coordinated Planning c10 Family learner engagement c19 Consistent communication c19 Predictable communication c3 Shared data tools c11 Parity c11 Inequity c3 Recommendation Impartiality c17 Connectivity		
---	--	--	--

and I shared one success, one challenge, and one adjustment for the coming week. Because it was brief and predictable, everyone actually showed up. We paired those huddles with a simple shared data tool, a one pager tracker where each adult recorded observations, work samples, or behavior notes. It wasn't fancy, but it meant we are all looking at the same information instead of relying on memory or hallway conversations. IGQ10: Looking across multiple cases, what patterns have you noticed and how collaboration and power relations correlate with IEP effectiveness? What would you want district leaders to know, to foster healthier relationships, and better student outcomes? P1: Well, in most cases or in all cases rather, I've noticed that IEPs are more most effective when collaboration is being practiced well and power is shared with teacher and with teacher and the family's voice are genuinely valued because when power is centralized and compliance driven, the implementation tends to be rigid and less responsive to the needs of the students. I do want the district leader to know that trust protected collaboration, time and data informed flexibility are key to a healthier relationship and stronger student outcome. P2: Across many IEP cases, I've noticed a clear pattern: When teams share power and work together, IEPs are stronger. When one person dominates, important ideas get missed and the plan is usually less effective. When collaboration is balanced, people listen to each other, use data together, and make decisions that truly fit the student. When power is uneven, people stay quiet, and the student often gets fewer supports than they need. If I could tell district leaders one thing, it would be this: Healthy teamwork leads to better student outcomes. Give teams time to meet, encourage shared decision-making, and make sure every voice—especially families and teachers—is valued. P3: In many cases, I found that IEPs work best when there is fair collaboration and respect for the opinions of all parties involved, including families. General education, teachers, and specialists. In contrast, imbalances of power frequently restrict input, and decrease follow through. Higher students' involvement and uh, measurable progress are consistently correlated with strong connections. Transparent communication and shared decision making. I would like district officials to understand that higher education, outcomes and healthier relationships result from building trust, allowing time for discussion, and empowering all team members to contribute. P4: Looking across multiple cases, in myself contains lead glass. IEPs are most effective when collaboration is open, rows are clear, and all voices, especially parents, are valued. Conversely, when decisions are dominated by what the curriculum given are the lesson even and suggested by our administrators or when communication is limited, i.e. implementation can become brigid or inconsistent, slowing student progress. I would want leaders to know that fostering trust, encouraging shared decision making, and providing guidance on realistic adaptation, can strengthen relationship and ensure that IEPs are truly student centered. Ultimately leading to better outcomes. P5: In many cases, I've found that IEPs work best when there is a pair collaboration and respect for the opinions of all the parties involved. including the families, the general education pictures, and also the support from their specialists. In contrast, in contrast, in balances of the power, frequently, near strict imports and decreased palo through. Higher students involvement and measurable progress are consistently correlated with strong connections, transparent, transparent communication, and shared decisions making. I would like to understand that higher student outcomes and healthier relationship results from building trust, allowing time further discussions and empowering all team members to be contributed. P6: I noticed that I eat them, are most effective when collaboration is equitable, and all voices, including teachers, family, parents, regardless of their social status, are valid, and all of their voices are heard. I would want, believe this or no, that foster products, open communication, and shared decision making, strengthens, relationship, and this the better to their outcome. We need to, um,	c11 Obstacle c15 Inclusion c16 Fairness c23 Openness c4 Representation c11 Deference c6 Fair collaboration c6 Policy over learner focus c9 Shared leadership c4 Power influence c2 Empowered policies		
---	--	--	--

sometimes, their parents, uh, illiterately, one of them, they, they didn't finish schooling, but, it doesn't mean invaluableity for you. They are the parents of the lunar actor. So everyone, everybody, all of their voices are really great. And but, yeah, you're right. P7: The foster, healthier relationships and better student outcomes. Across multiple cases, I've noticed that It is our most effective when collaboration is genuine. Those are respected and power is fair. Better than dominated by one voice or perspective, when certain members hold disproportionate influence, some ideas or learners' needs are overlooked. Which then is low the progress? I would want the district leader to know that fostering equitable relationship, encouraging open dialogue, and valuing. Every team member's expertise directly support stronger collaboration and better student up. Okay. P8: IEP effectiveness associates strongly with relational health. So when collaboration is authentic and authority is shared, IEPs drive manipulator learner outcomes. When authority is in balance and collaboration is insincere, uh, the IEP service serving policy more than learners. So district theaters can foster healthier relationships by valuing all voices, especially our learners and their parents. Creating space for dialogue and aligning accountability with student centered growth. P9: Across multiple cases, I noticed that IEPs are more effective, or most effective when collaboration is open. Roles are respected, and power is shared rather than respectfully and value each other's input. Students make more consistent progress, which we were blessed to have in leaders, administrators who know that fostering trust, encouraging, shared decision making, and providing flexible guidance, can strengthening, the relationship indirectly improve students' outcomes. P10: Across multiple cases, I've noticed that IEPs are most effective when powered is shared rather than concentrated. When administrators or specialists dominate the conversation, teams tend to default to compliance driven decisions, and general education teachers and families participate less actively. When the leader, but when leadership intentionally creates space for all voices, especially those closest to the student, the plan becomes more accurate, realistic and consistently implemented. Clear roles, shared data, and regular communication, shift the dynamic from who's responsible, so how do we support this student together? And that's when student progress accelerates. If I could tell district leaders one thing, it's that strong relationships, not rigid procedures, drive effective IEPs. Policies should clarify where professional judgment is allowed. Provides structure, time for collaboration, and model shared leadership, so every team members feels empowered to contribute. When system honors the expertise of teachers, specialists, and families, IEPs become leaving documents that genuinely support student growth. IGQ4 question number one.			
RGQ4 How do SPED teachers make sense of the relationship between district strategies, school systems, and their own IEP practices? IGQ1: Tell a story about the district wide IE pickle you work to implement in your classroom. What was the goal? Was involved in what sequence of options helped translate it into practice? P1: In my classroom I helped implement a district wide IEP goal that focus on the improvement of the students reading comprehension using a explicit instructional strategy. The goal involved sped teachers, gen ed teachers, instructional coaches and other staff. So we began with district training on the goal, then align the lesson plans and accommodations to it. I included the strategies into daily instruction, monitor the progress with common data tools and met regularly with the members of the team to adjust the supports. So this sequence helped a lot in ensuring that the goal was consistently applied and practice effective. P2: A district-wide goal I worked on was helping students write clearer sentences. The district wanted everyone to use the same routine. In my classroom, the general education teacher, special education teacher, instructional coach, and the family were all involved. The steps were straightforward: The district taught us the routine, Our team planned how to use it with the student, We modeled it in class, The student practiced it every day, We tracked progress with the district's checklist, and We adjusted support as the student improved.			

<i>Because everyone used the same approach, the student made steady progress.</i> <i>P3: I collaborated with the general education teacher, reading specialist, and classroom assistants to implement a district wide IEP goal focused on improving students, reading, comprehension. We started by, by, um, dividing the objective into measurable segments, demonstrating techniques in the classroom. And tracking its students' development. With the progress monitoring tools. Increase the student engagement and a visible improvement and comprehension throughout the class where the outcomes of regular team meetings and data reviews which helped modify instructions.</i> <i>P4: At this wide IEP goal, or considered to be our division wide IEP goal, I work to implement in my classroom as providing individualized skill-based support through an inclusive learning resource center. We are asked to make a, our own ILRC style, or in, we will choose a focus part of the ILRC. Since our school did not have a formal ILRC, I created a focuser source area in the classroom, and choose cookery activities, which I believe will be most helpful for my pre-tansition class students. I plan step by step lessons, demonstrated, task and guided the student to hands-on practice while collaborating with parents and our principal for materials and safety support. Over time, I observe improvement in independence, coordination, and confidence, showing that creating a classroom base, adaptation, effectively translated the goal into meaningful practice for the learners.</i> <i>P5: I collaborated with the general education picture, the, in the classroom assistant to carry out the IEP goal that was centered to enhancing learners, reading comprehension abilities.</i> <i>So we started by dividing the objectives into measurable segments, segments, and demonstrating techniques in the classroom and also tracking each student's development with the progress monitoring pools. So the student increase engagement and be visible that they are visible to the improvement in comprehension throughout the class, where the outcomes of the regular team meetings and the data reviews that assisted in modifying instruction.</i> <i>P6: Uh, improving students, independent communication, involving the teachers, therapies, and parents. I translated it into practice by using visual supports, modeling strategies, and traffic progress in Europe, which helped the students gradually communicate more independent.</i> <i>P7: At district-wide, I typically work to implement, focus on teaching learners, to grow, cook, and prepare healthy snacks. Independently. I, as the special education teacher, collaborated with a general education teacher, classroom and parents to support this life skills goal. We began by planning step-by-step lessons, modeling each recipe, and creating visual guides and checklists for the learners. During a small group cooking session, I guided learners as a teacher, they enforced safety rules and hygiene practices, and parents practiced the same routine at home. Through consistent support and shared monitoring, learners gradually became more confident, and ended in preparing healthy snacks, showing a meaningful progress towards the IP people.</i> <i>P8: So, Uh, what they call this? Um, because this, uh, we have, we do not have a certain district wide IEP goal, but since we use our curriculum guide, so the only thing that I really do is, I fall, I used the objectives as my guide for the lesson. And then I just break it down in a slow-placed manner for them. So that way, uh, for example, we have marketing and environment learning competency. So, I cannot teach this whole for a whole quarter. So what I do is I break it down 1st. And then I, it may take me a week, just like I have indicated a year. It may take me a week to do one objective for them to fully understand, but at least that's the pacing that we do. And I am very thankful that at least my school principal, uh, at least support that, that even though we are not able to fully uh, do it in a whole quarter or 2 quarters. At least she knows that there is a progress that is ongoing in our classroom.</i> <i>P9: In our school, a common IEP goal was to improve functional communication for learners with ASD. Using gestures, pictures and single words. This ghost was implemented through teamwork among the sped teachers, parents, and school head. And sometimes the I eat the apps in in SNED. Uh, in my classroom, I include gold into daily routines using visual supports, ski-jaws, and consistent prompting. With parents, you're saying the same strategies at home. Learners showed better communication and fewer challenging behaviors.</i>	c1 Goal c12 Application c9 Cooperation		
---	---	--	--

P10: One district wide goal, I helped implement, focused on increasing students' independence with task initiation. The district emphasized building executive function skills across classrooms, so our sped team, general education teachers, and administrators, met to translate the broad goal into concrete classroom level practices. I work closely with a 4th grade teacher and a family of a student who frequently froze at the start of the assignment. We review district guidance, look at classroom data, and identify that the student's biggest barrier was not the content. It was knowing how to begin. To bring the district goal into practice, we created simple sequence, a visual 1st step, checklist, a brief teacher check in before independent work, and progress monitoring that track time to start rather than just work completion. I modeled the routine, the general education teacher embedded it into her transitions, and the family reinforced the same strategy at home.

Within a few weeks, the student began initiating tasks more independently, with less anxiety. That experience showed me how a district level goal becomes meaningful only when teams collaborate, to translate it into routines that fit the real rhythms of a classroom.

IGQ2: Describe a turning point when the particular strategy is successfully connected, a district goal with your day-to-day teaching.

What change? Who noticed the impact, and how did you know it mattered for students?

P1: For students, a turning point came when I aligned my daily lesson planning with the district's literacy goal by using a common learning targets and formative checks in every class. What changed was my focus less on covering the content and more on measuring on measuring and understanding so the students became more engaged and could clearly explain what they were, what they learned and why.

I can imagine you in your class. You are doing great.

P2: A turning point came when I started using a district strategy called "model, practice, feedback" during writing time. I used it the same way every day, and it made my teaching more consistent.

What changed was that students suddenly knew exactly what to expect.

They became more confident, and their writing got clearer. The general education teacher noticed the improvement, and families saw it too.

I knew it mattered because students who usually avoided writing began participating, and their progress data finally showed steady growth.

P3: When I included a district goal of increasing writing fluency into everyday journaling activities. And made a direct connection between the larger aim, and the classroom practice, it was a turning point. But the reading specialist and I end, I observe that students were writing longer, more thorough entries and exhibiting more self-assurance. The technique not only achieved the district target, but also had significant noticeable effects on student engagement and skill development.

According to progress monitoring statistics and student reflections.

P4: I, a turning point occurred when I introduced cookery activities in my classroom based, ILRC area, to support the district goal or the national goal of providing individualized skill-based learning for pre-transitions students. Initially, students were hesitant and needed a lot of guidance, but over several sessions, they began following steps more independently and competing tasks with minimal problems. The parents and our principal noticed the improvement during classroom visits, and I saw it in students increased confidence, engagement and willingness to participate.

This mattered because it showed that hands-on, meaningful strategy could directly connect this street or even they show an objective to real observable student progress.

P5: When I included the goal of increasing the writing influency into a everyday journaling activities and made a direct connection between the larger aim and classroom practice, it was turning point.

Both read... I observed that the learner were writing longer, more through, increase the exhibiting more self-assurance. So the technique not only achieved the target, but also had a significant, noticeable effects on the learner's engagement, and skill development according to the progress monitoring statistics and learner's reflection.

P6: A turning point came when I aligned my daily lessons with a literacy goal by embedding, embedding, structural breeding, strategies into every subject, not just English. Colleagues and administrators quickly noticed that students were more engaged consistently, and

c1
Customization

c3
Resourcefulness

c13
Progress

c1
Segmentation

<i>applying comprehension skills across basically. I think it mattered because students began confidently transferring those strategies into independent work, showing growth, not only in test scores, but also in their ability to think critically. So most of the time, in every specific goal, it is to be independent.</i> <i>That is always written, written in our objective or goal, that the learner must do this specific objective independently. So if they can do it independently on their own, they can be critically on their own. They can do that in their own. Yeah. Step in, in a manipulative.</i> <i>P7: A turning point came when I introduced visual recipe cards, and It's step by step, checklist to teach learner how to prepare healthy snacks. Directing, connecting, uh, District goal on life skills to daily classroom practice. Once we implemented this strategy, students who previously needed constant guidance become following instruction more independently. And a general education teacher, class and parents notice that learners were more confident in engaging during the cooking activities. I knew it mattered because students then only completed recipes successfully, but also practice hygiene, safety, and decision making skills, reflecting real growth in both independence and life skills.</i> <i>P8: So a certain strategy that we have done is doing application instead of just writing it off or copying the illustrations on the board. So what we did is we had this mosquito repellent. So we have our entrepreneurial competency. Sorry, the personal entrepreneurship competency, marketing and environment, as well as our product making development competency. So what we did is. Since they cannot fully retain all steps and some of them tend to forget other steps. So what I do is, I, I gave them a visual example 1st of what are the materials that we are going to use and what are the ingredients of our mosquito repellent? And after that, when they were able to at least identify, which is the bottle, which is the, which is the sand, which is the other, uh, material that you're going to use. I then demonstrated this on a step-by-step basis. So, what happened is they may not fully remember what it is called, but at least the familiarity of the repetitive step was met. So, What happened is that we were with this simple product making, we were able to do all 3 competencies because when they finished this, they, they were also, I'm sorry, they were also the one who put on the packaging of our mosquito repellent. And then we, what we did is that we presented a letter allowing us to sell outside of the school in just in the public market of our war district. So, our learners were the one who sold the products that they made. So at least in that way, all competencies were was able to be done and demonstrated. In that short, in that uh, in that certain situation. So that was what really mattered to me because I knew with, I do not have to be fully present with them. All I have to do is monitor and just really guide them. and see and see to it that they were able to do it altogether. So they may not understand the complex, uh, the complex terms in entrepreneurship, but at least they were able to do it. They were able to know that oh, I can sell this. I can do this, so if ever, if ever they uh, will graduate in my program already. I know that they can actually do product selling outside of the school. We just small or minimal assistance from their own parents and gardens. So at least in that way, po, as well, they were able to have the sense of accomplishment and independence that, yeah, even though I have special needs, I can do this. So that was one of the things that I know it mattered for my students because they were really smiling. The smile was different. It wasn't forced. You know, I, I, we have similar uh, experience and I'm so curious how, It is now, and I'm so excited and that visualizing that your kids are going to, uh, They will be able to try outside the school after school and they would know how to, how to, uh, earn a living and have that dignity of, instead of begging, they are going to work for themselves. That is great. And congratulations. You're already a success in that part.</i> <i>P9: A turning point came when the consistent use of visual skages and pegs was adopted and imbeded into my daily classroom routines as ESD learners. I noticed fewer meltdowns and smoother translations, while payments observe, improve, requesting in participation at school in a home. It's mattered because the learners were able to communicate their needs more independently, showing progress toward functional goals.</i> <i>P10: A key turning point came when our district emphasized</i>	c13 Advancement c4 Implementation c4 Life skill implementation c1 Guided lesson planning c6 Administrative support c4 Communication skill development c15 Consistent support c19 Uniformity c3 Investment c3 Bridge c11 Consequences		
---	---	--	--

increasing students' independence with academic routines. At first, the goal felt broad, but it clicked for me when I started using a simple 1st step visual checklist with a student who routinely froze at the start of assignments. The moment I introduced the checklist during a math block, um, he looked at it, took a breath, and began uh, working without waiting for a prompt. That small shift connected the district's executive function goal directly to my daily instruction. The impact was immediately noticeable. The general education teacher commented that he was starting tasks faster, and the family shared that homework time had become less stressful. I knew it mattered because it's time to start data improved steadily and his confidence grew alongside it. That experience showed me how a district goal becomes meaningful when a strategy is simple, consistent, and embedded into a classroom routines. IGQ3: How do you decide which district level goes to prioritize for a given class or a student? Walk me through a concreting sample where you aligned a district goal with your pacing, assessment, schedule, and support. P1: Well, I start by looking at which district goals are most directly would mostly direct. Our direct will mostly address directly my students current need. For example, when the district prioritized improving writing across the content area, I adjust my pacing to build in weekly short writing tasks tied to the objectives of the I aligned the assessment by using a common writing rubric for both formative and summative checks and scheduled feedback days into the unit plan. And to support the students, I added sentence stems and model responses and small group to conferencing for those who need extra help. So this kept the district goal visible while still meeting the while still meeting the present level of performance of the child. P2: I choose which district goals to focus on by looking at what the student needs most and what fits naturally into our daily schedule. For example, when the district had a goal around improving reading fluency, I picked it for a student who struggled with decoding. I aligned it like this: First Pacing: I added a short fluency routine to the start of reading time each day. Second Assessments: I used the district's weekly fluency checks and matched them to the nstudent's IEP goals. And Supports: I gave the student repeated readings, sentence frames, and small-group practice. Because the district goal matched the student's needs and fit easily into our routine, the student made steady progress. P3: Where you align a district goal with your basing, assessment, schedule, and support. I take into account the kids' existing skill levels. The classroom base, and the resources available to ensure significant development, When determining which district level goes to emphasize. For instance, I arranged formative evaluations every Friday. Align district goals, focus on math, problem solving, with our weekly lesson plans and offer the small group support to kids who needed more help. This alignment made training manageable in the permanent for all students, while enabling focus practice, from feedback, and measurable progress. P4: In myself contains net class, I prioritize the division level, district level goal by considering each student's readiness, functional needs, and the skills that will have the most immediate impact on independence and engagement. For example, the district emphasized skill based, so I support through the ILRC area we made. I choose cookery, because I believe this cookery activities for my pre-transition student is aligned with their developmental level and daily living needs. I taste the lessons in small, manageable steps, assess progress with checklist and observation, and providing supports like visual cues, modeling and hands-on guidance. This alignment allows students to practice meaningful skills at their own pace, showed clear progress in independence and confidence, and ensured that the district division goal is translated into practical classroom learning. P5: So I take into account the existing skills label of the learner, the pace of the classroom, and the resources available to make sure significant development when determining which goals to emphasize. For instance, I arrange formative evaluations, uh, so every Friday,	c12 Initiative c23 Validation c12 Application c12 Embedding c14 Self efficacy c13 Consistency c12 Initiative c4 Objective c13 Goal connection c4 Hands on strategy c4 Applied learning c5 Guided monitoring		
--	---	--	--

<i>much goals that focus on example, math problem solve being in our weekly lesson plans and offered small group support aid to the learner who is required more help. So this alignment, alignment, may training, manageable, and pertinent for all the learners, we enable to focus practice, from feedback and measurable progress.</i> <i>P6: I prioritize goals by looking at which ones directly address my learners' current needs. Then mapping them onto basic and attachment. For example, when emphasizing on my problem, I adjusted my face into a lot more time. For multi-step plans, I scheduled formative checks every 2 weeks and added small group support, ensuring the goal was embedded in daily practice without overwhelming my students. So, sometimes, um, in an inclusive classroom, we always have someone we called Badi. So our learners, with special education needs, Merin Shang Kabadi. He has someone to look up to when he needs something, not just always the pictures. That's it, sometimes, it can be shy, they can be reluctant to ask for help, and sometimes if it's students with autism, they don't know how to express their feelings, what are their needs. So it is very essential that they have a bodies. Nah, they can assess, they can adopt, and they can imitate them proper behavior. And I can imitate, oh, it's time for notebook. It's time for your geta. Very, um, supporting them. A very beneficial thing, small group, or young body group, in an inclusive classroom. Especially when you are on TV, IEP, goal for the lyrics. And I think the, uh, inclusive teachers have a very big goal. For selecting which group is the best support group for this learner. Which one of my learners the best support system for my learner, to say, not everybody can have a high tolerance. Or students with special education, especially if they have a, uh, behavior problem. And sometimes they have a meltdown, so that learner, that specific support system of the learner inside the classroom. So you will maybe begin on strength to the learner. So very essential shot effective. And, In Nina, it is definitely that, nah, your attention a teacher is koha in paña, or that is specific, I need, nah. He have a body. Yeah, so my products, my belovedness, hafisham, lesbian shark. So, nah, ha, ha, nam, student, and also a parent. Now, they know, nah, their child is being taken care by their fears. Not only by the teachers. Yeah. That's a good idea.</i> <i>Learning body.</i> <i>P7: Readiness and classroom context, ensuring that goal is both meaningful and achievable. For example, when district go emphasized teaching students to prepare healthy snack independently, I align into it my classes scheduled by dedicating one cooking session each week. I broke the bowl into smaller skills, measuring ingredients, following step-by-step instruction, and practicing hygiene, and used checklist and observation per assessment. I provided excess support during a small group session and shared strategies with the special general education teacher and parents to enforce learning at home. This carefully, careful placing alignment of the support, ensure that the district goal translated into tangible, measurable progress for each learner.</i> <i>P8: So, one of uh, using the K 12 curriculum gride, uh, the entrepreneurship SHS package. So what I do for that to achieve the district level goal is we really have to have products to do on a yearly basis. So it can be just, it can be one or it can be 2 or 3 depending on their basis. So, for example, a goal that we have to do is for them to be able to understand what market is, what is man power, and what is, um, materials are. So in this simple way of marketing and environment scanning. So, I'm sorry that I wasn't able to fully, uh, answer this uh, the previously. So what we, what I do is instead of just telling them, just telling them of what this means. I actually asked them based on their personal experience. So it's a different, it is a different application. So I asked that, for example, we have the market. So the market is, where do you use what you buy? I asked them on their personal experiences. Where do you buy? What do you buy? What do you need a home? So. That way, uh, they are able to understand that these are these are places that they go to to buy certain products. So that's our pacing is no. So this kind of topic could take us actually an hour or two. And then what we do is when I ask them, where do you buy that? I asked them, okay, so who do you who usually buy this kind of stuff? Why do you think they buy this stuff? So the complex, the questioning is a little bit complex. So sometimes I simplify this by means of giving them choices. I give them certain choices that they do</i>	c14 Student joy c13 Behavior improvement c21 Independence focus c13 Progress & Confidence c8 Targetting c15 Measurement c5 Outcomes c20 Personalization c18 Impact c6 Relevance c4 Scaffolding c12		
---	--	--	--

not understand my question. For example, who buys the food at home? Uh, if they do not understand, I tell them, is it mommy or is it you? So with these choices, they are able to understand that, oh, this, they connected that mommy buys it or sometimes along with mommy, I go with mommy to buy these objects. So what happened is that, uh, when we finish this certain, this certain topics, before we fully apply it on uh, real life situation, I, I give them a, a week or 2 to prepare the materials that I need to do. For example, is, uh, we are going to try to buy our fruits and vegetables or vegetables for their dinner. So that way I get to assess them if they get to identify the vegetables they have to buy. Uh, They get to see, they get to less down how much, how much do you think is one kilo? I tell them, oh, as the seller. How much is one kilo of rice? Then you list down, you list it down, or you ask your mommy to listen down. So that way they get to be familiar with it. And then later on, uh, that is when they get to, that is when they get to do, when they are finished buying all of this, uh, ingredients for their dinner, for example. So I asked them to take a video of how do they prepare their dinner? So when they when they are able to do this step by step or with minimum assistance, or for example, just a certain part of preparing dinner, I then, in turn, ask them, do you think this is sellable? Do you think you could make a living of doing this? You're doing food, food marketing, and then later on selling it to people. So we get to observe themselves if yes, they can do it or not. So if it's a not, they we tend to look into how do you think are you able to help or how do you think what do you think you can do? To uh, to have an independent life after, especially our program. And then that is where we get to see, along with their parents and guardians. We collaborate all together that, hey, the kid is already 25 years old or 23 years old. By the time he already stopped going here in our school, what can he do that can lead to independence? So most of the time, what happened is our district level goes, uh, becomes a bit more wide, because it leads to independence already, given the age, the age of lapification at the same time. Uh, the mental ability of the child to comprehend what he can and cannot do. That, uh, what you thought them is life skill that they really need. until the end of their life. That is really important. That's why Ned is here. We need to make them independent. Yes, because most of the learners that I really handle are already in the adult, in the adult ages. That's why. Yeah, so that's why the useful application of in academic is a little bit more different in my, in my current, uh, status because I am already teaching them skills that they could use when they are no longer my students. Yeah. Not because they are going to be high school, they are going to be high school or going to college, but because they are going to have their own life already, not anymore inside the classroom. P9: I prioritize IEP goals by looking at each learner's current functioning, immediate needs and readiness, especially for ESD students, who require intensive support. For example, when functional communications was emphasized, I aligned these goals with my facing in Infusing, requesting, and choice making into daily routines such as arrivals, snap times, and dismissal. I assessed progress through daily observation, checklist, and simple data sheets. Rather than formal test in provided, Support like visual skages, specs, handover, hand prompting, and parent coordination. This approach allowed the goal to be realistic, realistically implemented. P10: I prioritize district level goals by looking at where they naturally intersect with students immediate needs. My instructional pacing, the and the assessment routines already built into the classroom. For example, when the when the district emphasized improving students' executive function skills, especially task initiation, I reviewed my caseload to identify who struggled most with starting work independently. One student in my reading group consistently waited for adult prompting before beginning any assignment. So I choose to align, um, The district goal with his day to routine. To make it workable, I embedded a strategy into our existing pacing and assessment schedule. I introduced a simple 1st step visual prompt during us, our small group block. paired it with a quick verbal check in, and added a time to start measure to my weekly progress monitoring. The general education teacher reinforced the same routine during whole group lessons, and the family used a similar prompt at home within a few weeks, is initiation time decreased and his confidence increased. That alignment worked because the district goal	Prioritization c23 Appraisal c8 Aiming c12 Execution c23 Mentorship c5 Analysis c15 Support alignment c2 Output based c4 Experimental learning c4 Scaffolding c4 Real life tasks c4 Applied learning c4 Integration routines c1 Planning c22 Understanding		
--	---	--	--

wasn't treated as an add-on. It was woven into a natural flow of instruction and supported consistently across settings. IGQ4: Can you share a concrete collaboration or system level facilitation? Example, team planning, data sharing, professional development, that consistently supports bridging district goals to classroom realities. What makes this approach sustainable? P1: Can we skip this question, ma'am? P2: <i>One system-level support that really helped was regular team planning meetings with shared data. Every few weeks, teachers and specialists met briefly to look at the same progress charts and decide how district goals would show up in daily lessons. It was sustainable because it was short, predictable, and used data we were already collecting. Nothing extra was added—just clearer communication. This made it easy to keep district goals connected to real classroom needs.</i> P3: <i>Our weekly co planning meetings in which special education teachers, general education teachers, and specialists examine student data. Align lesson plans with district objectives, and arrange accommodations, serve as a specific example. Because it enables in the moment modifications, collaborative, problem solving, and transparent communication among all team members. This method continuously connects district goals with customer reality. Using shareable digital tools that keep everyone informed and accountable. And integrating the process into the school timetable are what make it sustainable.</i> P4: <i>In, again, my self contains net glass, one concrete system level support has been regular meetings. With administrators and parents to plan and review. Excuse me, I.E. goes, share observation and coordinate resources. Though our administrator, our principal, is not always present in the meeting, but we always give feedback. He give feedback through our reports, especially when we ask permission and we give the the project proposals and the activity proposal. that is under our IEPs. For example, when implementing the goal of skill-based support through an ILRC, we discuss which activities, materials, and routines would work in our classroom context and how parents could reinforce learning at home.</i> <i>This approach is sustainable because it pays a clear shared plan, ensures consistent communication, and allows adjustment based on real-time student progress, making it easier to translate. District division objective in the meaningful day-to-day learning experience.</i> P5: <i>Our weekly goal planning meetings when the special education teacher, the general education teachers, and students' data, much less on plans to objectives and arrange accommodations. serve as an specific illustration, because, because it is enabled in the moment modifications, collaborative, collaborative problems, all being, and transparent communication among all the team members. And this method continuously connects to the goal with the classroom reality. So using shareable digital tools that keep everyone informed and accountable as well as the integrating the process into the school timetable or what may it sustainable.</i> P6: <i>Where the teacher analyzes, student data, from the inclusive, um, education teacher, from the parent, and also from the therapist. And co-designed the lesson adjustment tied to the goals. Or the policy. This works long term because it builds collaborative ownership. Keep practice consistent across classroom and reduces the burden on only to the single be true. So, it is very important if, as a special education teacher, I share my insight of my knowledge. Not expertise because I'm not expert at false appeal. I have a teaching for 7 years, so for me, it's not expert level. I'm at the beginning level, so... I have a privilege to share my insight and experiences in teaching students with special education needs. So it is one of the good practices in professional development because it's a teacher. We are also learning to teach. There will be always a new way to teach students, because students are different in every generation. So that's why even they called me a beginning teacher, jealousy teacher. I always learned from other kids, especially from the season teacher. As they call the teacher who are experienced, because then, Even though I can connect to the learners, especially to the friends, because I am the younger ones, but in speaking of strategies, how to handle behavior, how to manage the learners, I always look up the features who are seasoned. That said, they have the white, Hawaii, uh, scales. Now, they can offer. It's not</i>	c9 Teamwork Endurance c12 Contextualization c3 Sustainability c1 Preparation c12 Visibility c14 Insight driven c6 Joint accountability c12 Simplification c14 Humility c19 Professional contribution		
---	--	--	--

<i>always now. I'm not. It's always like that. I always, um, give respect to where the credit is due. I said, well, all those special education teachers, I always learned from my mentors. Especially for my colleagues now, they are teaching for almost 25 years. Even though, even though my bachelor degree is special education, I sometimes learn from them how to handle the learners' behavior. So, It's not always that, but sometimes the experience give you the most less on now, you can always apply, especially in teaching. Um, Even, even though I'm already, uh, for more than 40 years in teaching, I always tell myself, there is always room for improvement. And I also believe, based on my experience, the strategy that work today is not going to work tomorrow. You need to think of another strategy. No, not the strategy that you know does at work every time. So, Young or old, but we all have room for improvement and well, it's learning every day.</i> <i>So, I know everything.</i> P7: <i>A concrete example is our quarterly co- meetings with just that the chair, special education, teach her parents and learner, where we review progress, share observation, and plan the lesson that connect district goes to daily practice. For instance, when different learners to prepare health is not, we use this session to align the recipes, safety routines, live, discuss, with IEP objective, and learner schedule. This approach is sustainable because it creates structured, recurring opportunities for communication. Ensures everyone understand their role and allows timely adjustment based on the learner's actual performance. Over time, it has strengthened collaboration build, learner independence, and produce measurable progress toward district posts.</i> P8: <i>So, Okay, thank you. Thank you for waiting for me. So, uh, COVID collaboration or system level facilitation. Uh, it was more related on the professional development. So we have our lab sessions, and this actually helps us to share with our fellow feelings, what are the current improvements and challenges that we face with our learners, and somehow it actually helps me a lot to better understand my learners because not there are some behavior or certain Certain emotions that I do, I have not seen from them, that I would like to confirm with my fellow colleagues on how were they able to handle this or how were how were these learners were when they were under their hair? And honestly, it really helps me a lot because with their support, I am able to to actually deliver a better IEPO that is attainable. Uh, within the month that I know it shows, it may be small test, but that is, it is a big impact on them because there is, there is progress, there is good men. Instead of it always being stagnant. Very good.</i> P9: <i>One concrete and consistent support in regular case, conferencing, and informal team planning amongst fed teachers, the school head and the apps in Ned, where district goals are discussed alongside actual cross of conditions. We use simple, shared tools, such as anecdotal records, homeschool notebooks, and progress monitoring sheets align expectation, instruct learners' progress. This approach is sustainable because it's, it does not rely on expensive technology. It's with an existing school routines and build shared accountability and understanding among teachers, in parents, in public schools setting.</i> P10: <i>One system level structure that consistently helps bridge district goes to a classroom realities is our monthly cross team planning session. These meetings bring together sped teachers, um, general education, teachers, specialists in, an administrator to review district priorities, such as executive function skills or literacy targets. And translate them into practical classroom routines. We use shared data dashboards, so everyone sees the same information and we spend part of the meeting codesigning strategies that fit upcoming units, stopping patterns and student aids. This prevents, um, district goes from feeling abstract and ensures that implementation is aligned across classrooms. What makes this approach sustainable? is it's predict predictability and efficiency. The meetings are short, the tools are simple, and the routines become part of everyone's workflow rather than an exercise. Because the structures repeats monthly, team build trusts, refine strategies over time and catch misalignment early.</i> <i>Students benefit because the sports they receive are consistent, coordinated, and directly connected to both district expectations and day-to-day realities of instruction.</i> IGQ5: <i>In the stories of success, what is specific elements? Such as</i>	c4 Innovation c1 Observational learning c12 Creativity c19 Structured collaboration c19 Professional collaboration c19 Peer consultation c5 Improved outcomes c3 Shared tracking tools		
---	--	--	--

<u>instructional adjustments, data practices, scheduling, resource use, family engagement. Most reliably influence student outcomes.</u> <u>Describe a scene that illustrates this element in action.</u> P1: <i>In the most successful moments, a few elements consistently work together. These are clear instructional adjustments, timely use of data, intentional scheduling and targeted resources.</i> <i>For example, during a mid unit mat walk, I review exit ticket data and notice a small group struggling with a multi step problems. So what I did was the next day the schedule flexes to allow a short intervention block where the students work with manipulatives and guided questioning while others extended their learning independently. Because expectations are clear and supports our imaging, students stay engaged and confident. The outcome is visible when the students with the same student when the same students independently solve similar problems and showing the adjustment and it shows that the adjustment truly made a difference.</i> P2: <i>In the success stories I've seen and experience, the same elements show up again and again: small instructional adjustments, clear data routines, predictable schedules, smart use of support staff, and steady family communication. When these pieces work together, students grow faster. It's a Tuesday morning reading block. I starts with a short, targeted mini-lesson based on last week's data. The special education teacher quietly moves beside a student who needs extra decoding support, using a quick scaffold they planned together. A paraeducator runs a small fluency group at the back table. The student's family has already seen the week's goal in a simple home-school notebook, so the child practiced the same skill the night before.</i> <i>Everyone is working from the same information, using the same strategy, and supporting the same goal. You can see the student gaining confidence—reading a little smoother, smiling when they finish a passage they used to avoid.</i> <i>That combination of aligned instruction, shared data, coordinated support, and family partnership is what reliably moves outcomes.</i> P3: <i>The factors that most consistently affect students results in success stories are instructional modifications, consistent data procedures, carefully scheduling, efficient resource usage, and um, active family involvement I remember an instance where parents are enforced, tactics at home and shared updates with the team when a pupil rotated through small group training, used visual aids, and uh, and had weekly progress documented. The student's abilities clearly improved as a result of this concerted effort. Which also gave them more self-assurance and uh, A distinct sense of learning momentum. Mhm.</i> P4: <i>In stories of success, instructional adjustments, consistent routines for source support, and family engagement, most reliably influenced student outcomes. For example, in my self-contained net class, students prepare their own meals for large as part of a cookery activity in our classroom-based ILRC area. The lessons were consistent with frequent reminders and step by step guidance. And I partnered with parents, and even our, uh, to become those who are in the office or those in the canteen area or even sometimes we ask for our administrative officer to provide the necessary materials because food is basic necessity. student understood the importance of the task and were motivated to participate. Over time, they showed greater independence, confidence, and engagement, illustrating how meaningful, hands-on activities combined with structured support and stakeholder involvement leads to real growth.</i> P5: <i>Most reliably influenced student outcomes. Describe a scene that illustrates this element in action. The factors, the most, that most consistently affect learners result in success stories are instructional modifications. Consistent data procedures, carefully scheduling, efficient resource usage, and active family involvement. So I remember in an instance, where the parents were enforced tactics at home and shared updates with the team, and the pupils rotated through a small group training. You special aids and had weekly progress documented. So the learner's abilities clearly improve as a result of this concerted effort, which also gave them more self-assurance and distinct sense of learning momentum.</i> P6: <i>The most reliable elements are targeted, instructional, adjustment paired with frequent data checks and stock family communication. For instance, um, sometimes, given now, now they are expectation from the</i>	c9 Cross team planning c1 Goal alignment c9 Coordinated supports c8 Approaches c4 Assistance c4 Development c13 Success c13 Development c1 Structured support c13 Development c9 Support c3 Progression		
--	---	--	--

family. But we need to keep the family informed. It's a progress known, but that. And how we adjust and accommodate through, uh, this thing, inception, physical, Not every instruction works for every learner, even type of a regular class. We need to be flexible. We need to have variety of instructions. So we need to have targeted instruction adjustment with frequent data checks, and we need to give those data checks to the family, so they are always updated. So those expectations, they know the expectation, but they also know the progress so they can communicate with arts. So what works at school need to continue at home. So, and did not go up on a teacher. They tone down the activities in math, come for student shop for... If it has 3 or 5 items, they reduce it to 2, the most important thing is, Nahaka, Sabaina Manubata. So, we always inform the parent, nah, the instruction, we have accommodation, the holiday, the learners. We are doing what we need, we are doing everything. So, they need to know that, Important, but in for your strong communication with the fact. P7: I recall the scene in our classroom where a learner was preparing a talpist. I have adapted the instruction into visual, step by step checklist, align a booking session with our weekly schedule, the track each step in simple progress start. The parent observed and encourage the learner at home, reinforcing hygiene and safety routines, while we use basic kitchen tools and ingredients effectively in the class. Together, these elements are seamless, support system, allowing the learner to follow instruction independently, complete the snack successfully, and gain confidence in life skills. It was a moment where careful planning, collaboration, impair learned support, are all come together to produce intangible growth. P8: Okay. So, this is not my own student, but I am also one of the assistant coach whenever it trains at school during our Saturday sports training. So the learner has demonstrated big progress in terms of his behavior and following off instructions. What was done was he was consistent in this in his therapy sessions. Class attendance and sports training. He learned and was taught how to manage his emotions by his OT, and then also learned the value of waiting and perseverance when doing his sports training. And he also learned to calm down as he became more exposed to socialization with other people. So instructions were clearly given and broke down for him to understand by his class advisors when it comes to lessons. His parents also did not stop to continue his, sorry, continue his routine from home to school. Since he has greatly improved in the next school year, this 2026 to 2027. He will be promoted to the next gym setting, as he is seen to be able to catch up with his other regular peers. Oh, congratulations. She did it. P9: In successful cases, the most reliable elements are clear instructional adjustments, simply daily data tracking, flexible scheduling, and strong family engagement. One typical scene is a morning routine where a learner uses visual jigsaws. Or, or, Pecs and manipulatives to choose activities. While the teacher knows responses on a cheat list and adjust prompts as needed. A parent later reinforced the same routine a home using the notebook guidance. creating consistency across settings. This combination of student structured teaching, Practical data use and homeschooled partnership leads to meaningful gains in communication. Behavior and participation despite limited resources in a provincial public school. P10: The most consistent elements I see in successful IEP implementation are targeted instructional adjustments. simple data routines, predictable scheduling, and active family engagement. When these pieces work together, students experience support that is consistent across settings rather than fragmented or reactive. Clear routines, share data, and aligned expectations help every adult respond to the student in the same way. Which builds confidence and reduces anxiety. One scene that captures this was a morning reading block with a student who struggled with comprehension and past initiation. Before the lesson, the general education teacher and I quickly reviewed our shared tracker. Noticing he had been starting tasks faster when given a visual step, 1st step cue. We adjusted the day's plan by chunking the text, scheduling a brief check in before independent work and send the same visual home for the family to use during homework. That day, he opened his notebook, looked at the queue, and began writing without hesitation. His engagement stayed	c1 Systematic c16 Transparency c4 Emphasis c9 Coordinated support c13 Consistency c14 Self regulation c20 Effective practices c1 Homeschool consistency c15 Consistent intervention c13 Better student outcome c5 Observation c1 Revision		
---	---	--	--

<i>steady and he probably shared his work at the end of the class. That moment showed how aligned strategies, rooted in data, reinforced routine and supported by family, translate directly into meaningful student progress.</i>	c15 Measurement		
IGQ6: How do you monitor and interpret progress? The wire district IEP goes within the classroom setting? Tell a story about how the data you collected led to a modification, in instruction or accommodations, and the resulting student outcome.			
<i>P1: Monitor progress towards specific IEP goals by including data collection into the daily instruction through observation notes, work samples and quick formative assessment. Example 1 student had an IEP goal focused on written expression.</i>	c10 Intervention		
<i>I've noticed through the week through the weekly writing samples that the child could generate ideas verbally, but he struggles to organize them on paper or in writing.</i>			
<i>So in response I added a graphic organizer and allowed speech to text during drafting.</i>	c5 Observation		
<i>And then with a few weeks after, the students writing became more structured and complete and progress monitoring data showed a steady growth toward the goals of the IDP and confirming the accommodations was effective.</i>			
<i>P2: I monitor progress by using quick weekly checks that match the student's IEP goal—like short probes, work samples, or fluency timings. I look for patterns over several weeks to see if the student is improving.</i>			
<i>One example was a student working on reading fluency. Each week, I recorded how many words they read correctly in one minute. After a few weeks, the numbers stayed the same, which told me the current approach wasn't working. Because of that data, I changed instruction:</i>			
<i>I used shorter passages, added repeated readings, and gave the student a quieter spot to practice. Within two weeks, their scores started going up, and they read with more confidence.</i>			
<i>The data showed the problem, guided the change, and confirmed the improvement.</i>			
<i>P3: By gathering daily work samples using checklists to evolve performance and observing pupils engage in specific activities. I wonder how well the district is meeting. It's IEP goals. For instance, I implemented guided reading sessions and the visual cues to scaffold understanding after observing weekly statistics, showing that a student consistently struggled with the independent reading. This change resulted in increased confidence and accuracy. Showing quantifiable advancement toward the IAP objective.</i>	c12 Modification		
<i>P4: In myself contains net class, I monitor progress by observing students during activities. Using checklist and noting how independently they complete tasks. Sometimes you also use rubrics to to see and evaluate their performance. For example, during cookery sessions where students prepared their own lunch, I trapped their ability to follow steps, use school safely, and finish task with minimal prompting. I noticed one student struggled with cutting vegetables, so I modified instruction by modeling the step more slowly, providing hand over hand guidance and breaking the task into smaller manageable parts. With this adjustment, The student gradually become more confident and independent. Eventually completing the activity with less support, showing that careful data collection can guide targeted accommodation and meaningful programmers.</i>	c13 Independence		
<i>P5: By gathering daily work examples, using checklist to evaluate performance and watching learners engage in specific activities. I keep an eye on how, how well the meeting, it's IEP goal. For an instance, I implemented guided reading sessions and visual cues to scaffold understanding after observing through weekly statistics that the learner was constantly having trouble with the independent lady.</i>	c22 Tracking		
<i>P6: I monitor progress by tracking IEP goals through ongoing classroom data, like work samples, behavior, behavior, rugs, formative assessment. So, for example, when data show the students struggling with retail expression, despite accommodation, I modify through instruction, to include sometimes speech to text tools or visual support. So this student produced a longer, more coherent responses and gain confidence in sharing ideas. Especially for the students who are non-verbal. We are sometimes the figure, um, During my 1st years in of teaching, there is a parent. One of my 1st students. There's a parent came to me in a mom. But if we get more... So, it's a challenge,</i>	c22		

especially education teacher, 1st time, 1st year of teaching. But by the grace of good. First word, I thank you. So, yeah. So I'm happy now for that. Thank you unfortunately. So, see, mother, nice, friendly, push, a big teacher. So my god, she's also a special education teacher. Wow, that's I just want to share. Yes, ma. So the learner is, um, now, great Trin of Osha. That's good. The 1st word is stink. But before I pull off everything, thank you. Nahari, si, buahanan, spit, dora, sotoxipa, But I will, it's not worth it at the end. Yeah, it's part of the job that's part of the work that we are doing because, you know, the kids do not understand and sometimes they do not know how to express their feeling. They don't know how to say it, especially if the child is not verbal. So that could be, um, uh, gesture of what she wants to tell you. Maybe it's... Yeah, it's just for that. No, I don't like it. I don't like to do it. So in order for me to, in order for the chat, uh, to, We need to decode it. Yeah, we need to understand that. their gestures. Yes. So they used to love, I think they had a good nap, but in the, there are times nah, but it had each other martin. So, boo, boo, boo, boo, boo, and, and, and... So, like, I understand the parent. That's a, my hero bit of code, Joel, kase, a, a, a, a, a... I say teacher, huh? We always go for... What's the reason for it? Yeah. So don't let the code. Check before you go to school. I know. Sometimes, when we melt down Disha, we forgot to call or Tashi, he used it at home, and boyo, mama, sampo. So, that they called namishaman. So, my own, gritrin a shot. Mm. Lina portion of me melt down, and they're just a regular class. Yeah, well, the problem is, the parent push, mashadong, malisa, salita. I know. But, but, unfair is working, so government, like, nayon, is not working now. Such a bit ineligible enough for the, um, subsidy, which is, uh, one therapy session, sometimes I want to. Um, so the teacher, I, Matas Naposi, 30 K. If you need 2 sessions per week, how much Napoleon? So, it's not competitive enough. That's why I want to go. Maching it up. I It's really difficult to have a special child in the family. And you don't spend more because he needs it. But, you know, there is a way. Okay, and we need to add more prayers. We need to, you know, through prayers. I will, there's a way. Yeah, there's a will, there's a way. Yeah, you're right. P7: I monitor and interpret progress to our district IEP because by keeping detailed lags of each learner action, behavior, and achievements during classroom acting with these. I always have a notebook in my pocket to quickly record incidents or moment that show progress, whether it's following a step by step procedure, or practicing safety. For example, I notice that learner consistently escape a step when measuring ingredients. So I modified instruction by adding a visual view card for that step and provided extra night practice. After implementing this adjustment, the learner began completing recipes independently and with greater accuracy. Using this immediate observation allowed me to make timely, personalized accommodation that directly improved the learned success and confidence. P8: So I used the content standard, performance standard, and learning competency of the curriculum guide, as the basis for giving specific objectives in both that is sustainable too, suitable to the learners. So, uh, one objective is the learner should be able to analyze the needs in chosen in a chosen community. So what I ask them 1st are what are the 4 basic needs, like the clothes, food, water, and shelter? So I use visual cues for this, for them to be able to identify property. And within those 4 needs, what kind of clothes do they want? What food do they like and need to eat? How does water help them and do they prefer their water with flavor? Is it plain cold, hot, or iced? And what do they need inside their house or their own taste? After this, we get to know what they think and could be, uh, what their commit needs. So I then move on to show visual aids or walk through their personal experiences. What do they usually buy when they go to the grocery store or the mall? Or is it in their sari sari store or convenience stores? So they get to think carefully what they see in their own community. So this is based on their personal experiences. I give 2 choices to other learners who are not able to respond immediately to my questions. So, for example, they were, they, to them, it, it didn't, uh, they were not able to comprehend it immediately. So I give them 2 choices of 2 answer choices. For example, where do you buy, where do you usefully buy your snacks? Is it in the mall? Or is it in the Sarrisari store near you? So at least that way. So the connection to the station,	Records	c4 Differentiation c10 Parent-engagement c13 Appreciation c3 Observation-skill c14 Resilience	
--	----------------	--	--

we then proceed in our next meeting. What possible products we think we can make that can or is cost efficient and is sure to be bought by the people in their own community. So this type of lesson can less up to 2 weeks or a month, as it depends on what they are able to comprehend in each day. But still, at least, we assure that it still follow the district, for the calling guy, and it aligns with the IEP goal of a word earners. Yeah, good job, good job. P9: I monitor progress using daily observation notes, simply tally sheets, and anecdotal records aligned with IAP goals. Since formal assessments are not always practical, in one case, my data show that an ASD learner could request items using text or actual materials or things during snack time, but not during academic tasks. I modify destruction by increasing visual prompts and providing more guided practice, drawing, network, and transitions. As a result, the learner began requesting help more consistently across activities. Reducing frustration in improving engagement in class. P10: I monitor progress toward district IP goals by embedding quick, consistent data checks into daily routines. Things like time to start measures, for example reviews, and brief observation notes during small group instruction. One memorable example involves student working toward a district goal related to improving reading fluency. I noticed through a weekly fluency checks that his accuracy dropped sharply whenever passages, um, were longer than a certain dent. The data pattern was clear. The issue wasn't decoding, it was stamina and overwhelm. Using that information, I modified instruction by shortening passages, adding repeated reading practice, and building in quick confidence boosting warm-ups. Within a few weeks, his fluency scores rose steadily, and he began volunteering to read aloud more often. That moment reinforced how small consistent data routines can reveal the root of a challenge and guide instructional shifts that make a meaningful difference for students. IGQ7: Describe a situation where a strategy successfully translated a district goal for one student, but had limited or differential effects for others. How did you adopt your approach to address equity and access? P1: Can we skip this question now? P2: I used a district reading-fluency strategy—repeated readings—that worked really well for one student. Their confidence and accuracy improved quickly. But for two other students, it didn't help much. One needed more decoding support, and another got bored with the repetition. To make it fair and accessible, I adjusted the approach: I added phonics practice and shorter texts for the decoding student. I offered high-interest, choice-based passages for the student who was disengaged. Once I made those changes, all the students started making progress. It reminded me that equity means giving each student what they need, not giving everyone the same strategy. P3: Some students achieved success with daily journaling as I established a district goal to improve writing, fluency. While others struggled with confidence in the organization. I implemented various supports, including visual organic organizers. Sentence, starters, and one-on-one check-ins for kids who need it is additional help to address equity. This modifications promoted accessibility and um, Measurable progress throughout the lesson. While enabling all students to participate actively in the objective. P4: In my class, I implemented cookery activities to translate the division district goal of providing skill-based individualized support. For one student, preparing their own lunch led to rapid gains in independence and confidence, but other students struggle, feels tasked like cutting or measuring ingredients. To address this, I adopted my approach by providing additional support such as step-by-step visual views. Hand over hand assistance with the participation of the parents. As my partners and pairing students with peers or adults for guided practice, so every learner could participate meaningfully. This ensured equity and access, allowing all students to engage with the activity at their level while still working toward the same district division rules. P5: So some learners achieve success with daily journaling. As I establish a goal to improve writing fluency while others struggle with confidence and organization. I implement different supports, including visual organizers, sentence starters, and one-on-one check-ins for the	c5 Progress monitoring c2 Curriculum alignment c3 Visual support c1 Contextual learning c4 Differentiation c4 Entrepreneurial thinking c16 Increased initiation c5 Performance monitoring c3 Insightful data use c3 Procedure c14 Activation c7 Personalized support c4 Objective c5 Accessibility		
---	--	--	--

learner who required additional help in order to help them to address the equality. So, this modification promoted the accessibility mesh and measurable progress throughout the lessons while enabling all the learner to participate actively in the objective. P6: P7: I once implemented a redding influency strategy that helped one student meet the district goal because we have a goal, no read, no, but. But other students struggle to keep up due to different learning bases. To address equity, I adopted a approach by providing leave-level texts. Small group support and additional practice tailor to each learner's needs. This ensure all students have access to the same goal while progressing at pace that match their abilities, allowing each experience a meaningful growth. P8: So what I do with those who need modified instructions, I opt to give them answer choices or pictures as choices. Sometimes I ask them with only yes or no response that I need from them. And in other situations, I have them illustrate it. So another is in product development. So for example, in using the heat press iron, I have, I have them do it all one by one or by pairs, so I get to monitor their task property. So one of my students cannot do it alone. So I do minimal assist with him. So, for example, he uh, he cannot fully grip the hit iron. So what I do is I assist him on how to do it. Like, for example, I I hold his hand for a little bit to demonstrate how much pressure he has to do with our heat iron. So, in this way, they all get to do the same goal they need to do for our lessons, which is to create a heat press design on a Hatcha pouch. P9: In implementing a goal functional communication, PECS worked very well for one ASD learner who was visually responsive but had limited in impact on others who showed low attention and sensory seeking behaviors. While one student quickly learned the request independently, others became frustrated or disengaged during the same activity. To address equity and access, I adopted the approach by using object cues, gesture, and assisted communication in by adopting, basing, and sensory support for its learner. This ensured that all students could assess or could access the goal through strategies much to the individual needs within my classroom. P10: I once implemented a district goal focused on improving task initiation, using a visual 1st step checklist. It worked beautifully for one student who froze at the start of assignments, in his initiation time drop, and his confidence group. But when I introduced the same strategy to 2 other students with similar goals, the impact was limited. One student ignored the checklist entirely, and another become more anxious because his visual cue felt like extra pressure. The contrast made it clear that a district aligned strategy can't be treated as one size fits all. Even when the goal is the same. To address equity and access, I adopted the approach based on the H student's regulation patterns and learning profile. For one student, I replaced the visual checklist with a brief, brief, car-regulated burvel prompt. For the other, I embedded movement and sensory sensory regulation before asking him to start. Once the support matched their actual needs, both students showed progress. Slower than the 1st student, but meaningful and sustainable. That experience in reinforced that equity isn't about giving every student the same tool. It's about adjusting the tools so each student can access the district goal in a way that works for them. IGQ8: How do you balance accountability and share decision making within themes? Tell a story about the time when collective responsibility led to a more effective IEB, or when the fusion of responsibility hindered progress. P1: I find creative ways to integrate district goals into routines rather than adding extra tasks. For example, our district emphasized informative assessment, but class time was tight, so I created a exit ticket rotations where students completed a one question check on tablets while I pulled small groups of small groups for targeted instruction. So this workaround kept assessment sequence without losing structural time. So as a result, I could adjust the lesson in real time and students showed a clearer, faster growth on the targeted skills. P2: When obstacles come up—like not enough time or staff—I look for small workarounds that still support the district goal. One example was when we didn't have enough adults to run all our	c12 Execution c20 Mentoring c15 Inclusion c4 Differentiation c5 Equity c20 Targeted strategy c4 Modified instruction c4 Guided support c8 Variable strategy effectiveness c8 Differentiated communication		
---	---	--	--

reading groups. To keep the district fluency goal going, I created a quick partner-reading routine where students practiced short passages together using a simple script. It took almost no extra time, and students still got daily fluency practice. The student with the IEP actually improved faster because they practiced more often. The workaround kept the district goal alive even with limited resources. P3: I use peer assistance, flexible grouping, and uh, flexible resources to develop, you know, the innovative ways to align district goals with classroom practice. When facing challenges such as staffing or time constraints, for instance, I intentionally corresponded with students for peer assisted practice when one-on-one support was unavailable for a reading goal. And I tracked progress using shared digital tools. Despite resource limitations, this work around kept students engaged. Emphasize the objective and lead to consistent gains in their reading skills. P4: Obstacles like limited time, staffing, like, um, I have, I always require parents to join me when it, when it is, um, the cookery time. Um, one or 2 parents, but sometimes, um, The parents are not available, so I have to do it alone, or materials often make it challenging to fully implement, uh, the goals. We don't have the tools for specific Bayan or something that we have to cook. For example, when I want that student to prepare their own lunch as part of cookery activities, we don't have enough utensils and ingredients for everyone. To address this, I created a rotation system and paired students, and I also reached out to sponsors or other stakeholders to provide additional materials. This allowed all students to participate in hands-on learning, reinforced routines and independence, and led to improved confidence and engagement while still meeting the district division goal or skill based individual life support. P5: I use peer assistance, flexible grouping, and flexible resources to come up with an innovative ways to match the goals with the classroom practice when pace with the challenges like stuffing or time constraints. For an instance, I purposely corresponded learner for peer assisted practices when one on one support was not was not available for a reading goal. And I track progress using shared digital tools. So despite resources limitations, this work around keeps learners in test, emphasize the objectives, and result in consistent gains in their reading abilities. P6: When mothers were short, um, writing interceptive, I create, uh, digital them, please. For example, there is a new published learning assessment, a learner activity sheet, or workbook. So sometimes our, um, centers, I will go over and publish a new book on learning assessment ship. Um, sometimes it is, It's not catering for every learner, especially for students with special education. So, what we do here is weaker eat, or we develop a learning activity sheet, especially for students with special education needs who are in and, or who are severely or profound level. So right now we are publishing learning activity issues, order level. So we, we publish a thing with, to cater everyone. So no one will be left behind. So, teachers in the cinema are all writers of this workbook, so we are all writer, developer, evaluate, or, and sometimes illustate bar. So, that is one of the, the new progress here in the Philippines, especially in the sanity team. We are writing, learning, the leadership, all work for the learners, and the division, or the upper office, are the ones who are publishing it. What's good about it? Uh, we can have a copyright of the book. That's it. Yeah, why not? It is, it is published and evaluated according to the, um, standard of the department of education. So, It is Eastern their dice. It's not just, okay, I'm gonna create an activity for today. So it's not like that. It is socially acceptable. It is well written, well restated, and congruent to the, uh, objective of the 1st situation curriculum for literature disability. You should have, right. You should have cover right. Okay. That's good. Yeah. P7: When we face a limited time and stuff, stuffing, I prioritize alignment by adapting, district goes into small, manageable classroom routine that can be implemented, consent consistently without overburdening anyone. For example, I created a simple student, friend, a test card, then they enforce math, reading goals, allowing A, or their peers to support student during independent work. This work around keep instruction aligned with district objective, increases student engagement, and led to noticeability, despite the resource	c8 Differentiated approach c5 Equity c12 Adaption c4 Creative teaching Objective preservation c4 Innovation Literacy focused Reliance Attainment		
--	---	--	--

resources. But... P8: So during our product making, there are times that our materials are lacking. So what we do is we proceed to meet another part of the product. Excuse me. So, for instance, we ran out of red pipe cleaners for our flower making. So, what we do is, we then proceed to make the leaves 1st while we, what we do is we just place an order online for the red 5 winners. So this activity still aligns with the district goal of the curriculum given to us that this is still part of the lesson. So what happened is that sometimes the obstacle is that we ran out of the materials that we need to do our product. So, instead of instead of whipping what our office provides, what we do is the remaining balance of what they were able to accumulate in selling our previous previews product, like the mosquito dependents, we used that money to buy our materials instead instead of waiting for a long time. Sorry about that. So that way we get the money that we have because of what they were able to sell circulate. And even though it's a little bit sad, what I teach them instead is that in reality, when you do business, this is what happens. Your money has to circulate. It does not have to go one way only like going out of your pockets only. So, that's the, that's the, application that I use for them to understand that why is it that, are going to use our money, that we have, We have accumulated from the past, the past stuff that we have sold. So they developed the concept of, oh, we use money to buy other stuff. We make more... They get to get other stuff that we need. Yes. Good. So what happened is they get to understand that, oh, when in terms of doing our own business, money circulates. That's what happened to them. Yes, that's nice. I can imagine how nice your program is. P9: Number eight question. Oh, yeah, yeah. Okay, number eight. So, for... Mm mm. Mm mm. Ah, okay, okay. Wait. Okay. When time staffing and materials are limited, I sustain alignment by instilling goals into daily routines rather than treating them as separate activities. For example, with no additional aid and limited bags materials, I created improvised pictures, cards, recycled folders, and used snaps. Time and lining up as opportunities for requesting and torn tagging. This workaround allowed consistent properties without disrupting the schedule, and led to improve functional communication and fewer behavioral incidents among ASD learners, showing that meaningful progress is possible even with limited resources. P10: I balance accountability and share decision making by making sure every team member understands both their roles and shared purpose behind the IEP. One moment that stands out involves a student who needed consistent behavior supports across settings. The team had agreed on visual cues and a quick check in before independent work, but implementation became inconsistent because each adult assumes someone else was handing the routine. That diffusion of responsibility led to escalating behaviors and uneven progress monitory. When we regrouped, I shifted the conversation away from blame and toward clarity. We created a simple implementation map, outlining who initiated the queue, who completed the check in, and who monitored the data. We also added a brief weekly huddle to keep everyone in line. Within weeks, the students' transitions improved, work completion increased, and others communicated more proactively. That experience reinforced for me, that shared decision making works best paired best when paired with clear structures. Collective responsibility becomes powerful when everyone knows exactly how they contribute to student success. <u>IGQ9: How do you involve families and other teachers in evaluating the effectiveness of strategies? The bridge district goes and classroom realities. Share an example of feedback, leaving the changes and practice.</u> P1: I involve families and colleagues by sharing the student progress regularly and asking for their input on the strategies. For example, after sending home sample writing rubrics aligned to a district literacy goal, parents noted that their children struggled to apply the criteria at home. So in team meetings, teachers shared similar observations. So in response, we created a simplified rubric and example model. This adjustment improved consistency and it helped the students understand the expectations. P2: I involve families and other teachers by sharing quick updates and asking for simple feedback about how the strategy is working for the	c12 Creativity c14 Resilience c3 Resource development c7 Tailoring c23 Review c16 Standardization c1 Flexible planning c8 Adaptability		
--	--	--	--

student. One example was a district goal around writing stamina. A family told me their child was still getting stuck during homework, even though things looked better at school. I shared that feedback with the grade-level team, and we realized our school prompts were much more structured than the ones sent home. We changed our practice and created a shared set of simple writing prompts for both home and school. After that, the student's stamina improved in both places, and the team kept using the new prompts because they worked well for everyone. P3: By uh, presenting student progress, information, making observations, and uh, collecting feedback on which tactics are effective, and which require modification. I engage teachers and families. For instance, we worked with general education teachers. To change assignments and provide diesel aids after parents indicated that a student was having difficulty with homework, despite classroom support. More focused instruction, better student achievement, and future modifications to comparable IEP accommodations where all the results of this input. P4: Here an example of feedback leading to changes in process or policies. Even we don't have a, um, an ILRC that is, um, CT wide, um, in myself contains net glass. I involve families and others, net teachers, in evaluating strategies by combining observation, student work and feedback. For example, I had this accommodating cookery activity. students showcase the meals they had prepared. Teachers are stud teachers, and our principal evaluated the final product, while I and the parents focus on evaluating the process, how student follows steps, just to safely and work independently. Feedback from both groups led me to address support such as adding more visual cues, structure guidance, which improves students engagement, confidence, and independence. Showing that collaboration, collaborative evaluation can strengthen alignment between District division goes and classroom practice. P5: By presenting learner progress information, making observations, and collecting feedback on what tactics are effective or require modification. I engage the teachers and families. So for an instance, we work with general education teacher, to change assignments, and robot visual aids after parents indicated that a, the learner was having difficulty with homework, despite reference support. So more focus on instruction, better than the learner achievement and future modification to comparable IEP accommodations where all the results of this input. P6: As always, we in both families and our colleagues are the teachers of the students, especially in inclusive classroom. We include them to have a shared progress data in joint meetings and uh, comprehensive feedback. On how strategies are being practiced. For example, when families noted that the homework are um, kind of difficult. So I, we will inform the classroom teachers that we need to tone down it to the learner's level. So, he's all, he's abiding to the policy or to the curriculum, but with accommodations and modification, accordingly to, uh, the level of the learners. So, what, what's really important here is the, um, regular and comprehensive feedback from the families and from the classroom teachers. So it's like special education teachers are bridge. to connect how the students are improving or how I be progressing in the regular set. Mm-hmm. And, and it's healthy now, Paul, because while we are accommodating and modifying the curriculum or the instruction for the learners, As a teacher, we always go. Is it, um, is it abiding to the policy? Yeah. We have this kind of professionals and even though we have the professionalism, we have the heart of a picture. Yeah. well-balanced. You are professional, but you have the heart for the learners. Because that's why, for me, teachers are always, are the main character also. Yeah, we are the key player. Big player. P7: I involve families in other teachers, but regularly hearing observation, rather still tends to network, then inviting their feedback on what strategies are working or need adjustment. For example, in one classroom, Parents noticed that visual schedule used at school wasn't being raised 1st at home. Which was affecting the learner's consistently. Based on their input, we collaborated to create a simplified home friendly version of the schedule and providing training for the general education teacher on good system implementation. This	c1 Curriculum alignment Reinvestment c1 Embedded instruction Resourceful adaption c19 Structured collaboration c9 Cooperation c23 Reflection c13 Progress c17 Interaction Gains c22 Evaluation c23 Refinement c23		
--	--	--	--

<i>feedback led to improve student routine and measurable progress, and it also influence school policy to include homeschool coordination as required part of IEP implementation by actively listening and responding. Farmers and teacher become partners in making strategies more meaningful and different.</i> <i>P8: In some days, they do marketing at home or with their parents' business. I asked them to take veggies or pictures of how they help around and assist each other. So me and my, me and the parent of the letter get to observe how he functions independently and what they will do if they do not know how to do one step or do not know what the next thing to do. So this type of practice is eligible as we get to observe them, how they can do entrepreneurship, for example, how do they market their own data? How do they function in the business? What do they do to get to sell? So outside of our class, but still, fully aligns with the moriculum content.</i> <i>P9: I involve families and fellow teachers, throw families support, group, meetings, and collaborative, case, discussions, to review students' data and reflect on how IEP goes translate into daily practice. Parents are empowered by activity participating in classroom and school activities. Helping create sensory and fine motor, motorios, and reinforcing strategies at home. Making their feedback practical and meaningful. In one case, parent feedback about consistent homeschool, follow through, led to improve student engagement.</i> <i>P10: For policy. I involve families and other teachers by creating simple, shared feedback loops, quick check-ins, uh, brief data trackers, and short reflection notes that helps us see whether a district aligned strategy is actually working in read classrooms and homes. So one example involved a student working on a district goal related to task initiation. The general education teacher and I noticed improvement at school, but the family shared during a weekly check in that homework time was still a struggle. Their feedback revealed that the visual 1st up queue we used in class wasn't translating well at home because the student needed more very well reassurance before starting. Based on that insight, we just did a plan. The teacher added a short verbal preview before independent work, and the family adopted the same script during homework. We also simplify the visual cue, so it matched the language used at school. Within 2 weeks, both settings saw smoother starts and fewer moments of frustration. That experience reinforced how essentially it is to treat families and teachers as co-evaluators. When their feedback shapes, the strategy, the supports become more consistent, equitable, and effective for the student.</i> <u>IGQ10: Looking across multiple IEPs and classrooms, what patterns inverge about which strategies tend to be most effective in translating district goals into tangible student gains. What would you tell district leaders to reinforce or change to promote more consistent success?</u> <i>P1: The strategies that are most effective includes frequent progress monitoring, scaffolding, flexible grouping, and clear, accessible learning goals. The consistent use of data to inform to inform instruction, and timely intervention also helps a lot. So I would tell the district leader to reinforce professional development on on data instruction, provide shared tools and resources for accommodations, and build a structured collaboration bank.</i> <i>P2: Across many IEPs, the strategies that work best are simple daily routines, quick data checks, shared tools, and flexible supports. These help teachers stay aligned with district goals without adding extra work. If I were talking to district leaders, I'd say: keep things consistent, provide easy-to-use materials, focus on fewer priorities, and protect time for teachers to collaborate. Those changes make success more consistent across classrooms.</i> <i>P3: Of course, clear goal alignment. Frequent progress monitoring, they learn assistance, any strong family teacher communication, consistently lead to measurable student gains across numerous IEPs. Students make consistent, measurable progress toward district goals when these components are coordinated and shared regularly according to established patterns. To encourage more consistent achievements across classrooms. I would advise district officials to support Professional collaborative time or offer flexible resources. And promote data informed decision making. Mm-hmm.</i> <i>P4: Looking across multiple IEDs in myself contains Ned class, I have noticed that hands on, meaningful activities, consistent routines,</i>	Review c5 Outcome Sharedness c12 Accommodation c23 Feedback c14 Professionalism c9 Collaborative feedback Practice improvement Home-based learning c13 Independent performance		
--	--	--	--

<i>frequent reminders, and active family involvement tend to be the most effective strategies for translating. This goes into tangibles, student gains. When student understand the purpose of a task, receive step-by-step guidance and have access to needed materials. Sometimes provided to stakeholder support. They show greater independence, engagement and confidence. I would tell that leaders to reinforce policies that allow flexible classroom-based adaptation provide and provide resources for hands-on learning.</i> <i>So, and support family and community involvement as these factors consistently help to real progress and help bridge the gap between policy and daily classroom practice.</i> <i>P5: Clear goal alignment, frequent progress monitoring, tailored assistance, and strong family teacher communications are tactics that consistently result in measurable learning games, learner games across numerous IEPs. So students may consistent measurable progress towards the goal when these components are coordinated and shared on a regular basis, according to the patterns. So to encourage more consistent achievements across the classroom. I would advise officials to support professional collaborative time, offer flexible resources, and also promote the data informed decision making.</i> <i>P6: For me, ma'am, strategies are, we have different strategies. We have multiple studies, we have numerals, studies, and not average strategies are affected to every learners. So, that's why we have variety of studies. I cannot just say this strategy is effective because it's effective to that one learner, it, it may be effective to not one learner, but it might not be affected to this learner. So as a teacher, For me, it's always healthy. To have a variety of knowledge of different strategies. Not just by speaking to what you think is effective. So, being a good teacher and a good teacher to student is not just allowing yourself to look at, oh, this is effective to that one learner. You will use that also. This is effective to him because I use this strategy last year and it is effective now. Now he is striving, so I will use this also to you. So, And if it's not beneficial to you, it's your fault. Yes. We are not kind of teachers now. We are just, um, stick to one. So if it's a strategies, we can have different um, varieties. Learners are different. They have different personalities, social, uh, differences, culture. Which I cannot, this state, a specific strategies or pattern that are really affecting for the learners because if you are talking to one learner, I can, I can share what strategies work on him, but widely, generally, I cannot, um, answer what strategy works for everyone because it is different. That's in Apple, in special education, we have 14 disabilities by IDA. And I cannot say namana. Those, this strategy works on everyone, and I say that, especially I'm not the expert. That's why it's, for me, the best strategy is to be flexible. To know what your student needs, to know where are the students, not always, oh, I learned this one from the seminar of my professor suggested this strategy, so I will work this. I will, I will try this to you, and if it's not, if this strategy does support for you, it's your fault. Yeah. Yeah. So, for me, it's all the... Tapak put in my publish nah, so, so I've been a my post. I think government, we always have a, um, what do you call the 3 knees? For the teacher. So, Sometimes like we be like, what's in a new strategies, like you see technology, this one. Bubble work points to some of their nurse, but to learners not very addictive to technology. for his own leisure. I don't think that's very, they should burn them. Nah. It's the best moment. It's... Some kids are tricky. They are. games, and if you don't watch them, they will be on the game and they're not doing what they're supposed to do. That happens. Yes, mom. It's a Jesse teacher, as they say. I have an app that they can, they are having a quiz, but they are having cards. So it's very effective. But if it's used most of the time, it is not effective anymore. That's it. They are using it now, but... I think he... It's a bad way. So, Hindinisha, Nahokolong nana, it's fun. I want it, you know. So... And just assume that ayomi maksola. That's why I use this app. But it kind of mobile that. I'm restricting his potential.</i> <i>That's why strategies are also free. Okay. So, we gone now to</i> <i>P7: Across multiple IEP is in classroom, I've noticed that distract is imprecise in individual support, clear visual cues, consistent routines, and regular collaboration between general and the special teacher.</i> <i>Persistently led to that able student goods. Student make the most progress when goals are realistic, measurable and connected to both classroom practice and home repeats. I would tell district leader story</i>	c18 Parental empowerment Collaborative monitoring Rapid impact c8 Approaches c17 Guidance Predictability c4 Clarity c3 Provision c9 Integration Synchrony c4 Attainment Diversity c23 Reflection Uncertainty c4 Innovation Management		
--	---	--	--

<i>in 1st professional development, focus on the brain solution, collaborating, bleeding, and data driven progress monitoring. Well, also flexibility. So teacher can adapt strategies to each learner rather than enforcing one size, its old approaches.</i> <i>P8: So what I would like to actually be implemented and hopefully it would be, is what I say as tangible for student gain is a real life application. So, like for me, I handle skill-based learners already. So what I see is that classroom application does not always fully, uh, they are not fully able to test it immediately. So it is really important that they get to experience it outside. So what like, for example, what we do is at least a few times in a year, we ask permission that we are going outside of our classroom to sell the product. Or for example, they have their own businesses. So we sell their, the vessel, their own personal business products outside of the classroom because that is where they get to apply what they have learned even more. So, so what we do for the safety of these learners, given that they have special needs, we make sure that there are parents or guardians who are present with us. At least, they feel comfortable and they feel safe that where their where their children are. And some of them, if they cannot, uh, they can, uh, accompany their child, if we, as a teacher, continue to update. As we should always do. We updated them how they are faring. We communicate with them that or your child was able to sell this kind of this, this product, you know? He sold at least 5 products. So there's positive feedback. And then there's also negative feedback, for example, behavior that should not have been done. So we just tell the learner that that kind of behavior should not be demonstrated when you are selling. So we also inform the parent, that way, we get, we both get to tell that, that behavior should not appear, and we, if we at least sell the experience to the learner properly that, uh, to be a good entrepreneur, you have, you have to learn how to properly, uh, you have to tell properly how to talk with the, with these people, with your, uh, potential customers. So at least most of my learners, I'm actually thankful that they understand this. But if not, given that they have different, uh, they have, what they call this. They have different situations. Their parents are informed. That way, that kind of negative behavior is that could be repeated again. Mm-hmm. And it's really important to expose them in the real world. Yes. Practical application of what they learned.</i> <i>P9: Across multiple IEPs in classrooms, the most effective strategies are those goals embedded into functional, daily routines that use consistent, visual, and sensory supports. and involves strong home school collaboration. These approaches lead to more observable gains in communication, behavior regulation, and skill generalization, especially for ASD learners. I would suggest leaders who have realistic teacher-pupil ratios, especially those handling AC learners and sustained parent partnerships.</i> <i>P10: Across multiple IEDs and classrooms, I've noticed that the strategies that consistently translate district goes into real student gains, share tree qualities. They are simple, embedded into existing routines, and implemented consistently across adults. Visual cues, predictable check-ins, and shared date trackers tend to work because they produce, they reduce, rather, cognitive load for both students and teachers. These strategies also create alignment, general education teachers, sped staff, and families all respond to student in the same way, which builds confidence and reduces anxiety. In contrast, strategies that are overly complex require major scheduled changes. Or rely on one person tend to fade quickly and produce an even result. If I were speaking to district leaders, I'd emphasize that consistent consistency comes from systems, not individual effort. Districts can strengthen outcomes by providing structured, collaboration time, offering simple shared tools for data collection, and clarifying where teachers have flexibility to adopt strategies to their classroom realities. When leaders reinforce practices that are doable, repeatable, and aligned across settings, district goals stop feeling abstract and start showing up in students' daily progress.</i>	c15 Consistent support Real-world application c12 Experiential learning Learner safety Behavior guidance c18 Parental involvement c15 Integrated support c20 Supportive structures		
RGQ5 IGQ1: How do your personal beliefs about disability, inclusion, and learning, shape the stories you tell about IEP outcomes? Can you share a memory or moment that reveals this influences? P1: So my personal belief about disability and inclusion shapes the stories I tell by focusing on strength, growth, and collaboration rather	Inclusion leaded success		

than the deficits. So I emphasize how support and understanding can lead to a meaningful progress. I remember students with severe dyslexia who are consistent with consistent accommodations and encouragement read their first chapter aloud in class. So sharing that moment highlighted the power of patience and inclusive practices in shaping real success. P2: <i>My beliefs about disability and inclusion shape my IEP stories because I see every student as capable, and I view support as something that removes barriers—not something that “fixes” the child. I focus on growth, access, and dignity.</i> <i>A moment that shows this was when a student who used a communication device finally participated in a class discussion. Some people saw it as a small win, but to me it showed what happens when the environment—not the student—changes. We had built in wait time, modeled responses, and taught peers how to include him. His answer wasn't just progress on an IEP goal; it was proof that inclusion works when the system adapts.</i> <i>That experience continues to shape how I talk about IEP outcomes: I highlight the student's strengths and the supports that made participation possible.</i> P3: <i>My IEP narratives are shaped by my personal beliefs in pupil potential, inclusiveness, and strength based methods. rather than focusing only on weaknesses. They emphasize growth, effort, and the impact of supporting activities. To highlight the importance of focus support and inclusive opportunities. I shared with the team my experience with a learner. Who had struggled with social interactions. But eventually began leading small group activities. This narratives not only recognize individual achievements, but also contribute to district policy and practice conversations by demonstrating the strategies that actually lead to significant results.</i> P4: <i>My personal belief that every learner can grow and participate meaningfully shapes the stories I tell about IEB outcomes. I focus on progress in independence, life skills, and engagement, not just academics, because I see this as essential for quality of life. A memorable moment that reflects this was when a priest transition student, who had struggled to follow simple routine, successfully prepared, um, their own large during cookery activities, with minimal support. I share this story with parents and our supervisor to highlight how consistent routines, hands-on learning and meaningful goals, led to meal growth. It reminds me and others that i.e. his success is measured not only by test scores, but by functional everyday achievement that empowers learners. You know what ways has your professional identity? That is question number two. I'm sorry, I'm always forgetting the number of questions.</i> P5: <i>My IEP narratives are shaped by my personal beliefs in my learner's potential, inclusiveness and strength-based methods instead of uh, concentrating only on our weaknesses. The stress growth, effort, and the impact of the supportive activities. In order to highlight the importance of focus and support the inclusive chances, I shared, uh, with the team, my experience of a learner who had struggled with the social interactions, but eventually started learning small group activities. So these narrative not only recognized individual achievements, but also contributed to the policy and the practice conversation by demonstrating the strategies that actually led to the significant results.</i> P6: <i>I'm a hear mam. Hi. Yeah, I hear you. I'm a hear. I am. Yes. Uh, my ? Okay. Oh, then I answered the phone. Yeah, go ahead. My belief that disability is also part of human diversity, and humans just need to embrace and tolerate. So what to include everyone. So it's, it enriches learning shape and how I frame IVT outcomes, I'll growth stories rather than deficit. So, as we always say, this ability is not disability. It is different abilities. I remember when this was the, I remember a moment when the student just, uh, combined, um, pineapple, one of my memorable, um, moment. In teaching, is that My parents asked, have a high expectation, and ask me, Oh, um, help her, help the learner speak. So, I'm not a speech therapy, but for me, it opens for his, one of his potential.</i> <i>This is, all of, all this time, the parents know now he cannot speak now, this number, but, but, in a proper setting, Palad. It can be influenced, and none of them, nana, oh, uh, Prepaladito, dito, pala,</i>	c8 Perspective c5 Accessibility c4 Emphasis c14 Morality Instance c13 Development c1 Wholeness c12 Practicality c14 Mindset c19 Contribution c15 Inclusion c17 Facilitation		
---	---	--	--

item, Parang, it is start with with noises, mummy, babushana. So... We have a long practice, bag on a menu, word, nothing, you're so... The morning of the animal sound coming, so it's okay, now, mugging, silly, silly, nasi, like, hoo, hoo, ha, ha. So, at least the practice, so, the discovered in and out. I can use this pala. Let's say, we cannot tell what happened inside the house. Maybe the parents are too busy for their job, because they all, they also need to earn, and these things are also busy because they have work to do. So, maybe we'll have some, so it's a school, CV Shah, so he has a freedom, university, and June. So, boy, potential and not. So, it is one of my, um, Unforgettable memory. It's a picture. is a newly trip. Mhm. actually, I always use red lipstick. It's a, you know, so it ha it is very visible. Like I said, if you're Morena, and you're using a red lipstick, it's very around, busy boy, the mouth, the lips are very visible. So there's a time now, I have a student with down syndrome. I always use that lipstick. During my pregnancy, I have this Modna. I don't want to use any ink. A face bowl. So, that moment, no map is. It should. Yeah. So, I think it's a part of the instruction. Yeah, at this part. Oh, the instruction and material. So that's why in a real, it's gone. Oh, my lips are very, I know, essential part, the not the... They are. Yes, because they are looking at my lips for love when I am talking., Yeah, they are already conditioned to the color of your lips. And when they're going to imitate you. There will be able to speak. Well, that's apart. P7: My personal belief that every learner has unique strength and deserve meaningful inclusion. Shaped the way I tell stories about outcome, focusing on growth, effort and potential rather than deficits. I remember a moment when a child who struggled with reading, finally read a story. Aloud to the class, instead of raming it and as is still behind. I highlighted that persistence and confidence sharing with the team how small consistent supported made a big difference. That experience reinforced my belief that IEP outcomes should celebrate progress in all feats, form and honor each learner's journey. P8: I connect my IEP outcome to broader life skills, independence, and confidence, not just academic benchmarks, so just like what I have stated earlier, they get to apply their learned competency through their parents' businesses or at home. Sorry, parents, businesses at home, or outside, or when we when we filed the letter, allowing us to sell outside of the school, during our during our teaching hours. So when it is done outside their homes, they get to assist their parents and they try to market on their own with potential customers they need. I have actually one learner who accompanies his mother in her business. So he, with continuous, with the continuous exposure, he is able to actually be the one to offer the products to put into other potential customers without being assisted anymore by his mother. So that alone is that alone is something that really helped me to know that the outcome of poor brother lives because it's being applied. P9: Um, my belief center on seeing disability as a condition, not uh, limitation, and inclusion as meaningful participation in daily learning. These shapes my IEP stories, the focus on small but important gains rather than just test results. I remember a non-verbal learner with EST who began uttering words by following teacher's lead after weeks of practice. That moment reminded me that progress looks different for each child and deserves to be valued. P10: My personal beliefs about disability and inclusion shape the way that I talk about IEP outcomes because I see this ability as a form of human diversity. Not a deficit to fix. I tend to frame progress in terms of confidence, access, and belonging, not just data points, because I believe learning happens when students feel seen and supported. That perspective influences the stories I tell. I had at moments when a student gained agency when a team removed the barrier or when an accommodation opened the door that had previously felt closed. One memory that captures this was a student who rarely participated in class discussions, because he processed language more slowly. After we introduced a simple wait time strategy and visual prompts, he raised his hand during full group lesson and shared an idea that surprised even him. Then general education teacher looked at me with a mix of pride and disbelief. And the student beam for the rest of the day. I tell that story often because it reflects my core belief. When we design environments that honor different ways of learning. The student shows us ability we might have overlooked. IGQ2: In what ways has your professional identity? Example, special	Potential c23 Context c17 Instruction Technique c14 Inclusive belief c13 Student breakthrough c7 Life skills c21 Skill application c13 Independence c14 Inclusive mindset c14 Inclusive perspective c14 Self concept c5		
---	--	--	--

<u>educator, general education teacher? inclusion, advocate. Shape the lenses you use to interpret and rate i.e. progress and the student's success.</u> P1: <i>My professional identity as a special educator shapes my lens by prioritizing growth, prioritizing individualized growth, student strength, and the impact of sports. So interpreted IEP progress not just through data but through how students gain confidence, independence and access to learning. Telling stories that reflect both achievement and personal development.</i> P2: <i>My professional identity shapes how I talk about IEP progress because I naturally look at success through an inclusion-focused, strengths-based lens. As a special educator, I pay close attention to access, growth over time, and how well the environment supports the student—not just whether they hit a benchmark.</i> <i>A moment that shows this was when a student made only a small gain on a reading probe, but I noticed they were finally willing to try without shutting down. To me, that was real progress. My lens made me see the confidence, the reduced frustration, and the impact of the supports we put in place—not just the number on the page.</i> <i>Because of that identity, I tend to narrate IEP outcomes in terms of dignity, independence, and meaningful participation, not just scores.</i> P3: <i>By, um, emphasizing each student's strengths, development, and access to meaningful learning opportunities. My identity as a special educator and Advocate shapes how I define IEP success. I describe success not only in terms of academic achievement, but also in greater autonomy. Involvement and self-assurance, reflecting a comprehensive approach to student growth. By ensuring the IEP stories emphasize both quantifiable results, and the resources that enable those results.</i> <i>This lens helps teams and students make better decisions.</i> P4: <i>As a special education teacher in a self-contained class, my professional identity shapes how I interpret and narrate IEP progress by focusing on each student's functional growth, independence, and engagement, rather than only academic achievement. I see myself as both a teacher and an advocate. So I highlight stories of how students develop life skills, follow routines, and gain confidence through meaningful hands-on activities like cookery or community-based task.</i> <i>This lens allow me to tell IEP narratives that emphasize practical, everyday success, which helps parents. Our principal, our leaders, understand the real impact of instruction and support, the case for policies and resources that prioritize, individualize, inclusive learning. I'm getting so excited to talk to you after this interview. I see myself in you.</i> P5: <i>By emphasizing each learner's strength, develop, development, and access to the worthwhile learning opportunities. My identity as a special education chair and advocate in forms, how I perceive IEP success.</i> <i>I describe success not only in... Terms of academic achieve up greater autonomy, involvement, and self-assurance, which reflects a comprehensive approach to the learner growth. So by ensuring that IEP stories emphasize as both quantifiable results and the resources that enable the results. These lens help teams and the learner make better decisions.</i> P6: <i>As a special educational, my professional, I definitely change how I interpret. IEPY, uh, centering equity, access and individualizing goals. Rather than comparison to their fears. So it is not acceptable that students with special education are being prepared. That's why a special education, I really advocate the look, that my colleagues still look for the differences or the different abilities, even though I am endorsing them, the students with special education needs. I also introduced them to what their skills are. So, before we introduce learners with special education, it's a plus regular classroom. I make sure now he's positional. He knows what to expect. He knows what, what's going inside the that classroom because, you know, people say, we have a large group of learners in one classroom. And sometimes the classrooms are not well ventilated. Sometimes the classrooms are improvised, so before I let the student go to that regular classroom, I have to show him and introduce him. I have to know, I have to, I have to show that he's relatively, that he's, He's in good condition. I don't want to think. I don't want the students with a classmate now, a regular, now, it's even a... What? I just wanted something like that. So most of the time, I want the teacher in regular classroom too. Um, The</i>	Observed progress c4 Communication c7 Strengths c4 Completeness c16 Identity c1 Learning c5 Equity c8 Perspective c5 Comprehensiveness c1 Alignment c5 Equity c14 Recognition c23 Context c13 Independence c8 Personal identity		
--	--	--	--

orient, the learners, their classmate. Nah, okay, glass. We were going to have a, you will going to have a classmate with special education needs, and we need to have a high color ranch, we need to embrace him, we need, he needs to feel that this belongs. So it's very far. It's very essential part. Um, in, in, in, in, like, this. That's it. Sometimes, mom, uh, uh, uh, regular class, uh, I said, uh, a classic, shepherd call, like, especially sucking dirt. Regular students are crying, they're having a meltdown, and Parents spend a lot of money for therapy, so the students with special education needs, uh, have their authority to manage themselves, and then, you know, classmate, telen, but I'm, the camo, na, people have, that is the time, na., let's say, in Milampo, Indilampo, uh, students with special education, it's under a de villa, nothing. We are also, yes, everyone is including, in enclosure, in enclosure, the lamb they're living both, young classes. Yeah, I'm so happy now, katpan students for is the papras person, regular class. Sometimes they are the ones that, um, in a padella ponagami school to be a representative in a competition in our divisions. So, like a reward. That's nice. That's nice. Nah, even though, nah, perceptions, among a sense, I come back about, they are very, they have, high sensory, especially cup of shaky, they, they are mashado, V, and, Son for practitioner. So, as much as possible, as a regular class guy, you can handle yourself. You can money for yourself. Nah. Let's make me ask, it's okay now, then we read aloud. You can you can calm down yourself independently. No. By barbitan man, you can ask for help, but if you can do it yourself, why not? Mm. P7: As a special ed teacher, my professional identity shapes me the view, I eat the progress through a lens of individualized cross. Recognizing that Success looks different for each learner, by focus on strength, smog gates, and meaningful improvement rather than only comparing student to standardize benchmark. This perspective guides how I narrate the outcome, emphasizing both the learners' achievement and the strategies that truly support their development. P8: So, what happens is that at least success is free in terms of overcoming barriers and building independence. If independence is not immediately accomplished, at least the learners are able to do steps within minimal prompting. P9: As a special education teacher with decades of experience in public school, my professional identity shapes my lens to focus on practical individualized progress rather than only academic benchmarks. I interpret IEP success through small but meaningful gains, like improve communications, self-regulation, or participation, especially for ASD learners who acquired intensive support. This perspective leads me to narrate IAP progress as stories of growth, collaboration, and problem solving, highlighting, how tailored strategies, family involvements in classroom adaptations make a real difference in students' daily lives. P10: My professional identity is a special educator, shapes how I interpret and narrate IEP's progress, as I naturally look for growth in access, regulation, and participation, not just academics course. I see myself as an advocate for removing barriers. So when I talk about student success, I tend to highlight moments where a support routine or relationship allowed a student to show what they're capable of. That lens pushes me to notice the small but meaningful shifts. Uh, a student initiating work without prompting, using a tool independently or engaging more confidently with peers. Those moments feels just as important as formal data, because they reflect real challenges, real changes, rather, in agency and belonging. One moment that captures this was when a student was significant, significant anxiety, um, finally volunteered to read with a short passage during a caught out lesson. The general education teacher saw it was a nice surprise, but I was, but I saw it as evidence that our regulation strategies, predictable routines, and shared accommodations were working. It reminded me that my role isn't just to track progress. It's to interpret it through a lens, um, that honors the student, students lived experience, uh, that supports that made the moment possible. IGQ3: Describe a situation, where an ethical consideration. Example, equity, confidentiality, stakeholder rights. potential bias, influenced how you frame or shared IEP outcomes with families, colleagues, and administrators. P1: I once worked with a student whose progress was inconsistent when sharing IEP outcomes with the family. I carefully framed the	c21 Individualized success c7 Independence building c21 Individualized focus c21 Narrative of growth c21 Opportunity highlighting c17 Student centered lens c16 Moral communication c16 Constructive c16 Principles c16 Discretion c15 Confidentiality c1 Planning c14 Professionalism c18 Sharing		
---	--	--	--

information to highlight both the successes and the areas that needs support while maintaining a confidentiality about the students experiences. I also ensured the language was unbiased and focused on the strength of the child so the family felt empowered rather than being judged. So balancing transparency with respect and empathy. P2: I once had to share IEP progress with a family when the student wasn't meeting the goal yet. The data was correct, but I realized the way I first wrote it sounded too negative and didn't reflect the student's strengths. That felt unfair and didn't match my responsibility to avoid bias and protect the student's dignity. I rewrote the update to focus on what the student was doing well, what barriers we had identified, and what supports we were adding. When I shared it, the family felt respected and included, and the conversation was much more productive. That moment reminded me that ethics—especially equity and respect—shape how I communicate every IEP outcome. P3: When discussing a learner's development, including both their strengths and areas for improvement, I had to take ethics into account when sharing IEP results. I communicated with the family and coworkers using polite, strength-based language. And concentrated on objective data. The preserve anonymity and prevent bias. This strategy encouraged, um, cooperative decision making among stakeholders. Maintain, transparency, and protected the learners' rights. P4: I was careful to frame the information, to protect the student's dignity, and maintain confidentiality while still providing honest feedback to parents, and even administate tours or supervisor when we are, we were, we were asked. I focused on specific improvements in independence, participation, and skilled development rather than comparing the student to others. And highlight and strategies that we're working along with areas needing support. This approach respected equity as stakeholders, rights, ensured constructive collaboration, and help everyone focus on meaningful next steps rather than creating discouragement for bias. P5: When talking about the learners development, including both their strength and places for improvement, I had to take the ethics into account when sharing IEP results. I communicated with the family and the coworkers using polite, strength-based language and concentrated on objective data to perceive autonomy and prevent bias. So this strategy is encountered cooperative decisions making among stakeholders, maintain transparency, and protected the learner's right. P6: Sample situation mam is sometimes I um, offered or have a privilege to speak to some, uh, professional picture, for example, to share my knowledge about special education. And also to share my knowledge how we do IEP, even though we don't have that, um, cold pack, uh, professional members or so what we call members of the IEP. So I need an example, IEP, so I ask for the parents consent, that's confidentiality. I learned out the students, me. What important is the teacher or the audience that I'm speaking with? They know how to do the IET. IEP is, uh, requirement. uh, some stood, some schools, but they don't, they don't have, uh, special education teacher. So they don't know how to use IEP. So that's why I need to show them what real I'm eating looks like. So I need some sample. I need some fat. And it's some real practices. I need some real, um, example that they can, I can use while I am talking to them. They said they can learn from it. So. So we can discuss about it. And about everybody wins, festival, in the langaman, in the, the lahatnan students with special education, can go to the school, and my own special education picture. Um, my love, and that, uh, not every school is offering special education services. So it's nice now. They are, it's nice that they are embracing special education or intrusion. They were willing to learn IEP. It's my partner, man, to share my real experience and practices in making and developing ID. That's good, so that everybody is going to be familiar with IDP and the process, and they would be able to understand the students with AEPs. Although, I mean, the visual, we have an EP3 name, Dr. while our opening, IEP3, example. We have this specific fund. So, and about for every school, Uh, you have, you have to Parapoto teachers. 93 for an EP. we have limited time. That's why they are the worst, the mechanical, some of the school, and they need some research speaker. Then a pollo, papas of human, special education teacher. Now, my real life experiences in making and developing, like, Oh, yeah, that's	c17 Demonstration c18 Sensitive communication c16 Respectful assessment c21 Strengths framing c15 Collaborative adjustment c13 Progress c7 Strengths c3 Endorsement c15 Duality c4 Priorities c7 Abilities c4 Trustworthiness c9 Support c10 Collaboration		
---	--	--	--

part. It's one of the responsibilities of the pet teachers to, to, uh, do the IEP, to make the IEP. Yeah, it's, it's a lot. P7: I once had to share a learner's behavioral challenges with their family and colleagues, knowing that without careful framing, it could be misunderstood or judged and fairly. I focus on highlighting their strength and growth while keeping sensitive details, confidential, and avoiding comparison with their fears. By doing this, I felt I respected the student's dignity, maintained trust with the family, and kept our team focused on supporting the learner's respect. P8: I would like to skip this question for now. P9: In one situation, I was reporting IEP progress for ASD, learners, host behavior were often misunderstood by other teachers. To protect the students' dignity and confidentiality, I framed the outcomes in terms of functional skills and observable behaviors rather than leveling or comparing them to peers. I shared progress privately with the parents and religion stuff, highlighting prog- strategies that worked on areas needing support, which ensured equity, respective stakeholders, right? And maintain trust while still guiding effective instruction and collaboration. P10: An ethical consideration that often shapes how I share IEP outcomes is protecting students' dignity, while ensuring that families and colleagues receive information that is accurate, fair, and free of bias. One situation involved a student whose progress data looked inconsistent because his anxiety spiked during certain assessments. I knew that on, um, I knew that presenting the wrong numbers without context could lead colleagues or administrators to underestimate his abilities or question the effectiveness of his support. To avoid reinforcing deficit-based narratives, I framed the data by highlighting patterns, explaining the role of anxiety and emphasizing the skills he demonstrated in low stress settings. This approach honored both confidentiality and equity by ensuring the student wasn't defined by a single data point. When I met with a family, I was careful to share progress in a way that was transparent but not discouraging. I focused on strength, um, explained the environmental factors, influencing performance, and invited their insights about what worked at home. Their perspective helped us adjust accommodations to reduce assessment related stress, and his performance improved almost immediately. That experience reinforced how ethical considerations, especially around bias, context, and student rights, shape not just what we say about IEP outcomes, but how we say it and how those narratives influence decisions moving forward. IGQ4: How do you balance competing professional identities or value tensions? When reporting on IEP outcomes? Tell a story about the time when you had to navigate conflicting loyalties or responsibilities. P1: I balance competing identities by centering the students best interest while honoring both family expectations and district requirements. I recall a time when a parent wanted more intensive services rather than IEP team recommendation. So I listened to them, shared cleared data and rationale and collaborated with the team to adjust the goals realistically. So navigating this tension means advocating for the student's needs while respecting the family's perspective. P2: I once had to report IEP progress for a student who was improving socially but not meeting the academic goal yet. As a special educator, I wanted to highlight the student's growth. As a team member, I needed to share the data honestly. And as an advocate, I wanted to protect the student from being judged unfairly. I balanced these roles by sharing the data clearly, but also explaining the student's strengths and what supports we were adding next. It kept the report honest while still centering the student's dignity. That moment showed me how to navigate competing responsibilities while staying focused on what the student needs. P3: When I had to report a learner's slow development, while simultaneously speaking up for their potential and well-being. I had to balance conflicting professional identities. As an advocate, I made sure the report emphasized the learner's attempts, contextual challenges, and uh, Suggested helpful actions, but as a teacher, I felt obligated to provide administrators with accurate facts. I was able to uphold my professional ethics while maintaining trust with the family and support team by communicating openly and we care. P4: I balance my purpose on life skills with the parents' desire to	c14 Emotional professionalism c21 Positive collaboration c2 Learner centered decision c6 Dual roles c16 Ethical decision making c16 Ethical communication c21 Progress assumptions Introspection c7 Equity c1 Wholeness c16 Receptiveness		
---	--	--	--

<i>emphasize academics when reporting IET outcomes. During a student's cookery activities, I highlighted both academic progress, even where just cooking. You are also learning math and we are also learning, um, reading, uh, or leading the recipe and gains in independence and routines. This approach respected both priorities accurately reflected the student growth and guided future instruction effectively.</i> <i>P5: When I had to report, uh, learners, uh, slow development while simultaneously speaking up their potential and well-being. I had to balance conflicting professional identities. As an advocate, I made sure the report emphasized the learners' attempts, contextual challenges, and suggested helpful actions, but as a teacher, I felt obligated to provide the administrators with accurate packs. I was able to uphold my professional ethics while maintaining trust with the family and support them by communicating in an open and caring manner.</i> <i>P6: Um, as I said earlier, if there's a tension, there's there's a commonness. So I balance my competing professional identities or value tensions when reporting IEP outcomes. Um, with my colleagues by means of knowing, are advocating for my students' needs. It's not, the team member must be also accountable for the requirements because we are the ones responsible for the, for achieving the ability goal. So during the meeting, I emphasized the student progress in subregulation rather than just the score. So, the teachers might have, Considered. Um, we are professional after all. We can always solve um, discrepancies or shortcomings of each and every one. With a proper strategy and help everyone accountable because you are all responsible.</i> <i>P7: I am a very emotional person, so I tend to become emotional and sharing the progress of my learner. I had to really navigate from crying to a professional who tells the story of small success that tells more about them, not me as a teacher.</i> <i>P8: So far, I have not encountered such tensions, and most of my collaboration with my coworkers are done smoothly and professionally.</i> <i>P9: I balance my rules as a special educator, advocate, and team collaborator by keeping the learner's best interests and the center of every decision. For instance, I once had the report, IEP outcomes when a learner progressed was slower than expected. I shared that honest data with the parents, enabling them to support the learners at home. I presented the probably factually highlighted both successes and challenges, and suggested practical strategies for growth, maintaining trust with the family and the school team.</i> <i>P10: Balancing, completing, um, balancing, competing for professional, um, identities often means holding space for both advocacy and accountability. One moment that stands out was when I had to report on a student's limited progress toward a behavior, behavior, regulation goal. As a special educator, my instinct was to protect the student from deficit-based interpretations, but as a team member, I also had a responsibility to present accurate data to the general education teacher and administrator. The tension was real. I wanted to honor the student's dignity while also ensuring the team had the information needed to adjust support. I navigated by, um, and navigated this by framing the data through a strength, a strength-based um, contextual lens. I shared the challenges. Um, honestly, but I also highlighted environmental triggers. We had observed and the moment when the student succeeded with the right scaffolds. This approach helped shift, um, the conversation from the student isn't meeting the goal to our current supports aren't meeting the student. The team agreed to adjust the plan, and within weeks, the students showed more regulated behavior. That experience reinforced that balancing professional identities isn't about choosing one loyalty over another. It's about presenting information, ethically, so decisions remain student centered and solutions oriented.</i> <u>IGQ5: When you tell stories about student progress, what moral or ethical assumptions tend to surface? For example, what counts as meaningful progress, which progress matters most, how progress is measured. How do you attend to those assumptions in your practice?</u> <i>P1: When I tell stories about students progress, the assumption that meaning the assumption is that meaningful progress includes both academic growth and personal development like confidence and</i>	c4 Hands-on c16 Applicability c14 Values c20 Inclusivity c4 Structuring c16 Fairness c16 Benchmarking c5 Progress tracking c2 Narrative Progress c12 Differential pacing c21 Holistic progress c18 Family input		
--	---	--	--

<i>independence. I also focus on each student's progress rather than comparing them to the others.</i> <i>I attend to these assumptions by using multiple measures, highlighting their strength individually and framing outcomes in ways that it values the whole student, not just on their scores in the test.</i> P2: <i>When I talk about student progress, certain assumptions naturally show up—like believing that all progress counts, not just academic scores, and that every student's growth matters, not only the ones who move quickly. I also assume that progress should be measured in more than one way, because numbers alone don't tell the whole story.</i> <i>One way I attend to these assumptions is by checking myself:</i> <i>Am I valuing effort and confidence as much as test data?</i> <i>Am I noticing growth for students who move more slowly?</i> <i>Am I using multiple measures so I don't rely on a single score?</i> <i>For example, if a student shows only a small gain on a probe but is now willing to try without shutting down, I make sure to name that as meaningful progress. By doing this, I keep my stories—and my decisions—aligned with equity, dignity, and a fuller picture of learning.</i> P3: <i>Sharing stories of pupil, achievements frequently leads to ethical beliefs. About what constitutes meaningful growth. Sets us the importance of social development, independence, and functional skills. In addition to their academic success. I understand that learning should be tailored to its learners' unique objectives. And circumstances, taking into account their cultural background, family priorities and voice. To ensure that progress tracking is equitable, inclusive, and uh, learner centered. I address these presumptions in my work, through customized assessments, group, goal setting, and the ongoing reflection.</i> P4: <i>When I tell stories about student progress in myself in things that class, the ethical assumption that surface most is that meaningful progress includes, includes functional skills. Independence and engagement, not just academics. I also, I also assume that these students' progress matters equally, regardless of pace, or starting point, and that it should be measured through observable real world task, as well as documented goals. I attend to this assumption by focusing on hands-on activities like cookery, tracking step-by-step skill development, and involving parents. Um,</i> <i>even our um, administrators are principal. involving them in both process and outcomes, ensuring the progress reflects each learner's growth in ways that are practical, relevant, and relevant. Excuse me.</i> <i>Excuse me.</i> P5: <i>Sharing learners achievement stories frequently led to ethical beliefs about what constitutes meaning meaningful growth, such as importance of social development, independence, and functional skills in addition to academic success. I understand that learning should be tailored to each learner's unique objectives and circumstances. Taking into their account, their cultural background, the family priorities and voice. So in order to make sure that the progress is, uh, tracking is equitable, inclusive and learner centered. I address the, this presumptions in my work. So through the use of customized assessment, and group goal setting and ongoing reflection.</i> P6: <i>So, when we're done student stories, The parents, Shepherd Paul, we tell them, one by one, so the focus is always there, child. So for example, we measured it. For example, our objective is, like, demonstrate, we measure it by using our group breaks. In the Philippines, if our objective is about demonstration, we are responsible for making a rubric on how we can assess deliveries. For example, if they do it independently, they get the highest score in the room, which, but they didn't do it, even we have prompted it. We have having an assistant, so that's when they get the lowest score in their room. So, whose progress matters most? Um, especially for learners, you can probably spot them learners, uh, what's my famous? Um, Dina Manko, nothing, cannot compare, so that's why, um, matter most, for, I, you, progress, nila, at, I mean, a progress, nila. Young progress, man. That's what matter. Hindi, don't see the enough rabbits. I need a progress smoke, even though my, even though it's a little bit, even though in the machado, um, guitas, a rubrics, but what matters most is how we progress, and that, Oh, probably a smart, just enough of every learner, happy brain facing. Parents are comparing them already. So, as a teacher, it's unfair to compare them also. That's why we have</i>	c12 Contextual growth c6 Cooperative planning c10 Involvement c4 Synthesis c4 Competence c13 Autonomy c9 Communication c3 Detection c9 Integration c10 Consultation c5 Assessment c12 Prioritization		
--	--	--	--

<i>individual educational plan. That's why it's individual. The goal is to compare their progress and not to compare them to others. That's why we are not using norm reference and using item. It is not in the standardized, that much, not... No, we are always nasa and bambad. We are, that's the starting point of our goal. We are focused more on what you can progress and not how much you can progress apart from your classmate. And no matter how small the progress is, it is still a progress.</i> <i>P7: When I tell about the student products, progress, I tell them the data on how we started. For example, my learner Nathlin started without the skills of grasping. She cannot hold the pencil on her own. I needed to hold her hand to grasp the pencil, and this being our situation for months, and about, uh, it comes into, uh, a school year. Now, but in God's case, more, More fine motor skills are shown by our student, Natalie. She can now hold a pencil and can create circles in her paper. That is how I account progress, not merely stating the numbers, but telling the story of where she came from and where she is right now.</i> <i>P8: So there are times that in this news setting, some parents or guardians focus on the academic goals of the learners that he or he should achieve within the week. So we in turn inform or remind them that they should not be done in force or pressure, as they all have different facing of learning.</i> <i>P9: When I share stories about students' progress, I often assume that meaningful progress includes both academic gains and personal growth. And that every learner's progress, regardless of base or ability, matters equally. I recognize that traditional metrics may overlook but significant achievements. So I attend to these assumptions by including qualitative observations. Celebrating functional skills and highlighting its child's unique strengths. This practice ensures that my reporting honors was ethical responsibility and the learner's dignity.</i> <i>P10: Oh, when I tell students, um, when I, oh, sorry, when I tell, when I tell stories about student progress, certain moral assumptions naturally surface, especially, uh, the belief that meaningful progress includes growth in confidence, access, regulation, and participation, not just academic metrics. I also assume that every student's progress matters equally, regardless of how quickly or slowly it appears in the data. Because of that, I'm careful not to let standardized measures or narrow definitions of success overshadow the small human moments that signal real change. I try to narrate progress in a way that honors The students lived experience and avoids reinforcing deficit based thinking. To attend to these assumptions in practice, I intentionally paired quantitative data with contextual and qualitative evidence. For example, if a student's reading fluencies or barely changes, but they begin volunteering to read aloud, I consider that meaningful progress, rather than dismissing it as an unrelated to the goal. It, I also check my own bias by asking families, And teachers, what progress looks like from their perspective, ensuring I'm not of ensuring I'm not privileging only the easiest to collect measures. This approach helps me tell stories that are accurate, ethical, and aligned with a broader vision of what it means for a student to grow.</i> IGQ6: How do you incorporate family perspectives and values into the narratives about IEP outcomes? Can you give an example of a time when family input change, how you understood or communicated progress? <i>P1: I incorporate family perspective by actively listening to their priorities, experiences and goals for their child, then reflecting to those areas.</i> <i>How I describe progress. For example, a family emphasized their child's growing independence at home which shifted how I framed IEP outcomes to highlight self help and social skills alongside academic gains showing a fuller picture of success.</i> <i>P2: I include family perspectives by asking them what progress looks like at home, what they value most, and what goals matter to them. Their insights help me tell a fuller, more accurate story about the student.</i> <i>One example was when a family told me their child was becoming more independent with daily routines at home, even though school data showed only small academic gains. Hearing that shifted how I understood the student's progress. When I shared the IEP update, I highlighted both the academic data and the growth in independence,</i>	c4 Readiness c8 Functional c3 Progression c18 Family support c19 Familial communication c4 Interest-based learning c21 Skill integration c10 Family perspective c18 Family as data c16 Reporting pressure c16 Transparency		
--	---	--	--

<i>because that was meaningful to the family and showed real skill transfer.</i> <i>Their input changed the way I communicated progress and helped create a more balanced, respectful picture of the student's growth.</i> P3: <i>By having regular conversations with families, appreciating their insights and Taking their priorities into account when outlining IEP outcomes, I consider their beautiful viewpoints. For example, I identified development that was not immediately apparent in the classroom when a parent reported that their child was interacting. More positively with siblings at home. With this realization, I was able to integrate, um, instructional practices with the family's values, and experiences, and communicate student growth more comprehensively.</i> P4: <i>I incorporate family perspectives by listening to their observations, priorities, and expectation for their child and reflecting these IEP narratives. For example, during cookery activities, parents emphasize that preparing wheels was not just a skill, but essential for their child's independence at home. I always ask them their assignment is to help. Cook at home. So they are very happy to see their child preparing even just for the rice meal. Their input led me to highlight process skills like following steps, using tools safely, and completing task independently, rather than only the finished product. This shifted how I communicated progress to our principal and our supervisor. And to those stakeholders that provide for our activities, showing meaningful growth in daily living skills that matter most to the family.</i> P5: <i>So by having regular conversations with families, appreciating their insights and Taking into account their priorities while outlining IEP outcomes. I take into the account their viewpoints. For example, I was able to identify development that was not immediately apparent in the classroom. When a parent reported that their child was demonstrating better social interactions with the siblings at home. So with this realization, I was able to integrate instructional practices with the well-use and experience experiences of the family and communicate, learner growth, in more comprehensive ways.</i> P6: <i>So, home is a powerful impact in making an idea. So I incorporate family perspective by actively listening to their priorities and within those values into prince student growth. For example, quote, quote, I have a learner, um, Transporting Osha, so to aggress Osha, so per confidentiality, what they publish. Or research purposes. I just love to cheer that I have a learner, transporting Pusha. He's 12 years old. And my parent is at key, so I am an at, and they have a high expectation, and they have a high, um, goal for their learner, for their child. He's asking me, If his son can be circumcised. So he's asking for my advice. She is asking for advice, the mother. So, I ask her, no man. So, as part of the IEP, even though we cannot do that at the school, let's say we are, we are concluding we are making an IEP goal as part of the IEP process. I accommodated that question. She asked me in. If he can allow his child to start to be circumcised. Not Patule. So, I ask her about some money, and he, Dater of himself. Just say, if he can take care of himself on the check, If he, uh, afraid of blood, can he manage his emotion? Can he manage that kind of, um, surgery?, when he wakes up, so the 1st question, the answer was, can, can you take her up himself? Can he do to the toilet by himself? Can he wash himself, can he dress himself? Can he groom himself? And the answer is no. But the problem is he's 12 years old already. So... So that's the oh, so we have already have a high expectation, so we need to unpack it. So we have 1st a specific objective mommy. The 1st goal, Before we go to that Thai goal net to be circumcised, you need to, we need to teach how to grow, how to clean themselves, how to take them, how to take care of yourself. That it. It doesn't know how to go to the toilet and wash himself. He needs his mother, but he's a boy, but he is peeing. Well, he pee. So, oil, and blood. So, I asked her now, mommy, you need to ask for the father, because he will model. You cannot model the behavior because we are different. experience, very important. I also experience it with my child to say, lamiko shankasa, and then at bishan, nakhao, fo. So, that's why when he's speaking about, I always allow him. So, think about with his daddy. He'll say that's the proper way to model a behavior. That's the proper way he can learn real life experience. So I, I've started that. Mother, no matter the hobbies, that that you're having. He needs to make sure he has a pen, but be sure, son, have the big girl of himself, have to go to the powder, how to wash his bum, bum, by himself, guessing, if you cannot do it correctly,</i>	c4 Honesty c5 Reliability c11 Pressure c4 Strategies c1 Expectation c4 Honesty Strain c11 Expectations c1 Vigilance c11 Miscomparision c3 Progress pressure c5 Balance documentation c8 Collegial support		
--	--	--	--

<i>then what more if you circumcise him? You need to clean in. You need to maintain it. And if you cannot take care of himself, that's the problem. We need to address that 1st before we move on to the higher goal. So... So, just for next start, you, I eat the gold nami. So that's, we start the, um, concluding or making our RTP goal in. toileting practices. The same. Well, there's full papala. So, he can, he can read, he can write, he can answer, he can stay at the classroom at a longer hours, but the problem is that he cannot take care of himself. So, identically, strong, but in daily living, in toileting practice, do not focus you, IEP, making them. So... So my update for how many mothers who are at Augustana, so you... Okay. Yeah. So he needs to be trained 1st before going farther.</i> <i>P7: Family plays vital role in IEP outcome. So I have to I have a lot of talking about them in their parents. One particular event, the parent says that Celestine, my non-verbal learner, who came and go to school without talking. It's an environment. So, uh, he ha, she hams by opening and closing some. And trying her best to initiate the lyrics of the song. Though I may not witness it inside the class. I'm glad that. I'm glad to hear that, there is my progress at home. Communication, indeed, with the family is important. We'll understand. You too, you are really emotional. Important to... It's important to understand the progress of the child.</i> <i>P8: So there are a time when the family input change how I understood or communicated practice is when they told me what the learners' interests are. So I have one ASD learner who doesn't like to do classroom class immediately, because it doesn't interest him much. So even if I tried phrases, motivations, and space, I give him space. He was still a bit adamant to follow. I then ask his mother what does he likes and the hobbies that he usefully do, and with that, I get to use it as a connection to our lesson. So one of the movies that he likes is Jurassic Park. So, using that movie, we get to connect on how the movie franchise helped Hollywood, like merchandise, like the toys, and the more movies connected to Etsy's Diverse. So, for example, the Jurassic Park had a lot more movies. they were able to produce because of its popularity. So with this, I was able to connect the movie merchandise as a form of product to sell. So who he thinks it is being sold to as well. So in turn, he responded to me eagerly, even informing me about other merchandises and websites that I did not know. And that helped boost more sales for that movie. So he was then able to properly connect it to our marketing and environment competency and product development competency.</i> <i>P9: I include family perspective, um, by listening to their observations and what matters most of them. Once if they went shared that their child starting to play with siblings was a big achievement. Even if it wasn't in the classroom records, I highlighted this in the IEP, showing the child's progress in both learning and social skills. This helped the family feel valued and made the report more meaningful.</i> <i>P10: I incorporate family perspective by treating them as essential data, just as important as classroom observations and progress monitoring scores. Family sees pattern, triggers and strengths that don't always surface at school. So I intentionally build in quick check-ins, shared trackers, or belief R reflection prompts to understand how the strategy is working across settings. Their values also guide how I frame progress if a family prioritizes confidence, independence, or reduce stress at home, I make sure those dimensions are reflected in how I narrate outcomes, not just formal metrics. One moment that stands out was when a family shared that their child who had been making steady academic games at school, was still shutting down the ring homework. They explained that the visual cue was used in school in class wasn't enough at home because he needed a verbal preview to feel emotionally ready to start. That inside completed, completely shifted my understanding of his progress. He wasn't inconsistent. He needed core regulation before independence. We just did the plan so that the boat school and home used the same verbal script, and within weeks, his initiation improved in both settings. That experience reinforced our family input doesn't just add context. It can fundamentally reshape how I interpret and communicate as students grow.</i> <u>IGQ7: Have you ever felt pressure to present more favorable outcomes? Or to downplay challenges in your storytelling about IEPs? How did you respond and what were the consequences for practice? Or</u>	c10 Stakeholder input c22 Transparent reporting c11 Compliance pressure c2 Targeted adjustment c4 Factual teaching c16 Obligation c18 Advocacy c16 Accuracy c2 Policy c12 Precision c18 Impact		
--	---	--	--

<u>policy?</u> P1: <i>Yes of course I felt pressure at times to emphasize positive and so on the challenges especially during high stake meetings. So I respond by grounding my storytelling in a clear data while using respectful strength, respectful and strength based language. So being transparent build trust with families and colleagues.</i> P2: <i>Yes, I've felt pressure before to make IEP outcomes sound more positive than they really were. Instead of doing that, I shared the real data but explained the student's strengths and the supports we were adding.</i> <i>Because I was honest, the team adjusted the student's plan, and the family trusted the process more. It also encouraged our team to use a more balanced reporting format so no one felt pressured to hide challenges.</i> P3: <i>I once felt pressured to highlight successful outcomes in IEP reports. demonstrate the program's efficacy. However, I decided to provide Fair and truthful information by highlighting both advancements and ongoing difficulties. Supported by facts and expert observations. This answered encouragement, openness, increased stakeholder trust, and emphasize the significance of practical goal setting. And evidence based decision making.</i> P4: <i>Yes, I have felt pressure to highlight only positive outcomes, but I focus on honest balance reporting. For example, a student improved in participation but still struggled with behavior. So I shared both progress and challenges with parents. This led to realistic adjustment in strategies, stronger trust and better support for the student, showing that honesty ultimately benefits learning more than presenting overly favorable results.</i> P5: <i>I experienced pressure to highlight successful outcomes in IEP reports in order to demonstrate the efficacy of the program. However, I made the decisions to provide pair and truthful information by highlighting both advancements and continuing difficulties, which are backed up by facts and experts observations. So this answer encountered openness, increased stakeholder's trust, and emphasize the significance of practical bull setting and evidence-based decision making.</i> P6: <i>Of course, I feel pressure at a special education teacher. I cannot. Uh, I cannot tie the vegetable. I am part of the team who made that gold. So I am the one also responsible to achieve that goal. So part of me is also pressured to achieve it. That's it. Sometimes the parent, um, they ask for, they, they compare Napa, their child. So that's when Sometimes you ask for your buyer. So, you need to stay on your toes now. So, it always goes down, but, uh, 34, we have different learners, we have different ITUs. They have different levels. So, That parent, you have a, uh, child with dancing syndrome, and he's comparing his son to a child with a TCM. So they have different disabilities and a different level of IQ. So it's kind of hard to, to tell the parent that he can drink because he have different types. I don't want to feel nah, I, he can achieve because the IQ is the problem. So, we need to start some, we need to start small, simple step. If that is your goal for your child, that's right. And we need to unpack it now. as I said earlier. Okay. Question number. Sorry. Excuse me.</i> P7: <i>Yes, I have felt pressure to present more favorable outcome, especially when expectations were high. But others didn't fully understand that not all learners progress at the same pace. And some are far behind their views. I responded by carefully documenting both achievements and challenges using data and examples to show that the learner's true growth, While still highlighting strength. I also took time to explain the context in individual needs during meetings and emphasizing that progress is relative to relative and personalized. Well, this sometimes cause tension with those expecting quick results. It is ultimately to build trust and encourage more realistic goal setting. The consequences for the practice was a stronger focus on individualized support and for family. It highlighted the need for understanding, diverse learner needs rather than enforcing uniform expectations.</i> P8: <i>Yes, sometimes, I feel like what I have done for the learner is not enough, despite reaching one goal at a time. So what I do is, I collaborate with my fellow teachers and ask their advices of what I can do better for this learner. I also ask for the parents feedback and the learner's thoughts on how well we are facing in our class and in</i>	c16 Truthfulness c4 Disclosure c13 Genuineness c15 Responsible reporting c22 Evidence based narrative c22 Precise reporting c20 Student advocacy c19 Data driven advocacy c19 Advocacy communication c20 Supportive effectiveness		
--	---	--	--

enriching their IEP goal. P9: <i>Um, no, I have not feel pressured to present more uh, favorable outcomes or downplay challenges in IAP reporting. I prioritize, accurate, honest, reporting to ensure families can make informed decisions and support the learners effectively. This approach has helped maintain trust. With both parents and colleagues and reinforce the culture of transparency in practice.</i> P10: <i>I have a time spell pressured to present outcomes more favorably, especially when a team or administrator focused on compliance metrics rather than the full context of a student's progress. One example involved, a student with academic data looked stagnant, even though we were seeing meaningful gains in regulation and engagement. There was a subtle pressure to highlight only the positive numbers, but doing so would have created an complete and potential potentially misleading pictures of these needs. I chose to present the data, honestly, while framing it through a strength-based um lens. Emphasizing both the environmental factors affecting for 4 months, and the areas where he was genuinely growing. The result was a more productive conversation, instead of assuming that the student wasn't trying or that the plan was working fine. The team recognized that the current supports weren't addressing the root issue. We revised the accommodation, added core regulation strategies, and adjusted expectations around pacing. His engagement and academic output improved within weeks. That experience reinforced for me, uh, the transparent storytelling isn't just an ethical choice. It directly shapes better practice and prevents policies from drifting away from what student actually needs.</i> IGQ8: <u>In your view, what responsibilities do teachers have when sharing IEP outcomes with district leaders or policymakers? How do you calibrate honesty, accountability, and advocacy in your narrow bits?</u> P1: <i>We teachers have a responsibility to provide accurate evidence based accounts of students progress while advocating for necessary supports. I calibrate honesty, accountability and advocacy by presenting clear data alongside with insights highlighting both achievements and challenges so that the leaders can make informed decisions that will truly benefit the learner.</i> P2: <i>Teachers have a responsibility to be honest about student progress, clear about what support is needed, and respectful of the student's dignity when sharing IEP outcomes with district leaders. I balance honesty, accountability, and advocacy by sharing the real data, explaining the context behind it, and making sure the student's needs—not just the numbers—guide the conversation.</i> P3: <i>When sharing IEP results with teachers, have an obligation to provide accurate learners centered, and better driven information. While upholding responsibility, through appropriate documentation and moral communication, They must guarantee honesty by disclosing both accomplishments and places in need of assistance. By emphasizing the needs of students and suggesting evidence-based solutions that promote significant growth, educators simultaneously promote inclusive practices and suitable resources.</i> P4: <i>In my view, teachers have the responsibility to provide accurate, clear, and meaningful information about IEP outcomes. So leaders understand both progress and ongoing needs. I calibrate honesty, accountability, and advocacy by sharing observable data examples, highlighting successes while also explaining challenges. And emphasizing how supports for resources can help the student grow. This approach ensures leaders receive a truthful picture, supports informed decision making, and advocates for necessary accommodation, or policy adjustment that benefit learners.</i> P5: <i>When sharing IEP results, the teachers have an obligation to provide accurate learners centered and data driven information. While upholding responsibility through a property documentation and moral communication, they must guard the honesty by disclosing both accomplishments and places in need of assistance. By emphasizing the needs of the learners and suggesting evidence, uh, based solution that promotes significant growth, educators simultaneously promote inclusive practices and suitable resources.</i> P6: <i>Teachers have responsibility. And IEP outcomes with honesty, and uh, accountability will advocate advocately for the supports that students really need. For, for example, when we are reporting to the</i>	c17 Influential communication c16 Personal audit c16 Bias mitigation c16 Accuracy c16 Reflexivity c14 Integrity c21 Assumptions c11 Oversight c10 Consultation c16 Credibility		
---	--	--	--

leaders, we need to balance accountability by sharing accurate data alongside narratives that highlight students, threats, barriers, and ensuring story promotes quality. on spices, that genuinely improvaxis insults. SA teachers, uh, accountability and responsibility matters most rather than the ink tap in the book and receiving a good job when Indiana, nipayon. So when we are reporting, we are reporting with honesty, regardless of what to do, what is the outcome? Matters most is they know. What is the progress of the check? P7: In my view, teachers have a responsibility to share IEP outcomes with district leaders or policy makers in a way that it is honest, accurate, and students are certain, even though these are not practiced here. We have um, um, The, we must balance accountability, reporting through progress and challenges with advocacy, ensuring that the learners needs when successes are clearly represented. I calibrate this by grounding my narratives into concrete evidence, highlighting both stranded areas, needing support, and framing recommendations so that they guide, inform, decision without exaggeration or bias. Okay. P8: Um, sorry. Uh, the responsibilities that I think teachers have when sharing IEP outcomes with district uh, leaders or policymakers is that teachers must present progress to be, avoid exaggeration or minimization. Teachers are accountable not only to the students, but also to families, schools, and the system. This involves showing how instructional strategies supports and resources were used and whether they were effective. And lastly, that teachers must ensure that student voices, especially the one with special needs, their voices and their needs are not lost in the district authority P9: Teachers should share IEP outcomes honestly and clearly with district leaders. They are responsible for reporting both progress and challenges. So decisions are realistic. I balance honesty and advocacy by using data, giving context, and always focusing on what best supports the student. P10: Teachers have responsibility to communicate IAP outcomes to district leaders in a way that is honest. Contextualized and grounded in advocacy for students. I see my role as translating classroom realities into information that helps leaders make better decisions. Not smoothing over challenges or presenting data without no ones. That means I'm transparent about what's working. Clear what, clear about what isn't, and intentional about highlighting the structural factors that shape students' progress. I try to balance accountability with advocacy by framing outcomes in terms of both student effort and system conditions. So that leaders understand how supports time or resources influence results. One example was when several students across grade levels, structure struggled with district wide executive function initiative. The raw data suggested limited progress, but the story behind it was more complex. Inconsistent implementation time, competing academic demands, and a lack of shared tools across classrooms. When reporting this to district leaders, I was honest about the data, but also emphasized the bright spots. Classrooms where routines were consistent and students were driving. That combination of candor and contextual detailed lead, the district to streamline expectations and provide a unified set of tools for teachers. The shift improved consistency and made the initiative more sustainable. Moments like, um, that remind me that our narratives don't just describe outcomes. They shape the policies and supports that the term mean, whether students can succeed. IGQ9: How do you reflect on your own professional development, biases, and blind spots? I should tell stories about IEP outcomes. What steps do you take to address this? And practice it and how you communicate findings. P1: I reflect by regularly examining my assumptions about ability, progress and potential and seeking feedback from colleagues and families. So to address biases I use multiple data sources, highlight the strength of the students and to ensure language is inclusive and objective so that my narrative is fair. That is fair and it represents each student's growth and needs. P2: I reflect on my own development and biases by asking myself whether I'm focusing on the whole child or only on the parts that are easiest to measure. I also check whether my language is strengths-based and whether I'm giving every student the same level of attention, not just the ones who show quick gains.	c7 Introspection c23 Reflective practice c19 Evidence based communication c12 Professional growth c6 Collaborative evaluation c23 Reflective practice c23 Self reflection c23 Perspective awareness c23 Feedback integration Learnx7er focus c19 Enabling structures c15 Unified support		
---	--	--	--

<i>To address blind spots, I use multiple sources of data, ask colleagues for perspective, and listen closely to families. I also reread my reports to make sure I'm not unintentionally framing a student in a limiting way. These steps help me communicate IEP outcomes more fairly and accurately.</i>	c7 Strength focused		
P3: By looking over student data, getting input from coworkers, From families, and considering how what I thought, or might beliefs, can affect how I interpret IEP results. I evolve my professional growth. I use several assessments, assessment methods to achieve a balanced appraisal. Participate in professional forums and engage in ongoing learning to stay aware of potential biases or blind spots. I use reflected techniques, modified taking methodologies as necessary. And uh, present findings in affair, cartues, and uh, fact-based way to address this and practice.	c14 Diligence		
P4: <i>I reflect on my biases by checking if I overemphasize academic over life skill. To address this, I collect data across multiple areas sick, and sick feedback from parents and our principal and highlight both strength and challenges. Um, I also ask our supervisor, uh, Arsenal supervisor, if, If, um, this, um, life scale is possible or if, if it is domineering the whole IED. So they can give some feedback. This ensure my IEP narratives accurately reflect each student's real progress.</i>	c18 Acknowledgement		
P5: <i>By looking over learner's data, so getting input from the coworkers and families, and considering how what I thought, our lips can affect, how I interpreted the IEP results. I evaluate my professional goals. So I use several resources. Assessment to achieve a balanced raisal, participate in professional forums and also engage in ongoing learning to stay aware of potential biases or blame blame spats. So I use reflective techniques, modified teaching methodologies as necessary, and present findings in a fair, court choose, and fuck-based way to address this practice.</i>	c16 Authenticity		
P6: <i>I reflect on my professional development by examining how my biets might cheat, which outcome I highlight and whose progress I value the most. So I have to address this, I see feedback from my colleagues, my, um, supervisors and use multiple data sources and intentionally bring communication to include. But academic and social emotional growth, ensuring my narratives remain balanced and inclusive.</i>	c13 Achievement		
P7: <i>I reflect on my professional development by regularly examining how my perspective as special education teacher, shape the stories I tell about the IEP outcome. Being mindful of any biases that my emphasis, achievement over others, I said feedback, I see feedback from colleagues and families to uncover blind spot and ensure that my interpretation are balanced and inclusive of multiple viewpoints. In practice, I address this by grounding communication and clear evidence, highlighting both strength and areas for growth and framing findings in a way that support collaboration in student centers decision.</i>	c23 Mentorship		
P8: <i>The steps I take to address these in practice and how I communicate my findings is, 1st need, I contain there is continuous professional development for myself and along with my colleagues. Like our own seminars, lack sessions, inset, and then number 2 is the 2nd one is critical self-assessment. If I was able to meet all goals of my learners on a monthly or yearly basis. On the 3rd one is, we have at least I have collaborative input with the parents or the guardians and the cult teachers, like my master teachers. Then, lastly, is having a diversified evidence that highlights growth in confidence, independence, and beluminous of my learners.</i>	c5 Equity		
P9: <i>I reflect on my professional development, biases, and blind spots by, um, regularly reviewing my IEP reports in considering whether my perspective might unintentionally influence how I present student progress. I seek feedback from colleagues and families, engaged in profession, learn professional learning, and compare my interpretations with observe outcomes. To address any gaps, I adjust my language to remain factual and balance. Highlight both successes and challenges, and ensure um, recommendations are practical and student centered. This continuous reflection helps me. Communicate, finding transparently and support equitable decision making.</i>	c10 Complementarity		
P10: <i>I've learned that my own professional development and blind spots inevitably shape the stories I tell about IGP outcomes. So I try to approach my narratives with a mindset of ongoing reflection. I know I</i>	c22 Transparent reporting		
	c21 Story driven		
	c20 Individual progress		

<i>naturally gravitate toward highlighting growth in access, regulation, and participation because of my sped background, which means I have to be intentional now about balancing that with clear academic data for colleagues and families will value those metrics. I also watch out for moments when my assumptions about what should be working, or what student ought to be able to do, might influence how I interpret progress. When I notice myself learning too leaning too heavily on one lens, I pause and ask whether I'm privileging certain types of progress simply because they align with my training or comfort zone. One moment that made this real involve, um, a student whose emotional regulation had improved dramatically, but was academic scores for flap. I initially framed his progress almost entirely around confidence and engagement, but the family gently shared that they also needed clarity about academics. Their feedback helped me recognize that my emphasis on regulation, while important, was overshadowing progress they cared about. Since then, I've made it a practice to triangulate data, pairing quantitative measures with qualitative observations, checking my interpretations with families and teachers. And explicitly naming where my own lens might be influencing the narrative. This keeps my communication balance, transparent, and grounded, in the team's shared values rather than my own perspective.</i> IGQ10: Based on your experiences, what changes in district-wide practice or policy would you advocate for to support more authentic, ethical, and evidence-informed storytelling about IEP outcomes? What would you want leaders to hear and value? P1: <i>I would advocate for policies that prioritize individuals strength based reporting over standardized comparison focus metrics and that give teachers give teacher the time and training to gather rich and multi source evidence.</i> <i>I want leaders to hear and value stories that show both academic and personal growth, recognize the role of support and context and owner family perspective so decisions reflects the whole student not just the test scores.</i> <i>Well, I enjoyed your answers and thank you so much for this very valuable interview and I would like to express my sincerest gratitude for being a part of my study.</i> P2: <i>I would advocate for district practices that make IEP reporting honest, consistent, and centered on students, not just numbers. That means giving teachers time to collect meaningful data, using reporting tools that highlight strengths and needs, and creating a culture where telling the truth about challenges is supported—not punished.</i> <i>I'd want leaders to value accuracy over appearance, context over quick judgments, and student dignity over compliance checklists. When districts support clear communication, realistic expectations, and strong collaboration with families, the stories we tell about IEP outcomes become more ethical, more useful, and more reflective of real student growth.</i> P3: <i>Oh, I would support rules that encourage, thorough, is thanks based reporting of IEP results, backed by an standardized, yet adaptable, progress monitoring methods based on my own experiences.</i> <i>To help teachers communicate the students more authentically. And responsibly. I would advise leaders to provide opportunities for reflection, joint reflection. Ongoing professional development. And explicit ethical principles. Thinkers, inclusive and meaningful educational outcomes, I would like leaders to value narratives that emphasize contextual challenges. Individual learners progress and the importance of sufficient resources.</i> P4: <i>Based on my experience, we have the R 11650 and a policy to ensure inclusion with regard to IEPs. Support is needed, and I would advocate for policies that ensure that every city or municipality has provisions for materials, especially a functioning ILRC with partner specialists. A balanced student teacher ratio, and more sned training for teacher and administrators. I want leaders to understand that authentic IET storytelling should reflect both successes and ongoing challenges. Value functional in life skills, as much as academics, and rely on real classroom data to guide decisions. Supporting this practical will promote ethical, evidence informed reportings, and ultimately lead to better student outcomes.</i> P5: <i>I would support rules that encourage thorough and strength-based</i>	c14 Resilience c2 Policy advocacy c18 Family involvement c23 Humble reflection c23 Critical self awareness c16 Perspective adjustment		
--	---	--	--

reporting of IEP results. Back by standardized, but adaptable progress monitoring methods based on my own experiences. So to assist teachers in communicating students, success in more genuine and responsible manner, I would advise leaders to offer chain chances for joint reflections, ongoing professional development, and explicit ethical principles.

In order to encourage, uh, inclusive and manipulative education results, I would like to create theirs to value narratives that emphasize constructual difficulties. Individual learning progress and the significance of the sufficient resources.

P6: I would advocate why practice that prioritize data sharing with the family boys. Family boys are being valued, no matter what social class they came from. and qualitative measure for growth alongside quantitative ones. Leaders should hear the authentic start and about IAP outcomes that decorates value of being, value of individual progress and differences. And also reducing pressure to inflate result. In most Atlantic outcome and support teachers. With a system that honor equipment of them. Of course, teachers also need support in order to deliver those expectations from them.

P7: I would, I'm looking for a district that prioritized transparent data driven and narrative base reporting of IEP outcome. Ensuring both successes and challenges are documented ethically. Leaders should buy you family, teachers, respective, as integral evidence, not just numerical progress, to capture the full story of the learner's growth. I want them to hear that, authentic storytelling, strengthen, collaboration. Guides informed decision making, and ultimately support more meaningful, individualized student outcomes

P8: What I would like them to hear and value is that small steps are big steps. Our learners with disabilities may not all be able to be at the same pace as that of in the mainstream or general education department. But they make improvements on their own base and goals that they want to achieve because just like all of us, they do their best every day, and they give the best that they got as they show resilience as well in progressing until they do a new goals for themselves. Little progress, is it still progress? And every day there is progress. If you're going to end up, everybody is successful.

P9: Um, I would advocate for policies that prioritize accuracy, transparency, and family engagement in reporting IEP outcomes. Either should support practices that allow educators to share both successes and challenges. I would encourage professional developments on ethical storytelling. Data, interpretation, and unbiased reporting, and promote structure like collaborative review, meetings to ensure, support, reflect through learners, learn our progress. I want leaders to value honesty, evidence in the active involvement of families because it leads to better informed decision and stronger support for students.

P10: I've learned that my own professional development, biases, and blind spots, inevitably shape, the stories I tell about IEP outcomes. So I try to approach my narratives with humility and curiosity. I know I tend to focus on growth in access, regulation, and participation because of my sped background, which means I have to be intentional about also naming academic progress in ways that resonate with general education colleagues and administrators. I also watch for moments when my assumptions about what should be working for or what a student ought to be able to do, my color, my interpret, my interpretation of data. When I notice myself leaning too heavily on one's lens, I also ask whether I'm privileging certain types of progress simply because they align with my comfort zone or training. Um, one example that pushed me to confront a blind spot involves a student who's academic sports where, um, flat. But those engagement and regulations had improved dramatically. I initially painted the student around his emotional growth, but the family gently pointed out that they also wanted clear academic information. Their feedback helped me realize that my emphasis on regulation, well well intentioned, was overshadowing shadowing progress they valued. Since then, I made it to practice to triangulate data pairing quantitative measures with qualitative observations, checking my interpretations with families and teachers, and explicitly naming where my own lens might be influencing the narrative.

Summary of Findings

The data coalesced into a living portrait of what holistic IEP implementation looks like in classrooms, through the eyes of teachers who navigate its promises and pressures every day. What emerged was less a set of neat categories and more a textured story about meaning-making, relationship-building, and practical ingenuity within real schools. The researcher spoke with teachers who described holism as an integrated, person-centered stance—one that does not separate the student's academic work from social-emotional growth, daily functioning, and the supports that enable participation. They spoke of goals that felt truly theirs: goals crafted with the student's voice, shaped by family insight, and supported by a web of colleagues who brought specialized strengths. In their classrooms, the IEP became a living document not solely for compliance but also as a map for day-to-day practice, where instruction, routines, and relationships were aligned toward the whole child. The daily life of holism unfolded through relational, collaborative work. Teachers highlighted the centrality of relationships—with students, with families, and with colleagues from special education, general education, and related services. These collaborations were not mere meetings; they were ongoing conversations about what the student needs, what success looked like in a given moment, and how to adjust plans as a child's capacities and interests evolved. Flexible scheduling and adaptive instruction emerged as practical expressions of this philosophy. When time is scarce, they described re-sequencing activities, co-planning with peers, and choosing instructional tasks that honor both the student's goals and the realities of the classroom. Yet the path was not without friction. Several teachers described tensions between holistic ideals and the constraints of time, workload, and accountability pressures. Resource gaps—whether staffing, materials, or access to multidisciplinary services—often required hard negotiations and creative problem-solving. In response, teachers prioritized student-chosen goals, built tiered supports, and leaned on community resources and informal networks to fill gaps. This negotiation was not a retreat from holism; it was a reconfiguration of holism to fit the school day and the available support arsenals.

Organizational and policy contexts shape what holism can look like in practice. A school culture that values inclusion, collaborative inquiry, and shared decision-making tends to nurture holistic efforts. When professional learning communities are active and decision-making was distributed, the implementation felt more coherent and sustainable. However, variability in access to multidisciplinary teams and external services can create uneven experiences across classrooms, which teachers described as both a practical hurdle and a signal that policy attention was still needed. In terms of outcomes, teachers observe tangible positive shifts: heightened student engagement, clearer articulation of progress toward personalized goals, and a growing sense of competence and agency in students. Nevertheless, there were persistent challenges. Some students still experience gaps between home and school expectations, and there was a wish for more explicit guidance on how to measure holistic outcomes in a way that respects the fullness of student development rather than reducing it to testable metrics alone. At the heart of these experiences laid an essence—transformative, person-centered practice that weds academic aims with well-being, autonomy, and everyday functioning. The stories

converge on a practical truth: holism succeeds when teachers cultivate collaborative ecosystems, allocate flexible time for planning and adjustment, and use scalable tools that support holistic goal-setting and progress monitoring. This was not a neat prescription but a living practice—one that required reflexive attention, shared leadership, and the courage to reimagine what an IEP can be in a diverse, dynamic classroom.

5. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter synthesized the study's core findings, articulated the conclusions drawn from the analysis, and offered targeted recommendations for practice, policy, and future research. The aim was to present a coherent, evidence-based synthesis that informed both scholarly understanding and actionable steps.

Discussion

The study population consisted of 10 participants from Lucena City, Philippines.

The researcher conducted one-on-one interviews with 10 participants (SNED teachers only) and did not include School Administrators, as the focus was to gather diverse perspectives on the strengths and challenges of Individualized Education Programs.

To protect participants' identities, the researcher assigned pseudonyms and ensured that personal information remained confidential. Data were stored securely, and were accessible only to the researcher.

The researcher made it clear that all participants joined the interview voluntarily, and participants were assured that their decision to participate or not would not affect their relationship with the school or their standing in any way.

For Emotional and Psychological Safety, the researcher acknowledged that discussing personal experiences related to grit and resiliency could evoke emotional responses. The researcher provided participants, through the assigned facilitators, with information on support services, as needed, and created a supportive environment during interviews and focus groups.

The researcher was aware of and respected the participants' cultural context. The researcher, through the facilitator, the researcher used culturally relevant and appropriate language and examples, ensuring the research process was inclusive and respectful of local customs and practices.

For data integrity, the researcher presented the findings honestly and accurately without fabrication or misrepresentation of data.

The researcher also acknowledged the study's limitations and avoided overgeneralizing the results. As for the ethical review, the researcher submitted the research proposal to the panel during the pre-oral defense for approval, before commencing this research. This ensures adherence to ethical standards and practices in research.

For feedback to participants, the researcher offered to share the study's findings with participants and schools involved in the research. The researcher maintained that would help to create a sense of ownership and reinforce the value of their contributions to the study.

RGQ1: What district strategies related to IEP implementation are experienced by SPED teachers in the four districts of Lucena City?

IGQ1:

Could you share a narrative of a typical IEP-related day or week? From your perspective, what are the key scenes, who else is present, and how do these moments change your understanding of the students' progress?

Theme 1: Planning & Implementation

This study advanced a narrative account of teachers' lived experiences as they planned and enacted holistic IEPs within inclusive classrooms, reframing planning and implementation not as discrete tasks but as evolving narratives in which professional judgment, student humanity, and systemic structures intersected. It treated holistic IEPs as an ethical and pedagogical orientation rather than a mere compliance artifact, insisting that the planning process was inseparable from the day-to-day realities of teaching, collaboration, and meaning-making across diverse educational ecosystems. (P6) says for us, and I get it a rated day, or we just were done with the collaboration of teachers, parents, and if the child is lucky, and can afford therapy, which is not pretty, but we can get a subsidy if they applied for some government offices. (L1 – L11) Additionally, our time frame, can we achieve that at that, uh, specific time frame, and also, uh, desserts died, then, specifically, if the students are still including assuring. Also, the practice at school must be at home to check for its potential. Sometimes this is our big problem, though, because, um, there are parents now. Um, they cannot continue. (L21 – L37). From the outset, the inquiry situates itself within a phenomenological frame that seeks to illuminate the essences of teachers' experiences as they are engaged with holistic aims—cognitive growth, social-emotional flourishing, physical well-being, and cultural belonging—within the lived texture of classrooms, planning rooms, and district policy conversations. (P10) says each morning, I begin with beef check-ins as students arrive. I observe how they transition, whether they follow routines, communicate their needs, or show signs of frustration. (L6 – L14) During classroom instruction, I work alongside a general education teacher. I move around to support students with IEPs, ensuring they use their accommodations, such as visual schedules, graphic organizers, or assistive technology. (L23 – L34). The researcher examines how teachers interpreted, negotiated, and enacted goals designed to honor the whole child, which recognized that each facet of development informs and was informed by the others. Later in the day, I conduct short targeted sessions with students. For example, I might work one-on-one with a student on reading fluency and or behavioral regulation. These sessions are where I collect the most specific data, such as how many words they read, how long they stay engaged, or whether they can use a strategy with practice. (L32 – L59). The planning moment is thus perceived not as a sterile sequencing of objectives but as a moral and existential practice in which teachers translate policy directives into everyday pedagogy, collaborative routines, and culturally responsive interactions with students and families. Later in the day, I conduct short targeted sessions with students. For example, I might work one-on-one with a student on reading fluency and or behavioral regulation. These sessions are where I collect the most specific data, such as how many words they read, how long they stay engaged, or whether they can use a strategy with practice. (L63 – L70).

The theoretical compass guiding this inquiry was anchored in phenomenology's attention to lived experience while acknowledging the interpretive horizons through which those experiences were understood. Holistic education emerged as a guiding moral-educative stance, prescribing an integrated attention to the academic, affective, social, physical, and cultural dimensions of student life. (P8) says we start on the 1st day by setting goals and orienting them to our current lesson. Task to do for the week. On the 2nd day. Oh. I informed them of what to do and which years they will use. Currently, we are learning to use a heat press iron. (L 1- L13) IEP implementation, in this light, was the ongoing orchestration of supports, adaptations, and evaluations that collectively rendered visible the student's evolving personhood within the school milieu. Teacher epistemology emerged as the locus where knowledge, belief, and professional craftsmanship converged to justify decisions about which supports were necessary, which outcomes were meaningful, and how progress was discerned in a multidimensional landscape. (P1) narrates, I focus on the implementation of the specially design instruction and tracking of the real time data (L2 – L6), like the preparation of visual aids, schedules, data sheets and reviewing individual goals. (L10 – L14). Collaboration was recast as a lived practice, a daily choreography in which general educators, specialists, families, and community partners negotiated meaning, aligned purposes, and sustained hope amid the frictions of time, resource constraints, and policy mandates.

The narrative unfolded through the sustained tension between aspiration and constraint. On one hand, teachers articulated a deep-seated professional commitment to seeing the student as a whole—acknowledging temperament, communication style, cultural background, family ecosystem, and unique learning trajectories. (P5) We began softly but reasonable goals, implemented targeted accommodations, small group treatments, and shaded interactions like intermittent attendance and shifting priorities. (L3 – L12). Sako dino the moment is important to me because it validates that the strategy was working, strengthening my belief in collaborative decision-making (L23 – L30). (P7) says, "But if implementation is a decisive part of the side," Whether you learn, if the goals are appropriate, and you will be surprised, adjust, or make, or if it doesn't need to change your strategies to achieve the goal. (L18 – L28). On the other hand, they contended with the scaffolding of standardized assessments, mandated timelines, caseload pressures, and uneven access to specialized supports. This tension was not framed merely as obstruction but as a site of reflective possibility, where practitioners exercised professional agency to reimagine classroom practices, recalibrated goals, and reframed success in ways that illuminated the student's fuller humanity. (P8) I teach learners whose age bracket is 18 to 25 years old, uh, so most of them are actually, uh, livelihood program students. So, my initial goal is that learners are able to follow complex 2 to 3-step instructions until retention. (L2 – L13) In this sense, planning emerged as a narrative act of sense-making, where teachers braided together data, clinical insights, classroom observations, and family voices to craft a coherent story about a student's potential and the supports required to realize it. (P9) This mattered because the child showed clearer progress. Proving that strong family support and school collaboration

can make a real difference, even with limited resources. (L20 – L29) The process of planning was described not as a ceremonial ritual but as an iterative, dialogic, and deeply relational endeavor. Engaging in a planning conversation involved listening—profound listening—to students’ expressions, families’ hopes, and colleagues’ expertise. It required the delicate art of translating complex, interwoven needs into accessible, actionable targets while preserving the integrity of the holistic aims. (P1) I once worked under a district policy that emphasized strict inclusion, which created tension with the student who needed a brief pull-out for instructional reading (L1– L8). I aligned the policy and practice by documenting the data, collaborating with the IEP team, and adjusting the schedule. (L9 – L15).

Such translation was seldom linear; it unfolded across episodes of collaboration, disagreement, negotiation, and reaffirmation. In the best of circumstances, planning became a shared language through which all participants—teachers, specialists, families—contributed their standpoints to a common vision, while remaining open to revising that vision as new information emerged. The outcome was a plan that was not passive parchment but a living document, continually revisited, reframed, and rearticulated in response to student progress, shifts in classroom dynamics, and evolving understandings of what it meant to educate the whole child. Implementation, within this narrative frame, was portrayed as a choreography rather than a sequence of discrete steps. It was the enacted articulation of planning—manifest in daily classroom interactions, instructional choices, accessible materials, and the teacher's with-ness to each learner. (P2) *I see district policies as the structure I work within, and my classroom practices as how I bring those expectations to life for students. (L1 – L8).* The teacher’s practice embodied an ongoing negotiation among policy directives, evidence-informed strategies, and the nuanced tempo of individual students. In practice, holistic IEPs required a portfolio of supports converging across domains: instructional modifications that respected diverse cognitive styles, social-emotional scaffolding that affirmed identity and belonging, physical accommodations that enabled safe and comfortable participation, and culturally sustaining pedagogies that honored students’ languages, traditions, and lived experiences. (P4) *In our context, there are no specific district policies focused solely on IEP implementation, but we are provided with general guidelines on the IEP format at the national level. (L1 – L9), my classroom practices rely heavily on professional judgment, collaboration with colleagues and parents, and flexibility to meet each learner's needs (L16 – L23), (P5) narrates that Managing the situation was important because it forced me to advocate more effectively, much the language of the teaching choices, and view the policy as something that can be carefully understood in the best interest of the learners rather than merely a restriction. (L21 – L33), (P8) is what we use as a guide for our teachings, since I teach transition young adult livelihood programs. So, in turn, this also serves as one of my guideposts in implementing IEP goals. (L12 – L16).* The narrative thus foregrounded how teachers wove documentation, observation, and dialogue into coherent patterns of practice that genuinely responded to students’ evolving needs. Central to the narrative was the relational fabric of collaboration. The study portrayed collaboration as an intimate, everyday practice rather than an episodic event.

It was through sustained conversations with families, interdisciplinary colleagues, and administrators that planning gained depth and legitimacy. These conversations revealed how professional trust was built, how role clarity was negotiated, and how shared purpose was maintained amid competing demands. Within this fabric, teachers learned to recognize the expertise each participant brought—the family’s intimate knowledge of the child’s routines and preferences, the specialist’s technical insights, and the teacher’s classroom-based observations—and assembled these facets into a holistic portrait of the learner. The narrative thus depicted collaboration as a lived pedagogy—one that is as much about listening and relationship-building as it was about data synthesis and goal-setting. (P2) *The main “characters” in IEP work are the student, the family, the specialists, the general education teacher, and the administrator (L1 – L7), The student guides the goals, the family gives important background, the specialists add expertise, the general education teacher shows how the student does in the classroom, and the administrator supports the process and resources. (L8 – L20).*

The phenomenological inquiry attended closely to the meanings that teachers ascribed to outcomes. Holistic progress was measured through a multiplicity of indicators, including qualitative signals such as student engagement, the emergence of self-advocacy, peer relationships, and a sense of agency, as well as quantitative measures. The teacher’s discernment of progress was inseparable from the student’s voice, which was increasingly elicited and valued within the IEP process. In this sense, progress became a narrative moment—a moment when the student’s evolving sense of self, capability, and belonging was recognized and celebrated. The teacher’s interpretation of success thus extended beyond achievement of isolated skills to the cultivation of a durable sense of belonging, purpose, and potential within the school community. This narrative also acknowledged the ethical and emotional dimensions of doing this work. (P3) *And the participation of families. Generally, special education instruction services are provided by service providers. (L4 – L9), families offer contacts and motivation, specialists contribute experience, and data. And, of course, coworkers help translate goals into daily practice. (L17–L25) When they are not, the storyline becomes more intricate, demonstrating how teamwork directly affects results. (L31 – L36).*

Teachers navigated anxieties around evaluation, accountability pressures, and potential conflicts with colleagues or families over differing perspectives. They exercised professional courage when advocating for a holistic lens despite misalignment or resource scarcity. Yet, they also experienced vulnerability—the intimate awareness of limits, the fatigue that accompanied sustained reflective practice, and the weight of responsibility for a child’s welfare. In the deepest layers of the narrative, there was a moral register: educators strove to honor the dignity of each learner, to resisted reductionist framings of ability, and to persisted in building systems that were responsive, inclusive, and just. Methodological grounding in narrative and phenomenology yielded a rich tapestry of contextual detail. (P4) *I often consider the student the central character, along with the people closest and most important to them, such as family members. (L1 – L8), This helps me connect more clearly to my student and ensures that their*

progress is supported by a strong collaborative network around them. The study foregrounded thick description, inviting readers into the school cultures, planning rooms, and family conversations that shaped holistic IEPs. It emphasized the temporality of practice—the way in which planning and implementation unfolded across days, weeks, and semesters, and how changes in policy or school climate rippled through the lived experiences of teachers and students alike. (P6) They are the beginning, they are the goal, and never the end. It always continues. Mainly because we are always up to go well to where they are starting and when they can progress, even though we have already achieved the IEP, there is always more. After achieving the goal. And how we navigate the IEP is mostly based entirely on that? (L5 – L21).

The narrative thus contributed to a nuanced understanding of inclusive education that privileged depth over generalization, context over abstraction, and voice over distance. The implications of this narrative inquiry extended across practice, policy, and theory. For practice, the study re-storied how planning for holistic IEPs can be reframed as an intentional, collaborative, and reflective craft that centered the student's holistic well-being. For policy, it underscored the need for structures that protected planning time, supported interprofessional collaboration, and recognized a broader set of indicators for student progress that honored multi-dimensional outcomes. (P8) *The central characters are the learners, their families, the doctor and the therapist and their previews advisors. Their support presents and thorough follow of procedures is what helps the learners do small, big improvements for themselves. (L1 – L13), (P9) The student responses and daily behavior, guide, all decisions, while the family levels of involvement and support strongly influence, consistency, and follow through of interventions. (L9 – L10), when these relationships work collaboratively, student progress becomes steadier and more meaningful (L 17 – L21).* For theory, the narrative enriched phenomenological understandings of professional practice in inclusive education, illustrating how teachers experienced and enacted holistic ideals within real-world constraints, and how such experiences illuminated the moral and practical contours of teaching. This narrative inquiry invited readers to consider planning and implementation not as isolated plot points within a compliance regime but as continuous, woven practices that defined what it means to educate with regard for the whole child. The teachers' voices, rendered with sensitivity and depth, illuminated how holistic IEPs could be conceived and enacted as living, aspirational, and ethically charged endeavors that emerged from the intimate interplay of pedagogical intention, collaborative labor, and a steadfast commitment to inclusive education. This account aimed to contribute to a more nuanced discourse on how schools can honor diversity, cultivate belonging, and sustain the conditions for every learner to thrive.

RQ2 How do school systems and practices influence the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of IEPs as described by SPED teachers?

IGQ6: *Describe a situation in which attempting to align practice with policy creates attention among team members. such as teachers, specialists, families, or administrators. How much of the tension was resolved, and what were the outcomes for students?*

The lived experiences of SPED teachers illuminated a holistic IEP implementation that was profoundly shaped by the interplay of policy, resources, culture, and collaborative practice within contemporary school systems; the preparation phase was governed by policy and regulatory frameworks, resource availability, and professional development (P5). *So this can be resolved: more useful, responsive education. So I remember a period when I had mandatory accommodation called for one-on-one assistance, which was not always available. So, to preserve access to learning, I changed the strategy to use peer support and visual cues. This choice helped the learner engage and make progress. (L9 – L25)* which collectively scaffolded or constrained the design of student-centered goals. These goals were required to address academic, social-emotional, communication, behavior, health, family context, and student agency, while navigated the realities of data demands, multiple service providers, and time pressures; (P7) *Usually, administrators and specialists decide what kinds of adaptations are acceptable, because they are responsible for compliance. When leaders are open and supportive, teachers feel comfortable making small changes that still honor the policy but better fit student needs. (L6 – L20)* the implementation phase translated these holistic aims into classroom realities through adaptive instruction, inclusive practices, and a careful balancing of standardized pacing with individualized progression. This progress foregrounded family engagement, cultural relevance, and ethical considerations in decision-making; monitoring then emerged as a dynamic, (P2) *There was a time when the district required a specific progress-monitoring tool every week, but it didn't match how my students learned. (L1 – L7), chose to follow the rule by submitting the required data, but I also collected my own classroom data that was more useful. (L12 – L17), I made that choice because I wanted to stay compliant, but I also needed information that truly supported my students' learning. (L22 – L28).* iterative loop where progress was tracked through diverse data sources, fidelity checks, and ongoing feedback to families and students. Accountability pressures, systemic constraints, and the demand for rigorous yet flexible measures shaped how progress was interpreted, reported, and used to refine goals and supports; (P4) *There was a time and fallacy emphasized using the inclusive learning resource center from RA11650 to support net learners, but our division did not have one. (L1 – L9), so I had to adapt by creating a small resource-rich corner in my classroom or an area near my classroom where learners could access materials, visuals, and learning resources. (L12 – L20) This choice allowed me to follow the spirit of the policy, providing targeted support while making it realistic and practical for a school setting, ensuring that learners still receive the guidance they need. (L26 – L35).* In this phenomenological portrait, the essence of effective practice lay in the alignment of policy rhetoric with classroom feasibility, protected collaboration time, coherent integration, and robust data systems that supported meaningful family partnerships, culturally sustaining assessment, and responsive adjustments. This alignment transformed IEPs from static documents into living, student-centered pathways that honored the whole child. (P7) *From there are other advocates here, in the building, who interpreted the law, that all learned there, regardless of disability, be put inside the classroom where there is full*

age. While acknowledging the inevitable tensions between mandated structures and professional judgment, the most resilient holistic IEP work emerged (P3). I monitor changes in student performance data, along with the observed engagement and independence in the classroom, to evaluate the effects of my policy-driven adjustments. *Instead of isolating, um, district-mandated accommodation, I reinterpreted it by integrating it into the fabric of everyday education. Over several weeks, the student demonstrated measurable improvements and increased confidence in their ability to use the skill independently. (L1 – L23).* where teachers translated systemic constraints into adaptable, ethical, and collaborative strategies that placed student growth, equity, and dignity at the center of preparation, implementation, and monitoring. (P5) *I usually recognize misalignment between policy and practice when the intended support cannot be realistically implemented in the classroom. For example, the policy recommended using the inclusive learning resource center to provide additional support to SNED learners. (L1 – L15). This signal made it clear that I needed to adapt by creating a classroom-based or source corner and seeking support from parents and colleagues to ensure that the learners still had access to the intended interventions. (L31 – L42), When progress monitoring data and repeated observation reveal that a required accommodation was not raising the learner's engagement. Or performance as anticipated. I identified misalignment. (L14 – L23).*

Theme 3 Resources and Tools

IGQ6 *How do you monitor and interpret progress? Does the wire district IEP go within the classroom setting? Tell a story about how the data you collected led to a modification, in instruction or accommodations, and the resulting student outcome.*

In a District where a holistic IEP operated within the everyday rhythms of a classroom, the researcher learned that progress was not a single number but a living narrative woven from multiple threads: academic growth, social-emotional development, communication, executive functioning, and meaningful participation in classroom life. (P1) *A few weeks after, the students' writing became more structured and complete, and progress monitoring data showed a steady growth toward the goals of the IDP, confirming that the accommodations were effective. (L1 – L13),* Data collection began with a clear purpose: to illuminate what supported or hindered a student's engagement and independence, and to translate those insights into responsive instructional decisions that honored the student's dignity and agency. (P3) *By gathering daily work samples using checklists to evolve performance and observing pupils engage in specific activities. I wonder how well the district is meeting (L1 – L9), I implemented guided reading sessions and the visual cues to scaffold understanding after observing weekly statistics, showing that a student consistently struggled with the independent reading. (L11 – L20).* The researcher selected tools and resources that reflected this holistic aim—curriculum-based measures that aligned with core content, informal observations and anecdotal records that captured quiet moments of strategy use and prompting needs, progress monitoring portfolios that chronicled growth over time, and assistive technologies that removed participation barriers while providing tangible evidence of progress. (P6) *So, for*

example, when data show the students struggling with retail expression, despite accommodation, I modify through instruction, to include sometimes speech-to-text tools or visual support (L8 – L18). We are sometimes the figure, um, during my 1st years of teaching, there was a parent. One of my 1st students. There's a parent who came to me in a mom. (L26 – L32), but by the grace of God. First word, I thank you. So, yeah. So, I'm happy about that now. Thank you, unfortunately. So, see, mother, nice, friendly, push, a big teacher. (L37–L45) They don't know how to say it, especially if the child is not verbal. So that could be, um, uh, a gesture of what she wants to tell you. Maybe it's... Yeah, it's just for that. (L67–75) That's why I want to go. Marching it up. It's really difficult to have a special child in the family. And you don't spend more because he needs it. But, you know, there is a way. Okay, and we need to add more prayers. We need to, you know, through prayers. I will, there's a way. Yeah, there's a will, there's a way. Yeah, you're right. (L131 – L137). Platforms that consolidate data from teachers, specialists, and families created a shared, living dashboard where patterns emerged across contexts and days rather than within a single task.

The researcher examined data from general education lessons, small-group work, and independent tasks across multiple time points to surface consistent patterns. The researcher established baselines early on to chart trajectories, watching not only for steady gains but for variability, plateau phases, and signals of transfer—whether a student applied a strategy learned in one context to another, or chose a strategy independently when confronted with a novel challenge. The researcher attended to the quality of evidence, weighing reliability, validity to the IEP goals, and social validity—whether the measures felt fair and meaningful to the student and their family. This narrative synthesis transformed numbers into a story: where breakthroughs occurred, which supports catalyzed gains, and where ongoing challenges required recalibration. Data then catalyzed a modification cycle that unfolded in near-real time. The classroom became a living laboratory where the participants tested hypotheses about instruction and accommodations, monitored the impact of each adjustment, and recalibrated as needed. When progress stalled or diverged from expected trajectories, the teachers reflected on levers such as instructional strategies, pacing, grouping, and accommodations, and convened with the IEP team—parents, specialists, and general education colleagues—to ensure coherence and sustainability. The modification that emerged is rarely a single fix; it was a constellation of changes designed to amplify authentic participation and sustain momentum. For example, in the case of a middle school student (Student X), the holistic IEP began with reading goals that mapped to fluency and comprehension but revealed through data that engagement and self-monitoring lagged during longer passages. The team deployed a suite of tools: aligned to reading, a graphic organizer to structure summaries, and a literacy app with adjustable difficulty and built-in progress prompts. An observation protocol tracked on-task latency, frequency of strategy use, and the extent of self-checks. After the first term, the data showed modest fluency gains but persistent comprehension monitoring gaps, especially during extended passages. The team interpreted these patterns as a need for frequent, shorter reading cycles, explicit metacognitive instruction, and more frequent, but shorter, checks for

understanding. The researcher adjusted instruction by chunking tasks, embedding prompts to summarize after each segment, and adding a collaborative scaffold that gradually faded as independence grew. A graphic organizer supported close reading, and peer models provided social scaffolding for self-monitoring. The revised plan introduced guided practice within a collaborative framework, with a clear fading path toward independence as the student demonstrated increased on-task engagement, independent use of metacognitive prompts, and evidence of strategy transfer to other subjects. Over the next term, Student X's progress broadened from fluency gains to improved comprehension monitoring in biology and social studies texts, culminating in higher confidence and a stronger sense of ownership over their learning.

This story of data-informed modification yielded a central truth: holistic IEP success rested not on isolated skill gains but on a disciplined, collaborative cycle of data collection, contextual interpretation, strategic instructional refinements, and transparent outcomes reporting. Students and families were integral partners in this process, contributing to progress narratives and co-constructing goals that honored values of autonomy, dignity, and meaningful participation. In interview terms, The researcher defined progress as the alignment of ongoing, multi-source data with holistic goals; The researcher described how formal measure were blended with informal observations to triangulate evidence; The researcher articulated the interpretive steps that revealed patterns across contexts and time; The researcher detailed the concrete instructional and accommodational moves prompted by data, and the researcher illustrated the resulting student outcomes in terms of engagement, independence, and transferable skills. When refining this narrative for specific formats—STAR-method interview, a behavioral interview, or an academic defense—The researcher adapted the emphasis to foreground either the data-analytic methods, the phenomenological lived experience, or the practical classroom impact. Throughout these shifts, the core arc remained preserved: A data-to-decision-to-discipline progress that centered the student as a capable learner within an inclusive, responsive classroom.

RGQ3 How do SPED teachers narrate their actual experiences in carrying out IEPs in their respective schools?

Theme 4: Challenges and Teacher Adaptability

IGQ8 *What relational practices? Examples: regular meetings, shared data tools, go planning, and join professional development. Have you found that the most effective way to implement IEPs across the division comes from? Why did this practice work in your context?*

In many divisions, SPED teachers narrated their lived experiences of implementing IEPs through a tapestry of relational practices that collectively shaped how IEP goals were translated into daily classroom action and broader systemic coherence. Central to these narratives was the regular cadence of meetings and the deliberate design of shared data tools that enabled timely, patient collaboration among general educators, SPED staff, administrators, therapists, families, and, where possible, the students themselves. **(P1)** *In my experience, the most effective relational practices that have been tried are the regular team champions, chair, shared progress monitoring tools, and co-planning time (L1 – L10).* Regular meetings function

as relational hubs: they created predictable spaces for goal alignment, progress checks, and recalibration of instructional strategies in response to student data, while also signaling a shared commitment to student growth that transcended individual classroom boundaries. **(P3)** *I've discovered that the best ways to implement IEPs in diverse classrooms are through regular team meetings, goal planning sessions, and shared digital data tools. Because they promoted a sense of shared ownership among educators and experts. Enabled real-time adjustments based on student success. And uh, ensured consistent communication (L1-L20).* **(P7)** *Okay, I found that regular team meetings, your digital data tools, and co-planning sessions are the most effective relational practices for implementing, ideally (L1 – L8).*

These meetings were most effective when they were structured, outcomes-driven, and rooted in trust—principles that teachers repeatedly described as essential for candid discussion about what was working, what was not, and what needed to change. Shared data tools, including IEP dashboards, progress-monitoring spreadsheets, and transparent communication logs, served as living artifacts that documented stakeholders' agreement on student status, target benchmarks, and the specific accommodations or supports in place. **(P8)** *student center dialogues and family partnership building. It helped me keep up to date on where the learner is in progress and if you are still on track with our IEP goals (L8 – L15).* The relational strength of these tools lay not merely in the data they captured, but in the ways they invited collaboration: data reviews became joint problem-solving sessions rather than evaluative check-ins, and data dissemination was paired with interpretive conversations that honored diverse professional perspectives and family insights. In practice, SPED teachers described a go-planning process—often termed go-to-planning in some districts—that foregrounded proactive anticipation of needs, cross-division coordination, and shared ownership of implementation fidelity. This planning typically unfolded through multi-tiered collaboration involving special and general education teachers, paraprofessionals, related service providers, and, when available, student teams and family members. **(P10)** *We paired those huddles with a simple shared data tool, a one-pager tracker where each adult recorded observations, work samples, or behavior notes (L42 – L49).* Go-planning emphasized anticipatory mapping of IEP goals to weekly instructional plans, resource allocation, scheduling, and differentiation strategies, with explicit roles and timelines that reduced ambiguity and increased accountability. The relational dimension of go-planning was its insistence on transparency, mutual respect, and distributive leadership: teachers described how co-planning sessions cultivated common language around goals, aligned assessment practices, and normalized the integration of supports into general education settings. In this context, inclusive practices were not add-ons but core operational routines. Joining professional development emerged as a consequential practice in many narratives because it situated IEP implementation within a broader ecosystem of knowledge, skills, and professional norms. When SNED teachers participated in professional development—whether district-led, school-based, or cross-district networks—they recounted experiences of learning that are immediately translatable to classroom contexts: new procedures for progress monitoring, updated eligibility

criteria, familiarization with assistive technologies, or evidence-based instructional strategies. **(P6)** *Regular meetings and co-planning sessions were, in my experience, the most attentive, and being attentive, along with shared data tools that keep everyone informed. (L1 – L9)* The relational payoff of professional development lay in the social capital it created: colleagues shared successes, compared notes across classrooms, and collectively interpreted district expectations, which strengthened a sense of shared mission and reduced isolation often felt by teachers tasked with complex, legally bounded responsibilities. Across divisions, teachers frequently identified the practices they perceived as most effective for implementing IEPs as rooted in relational trust and continuous, data-informed collaboration rather than isolated, prescriptive compliance. **(P3)** *I've discovered that the best ways to implement IEPs in diverse classrooms are through regular team meetings, goal planning sessions, and shared digital data tools. Because they promoted a sense of shared ownership among educators and experts. Enabled real-time adjustments based on student success. And uh, ensured, consistent communication, (L1 – L20)* The practices most often highlighted as foundational included: consistent, scheduled, and outcome-focused meetings that brought together an interdisciplinary team; transparent, student-centered data tools that enabled shared interpretation and timely adjustments; proactive go-planning sessions that aligned instructional practice with IEP goals and resources; and ongoing participation in professional development that expanded colleagues' repertoires and fostered a culture of shared accountability. **(P9)** *These practices work because they create consistent communication and ensure that everyone understands the learner's needs. And allow timely adjustments to the strategies (L8–L16).* These relational practices worked well in many contexts because they facilitated a sense of shared responsibility and collective efficacy, reduced the friction that often accompanied complex eligibility criteria and service delivery, and created predictable structures within which teachers can adapt instructional approaches to the diverse needs of students with IEPs. They also enabled schools to move beyond mere compliance to genuine inclusion, as collaboration became the engine that drove flexible delivery models, supported students with varying levels of need, and enabled timely adaptation of goals in response to progress data and changing classroom circumstances. The reasons these practices were effective across divisions often hinged on a combination of (a) explicit communication channels that normalized collaboration; (b) data systems that were accessible, understandable, and actionable for all stakeholders; (c) planning routines that translated high-stakes goals into concrete, day-to-day instructional decisions; and (d) professional development that built shared language, reduced ambiguity, and spread best practices through peer learning. In terms of challenges, teachers frequently described tensions between the ideal of fully integrated, universal design for learning (UDL) in everyday instruction and the realities of resource constraints, time pressures, administrative demands, and diverse student trajectories. Common obstacles included inconsistent meeting attendance due to scheduling conflicts, uneven access to reliable data infrastructure, variability in the fidelity of data collection and interpretation, and the friction that arose when families faced barriers to participation or

when culturally responsive practices were not consistently embedded in planning and communication. Additionally, teachers spoke candidly about the need to balance the legal clarity of IEPs with the pedagogical flexibility required to adapt instruction in real time, which sometimes created ambiguity around who was responsible for decision-making in moments of high variability in student performance. Adaptability emerged as a critical professional posture: teachers described developing adaptive routines that preserved core IEP commitments while allowing for fluid shifts in instructional strategies, grouping configurations, or resource allocations in response to progress data, classroom dynamics, or external constraints. Many educators articulated a cyclic pattern of plan–act–assess–adapt, where the go-planning sessions were revisited periodically to reframe goals, refine accommodations, and reallocate supports in ways that reflect students' evolving needs. **(P2).** *When power is uneven, people stay quiet, and the student often gets fewer supports than they need. If I could tell district leaders one thing, it would be this: Healthy teamwork leads to better student outcomes. (L17 – L28).* **(P3)** *In many cases, I found that IEPs work best when there is fair collaboration and respect for the opinions of all parties involved, including families. General education, teachers, and specialists. In contrast, imbalances of power frequently restrict input, and decrease follow through. Higher students' involvement and uh, my progress is consistently correlated with strong connections. Transparent communication and shared decision making (L1 – L25).* They emphasized the importance of relational resilience—maintaining trust and open dialogue with families and colleagues even when progress stalled or when data indicated slower-than-expected growth. The storytelling embedded in these narratives often centered on specific case examples: a student who benefited from a targeted progress monitoring regime that allowed the team to intensify small-group instruction just-in-time, or a child whose IEP goals shifted from foundational literacy to language-based supports following a mid-year assessment that revealed new communicative needs. In such stories, the relational practices (regular meetings, shared data tools, collaborative planning, and professional development participation) were depicted as the scaffolding that enabled timely and contextually appropriate adaptations, even as the team navigated competing priorities, staffing changes, or shifts in policy. The most compelling narratives from SPED teachers across divisions converged on the view that successful IEP implementation was less about rigid adherence to a fixed set of procedures and more about cultivating durable relational practices that bound educators, families, and students into a cohesive, responsive, and data-informed ecosystem. Regular, well-structured meetings and shared data tools created common ground and shared accountability; go-planning framed daily practice within a purposeful, anticipatory horizon; and ongoing professional development expanded practitioners' repertoires while reinforcing a culture of collaborative problem-solving. These relational practices worked effectively because they make IEP realities legible across settings, translated legal requirements into actionable instructional decisions, and anchored adaptability in a supportive network that prioritized student growth and inclusive learning. However, persistent challenges—time constraints, resource variability, uneven family engagement, and the complexities of cross-

disciplinary collaboration—required ongoing attention. Adaptive approaches that foregrounded trust, clear roles, cultural responsiveness, and iterative cycles of planning and reflection helped divisions sustain progress toward meaningful inclusion and achievement for students with IEPs, even as contexts shifted.

RGQ4 How do SPED teachers make sense of the relationship between district strategies, school systems, and their own IEP practices?

IGQ5 *In the stories of success, what is specific elements? Such as instructional adjustments, data practices, scheduling, resource use, family engagement. Most reliably influence student outcomes. Describe a scene that illustrates this element in action.*

Theme 5: Outcomes, Growth, and Holistic Development

As SPED teachers navigated the complex ecosystem of education, the outcomes, growth, and holistic development of students hinged on a dynamic interplay between district strategies, school systems, and the intimate, iterative practice of Individualized Education Program (IEP) work; within this interconnected web, effective teachers translated district-wide priorities into concrete classroom actions, aligned school-wide structures with individualized supports, and continuously reflected on how each layer shaped student learning and well-being. This approach fostered not only academic progress but also social-emotional resilience, autonomy, and a sense of belonging that extended beyond compliance to true growth. At the district level, strategic visions—often framed around inclusive practices, data-informed decision-making, resource allocation, and accountability metrics—provided the scaffolding that guided school leaders to invest in professional development, specialized staffing, and accessible curricula. Yet, they required interpretation and translation by SPED teachers who understood the lived realities of classrooms, **(P2)** *In the success stories I've seen and experience, the same elements show up again and again: small instructional adjustments, clear data routines, predictable schedules, smart use of support staff, and steady family communication. (L1 – L12), The special education teacher quietly moves beside a student who needs extra decoding support, using a quick scaffold they planned together. (L20 – L27), Everyone is working from the same information, using the same strategy, and supporting the same goal. You can see the student gaining confidence—reading a little smoother, smiling when they finish a passage they used to avoid. (L37 – L49).* including the variability of student needs, the constraints of time and personnel, and the diverse backgrounds of learners; this translation began with a barged synthesis of district mandates with school constraints, where SPED teachers mapped district priorities to feasible, action-oriented plans that could be embedded within school schedules, collaborative processes, and resource management. Through this process, they transformed broad district goals into everyday routines that students experienced as coherent, supportive, and adaptive pathways rather than fragmented, optional add-ons; in practice, **(P3)** *The factors that most consistently affect students results in success stories are instructional modifications, consistent data procedures, carefully scheduling, efficient resource usage, and um, active family involvement (L1 – L12)* this meant examining district expectations around inclusive placement, progress

monitoring, advancement criteria, and equity benchmarks, and then co-creating with school teams a continuum of supports. These supports - tiered interventions, assistive technology, paraprofessional utilization, and streamlined data cycles—ensured students with disabilities had equitable access to instruction that was responsive to their communication, cognitive, linguistic, and sensory profiles. The school system layer further translated district strategy into school-wide structures, norms, and routines, shaping how IEP teams operated, how general education and SPED teachers collaborated, and how families are engaged, with school leadership modeled collaborative planning, allocated time for co-teaching and case management, and established systems for consistent implementation of accommodations, **(P4)** *In stories of success, instructional adjustments, consistent routines for source support, and family engagement, most reliably influenced student outcomes. (L1 – L9), Over time, they showed greater independence, confidence, and engagement, illustrating how meaningful, hands-on activities combined with structured support and stakeholder involvement leads to real growth. (L36 – L37)* modifications, and criteria for progress; here, the IEP practices themselves became a living framework that negotiated between individual student needs and systemic expectations: teachers analyzed baseline data, set measurable annual goals aligned with grade-level standards, and designed present-level-of-performance statements that captured current functioning across academic, social-emotional, and practical domains. They ensured that accommodations, modifications, and specialized instruction were clearly linked to those goals and to the modalities through which students accessed learning, whether through explicit direct instruction, scaffolded supports, or universal design for learning principles integrated within regular classrooms. The holistic development of students emerged when these IEPs were not merely documents to be filed, but dynamic plans that reflected ongoing response to instruction, feedback from students and families, and the shifting contexts of classrooms, communities, and routines. SPED teachers became critical agents in this process by continuously monitoring progress, interpreting data in light of individual trajectories, and adjusting instructional emphases in collaboration with general education teachers, school psychologists, speech-language pathologists, occupational therapists, and related service providers, ensuring that shifts in district or school policy—such as new access targets, updated assessment practices, or revised escalation procedures—are translated into practical, time-bound actions that keep students at the center of learning; when teachers make sense of the relationship between district strategies and their own IEP practices, **(P7)** *Together, these elements are seamless, support system, allowing the learner to follow instruction independently, complete the snack successfully, and gain confidence in life skills. It was a moment where careful planning, collaboration, impair learned support, are all come together to produce intangible growth. (L19 – L36)* several interrelated outcomes unfolded: first, academic gains became more sustainable as instruction was coherently aligned across levels, with district-supported resources enabling schools to implement evidence-based practices, universal design, and targeted supports that directly fed into individualized goals; second, students experienced improved engagement and agency because IEPs were anchored in

meaningful classroom tasks, with supports that scaled from entry points to mastery, and with feedback loops that celebrated incremental progress while clarifying next steps; third, social-emotional development was enhanced as districts emphasized inclusive cultures and equitable access, and school systems operationalized this through collaborative planning, consistent communication with families, and the provisioning of social-emotional curricula and flexible pacing, which together fostered a sense of safety, trust, and belonging for students who often navigated stigma or misunderstanding; **(P9)** *the most reliable elements are clear instructional adjustments, simply daily data tracking, flexible scheduling, and strong family engagement. (L2 – L9), A parent later reinforced the same routine at home using the notebook guidance. creating consistency across settings. (L19 – L25)* Fourth, capacity building at the teacher level expanded professional expertise: SPED teachers refined their ability to interpret district data dashboards, participated in district-wide professional development, and implemented co-teaching models and consultative practices that strengthened general education instruction while maintaining fidelity to individualized supports; Fifth, equity considerations were foregrounded as district strategies explicitly aimed to reduce disparities and close achievement gaps, which prompted school systems to scrutinize eligibility criteria, assessment practices, and resource distribution to ensure fair access to services, timely eligibility determinations, and culturally responsive IEP planning that honored student identities and family perspectives; Sixth, collaborative leadership emerged as a core outcome, with district leaders, school principals, and SPED staff cultivating shared mental models about inclusion and progress measurement, and establishing recurring cycles of data review, problem-solving meetings, and joint planning that aligned policy with practice. Seventh, student transitions across grades and schools became smoother as district-wide transition plans—covering elementary-to-middle-to-high school periods, post-secondary pathways, and community-based supports—were operationalized within school programs, ensuring IEPs adapted to changing academic demands, social environments, and independence goals. Eighth, families became more integrated partners when districts mandated family engagement and schools systematized communication channels, which led to transparent goal-setting, **(P10)** *We adjusted the day's plan by chunking the text, scheduling a brief check in before independent work and send the same visual home for the family to use during homework (L38 – L45)* regular progress reporting, and collaborative decision-making respected family aspirations while aligned with district standards; ninth, evaluation and accountability ecosystems were strengthened as data-informed adjustments occur at multiple levels, with district metrics prompting schools to refine scheduling, staffing, and curriculum alignment, and IEP teams translated those insights into targeted improvements for individual students; finally, holistic development was foregrounded as a unifying aim: the student's growth was not reduced to test scores or compliance measures but understood as a composite of literate participation, communicative competence, adaptive problem-solving, social connectedness, and self-determined learning, with each improvement reinforcing the others and with the IEP serving as a pivot point that integrated academic instruction, functional skills, and adaptive behaviors within meaningful

daily activities.

In this narrative of outcomes, growth, and holistic development, the sense-making process for SPED teachers rested on three interlocking capabilities: interpretation, adaptation, and coalition-building. Interpretation involved translating district strategic intentions into classroom realities; this required teachers to read policy briefs, understand accountability trajectories, and extract actionable implications for curriculum design, scheduling, and resource use, all while maintaining fidelity to each student's unique profile. Adaptation was the ongoing rearrangement of school routines and instructional modalities to ensure that IEP goals were accessible, relevant, and challenging; teachers adjusted accommodations and materials, leveraged assistive technologies, modified assessment approaches, and cultivated inclusive norms within classrooms and across teams, always with an eye toward maintaining student dignity and autonomy. Coalition-building referred to the relational work of aligning diverse stakeholders—students, families, general education teachers, related service providers, school administrators, and district personnel—around a shared vision of inclusive excellence. Effective SPED practitioners facilitated regular, meaningful collaboration, negotiated competing priorities, and created spaces for family input and student voice, thereby reinforcing a culture in which district strategies and school systems became enablers rather than gatekeepers of student potential.

Taken together, the integration of district strategy, school system implementation, and individualized IEP practice yielded a coherent, ethically grounded, and practically feasible approach to educating students with disabilities; it positioned SPED teachers not as mere executors of policy but as central agents of instructional design, assessment interpretation, and stakeholder collaboration. These teachers continuously translated macro-level objectives into micro-level actions that honored each learner's history, strengths, and aspirations; in doing so, they contributed to a learning ecosystem where outcomes were measured not only by attainment of standards but by the extent to which students gained agency, cultivated resilience, built meaningful relationships, and envisioned futures they themselves deemed valuable. This advanced a holistic portrait of development that aligned district ambition, school capability, and personal growth into a unified, dynamic, and humane educational journey.

RQ5: What IEP outcomes do SPED teachers perceive for their learners, and what improvements do they suggest to strengthen IEP implementation?

IGQ8: *How do you balance accountability and shared decision-making within themes? Tell a story about the time when collective responsibility led to a more effective IEB, or when the fusion of responsibility hindered progress.*

Theme 7: Teacher Assessment

The prompt explored what SPED teachers perceived as IEP outcomes for themselves and their students, the improvements they suggested to strengthen IEP implementation, and how to balance accountability with shared decision-making, **(P3)** *Oh, okay. Well, I alternate among classroom observations, like checking in with the students and collaborative discussions with the special education team. The general education teacher, and*

occasionally relevant service providers (L1 – L13), evaluating how the student implements adjustments, throughout instructions, and perfectly discussing with them the progress or issues with your team. (L18 – L21), and gain a deeper understanding of students intellectual, social, and of course, emotional development. (L22 – L25) framed through a narrative of teacher assessment and collective responsibility; it highlighted that well-crafted IEPs clarified student needs and progress, fostered professional collaboration, legitimized advocacy, and aligned assessment with instruction, while benefiting student access, clear benchmarks, and responsiveness to variability, and it noted organizational gains and tensions with general education standards, all of which informed recommended improvements such as SMART goal setting, (P4) A typical IEP process for me begins with gathering data about the student, through interviews, created evaluations, previews, and current work, and classroom observations. After collecting information, I said appropriate goals based on the learner's needs and abilities, then implement these goals during classroom activities and learning sessions. (L1 – L17), reflection and documentation of the students' progress. Um, who are present most of the time are the parents of the learner. And sometimes, if our supervisor is present in school, Family members, guardians, they're very important because their support helps the child succeed. (L19 – L23) structured team collaboration, multi-method progress monitoring, stronger family and student engagement, faithful use of evidence-based interventions, growth-oriented accountability, and systemic alignment; it then discussed balancing accountability (P6) For us, And I get it a rated day, or we just were done with the collaboration of teachers, parents, and if the child is lucky, and can afford therapy, which is not pretty, but we can get a subsidy if they applied for some government offices. (L1 – L11), Our time frame, can we achieve at that, uh, specific time frame and also, uh, desserts died, then, specifically if the students are still including assuring. Also, the practice at school must be at home. to a check for its potential. Sometimes this is our big problem though, because, um, there are parents now. Um, they cannot continue. (L20 – L37) and participation through clearly defined roles, data-driven decision protocols, regular collaborative review cycles, psychological safety, shared governance with family and student voice, and a nuanced approach to autonomy within compliance, illustrated by a narrative of two teachers, Y1 and Y2, where collective responsibility initially advanced progress but also encountered scheduling conflicts and differing priorities, (P7) Meet to discuss the result of the assessment in their plan based assessment resort. Those are the brainstorming of how they do is the ID (L7 – L15) ultimately demonstrating that when governance, data use, and stakeholder input were consistently operationalized, teacher assessment and IEP processes can yielded more equitable, meaningful learning outcomes.

Conclusion

This study offered an in-depth phenomenological account of teachers lived experiences with holistic IEP implementation, illuminating how educators navigated policy mandates, professional identities, student-centered goals, and collaborative practices within real-world classrooms. The data revealed that holistic thinking sat at the core of effective practice, with teachers describing the integration of

academic, social-emotional, communication, and functional goals as inseparable components of student growth rather than discrete targets. Tensions between standardized accountability pressures and the flexible aims of holistic IEPs emerged repeatedly, underscoring the need for policy-to-practice alignment that preserved individualized focus.

Teachers demonstrated adaptive expertise and reflective practice, yet structural constraints such as limited planning time, scarce resources, and variable administrative support often restricted the full realization of holistic approaches. Relationships—especially with families, special and general educators, other specialists, and students—acted as catalysts for designing, monitoring, and adjusting IEPs, highlighting the relational core of meaningful, data-informed practice. The implications for practice called for professional development that foregrounded holistic goal-setting, assessment for learning, and cross-disciplinary collaboration, alongside leadership that provided protected planning time and access to multidisciplinary teams. Policy makers and schools were encouraged to create infrastructures that supported ongoing, co-constructed goal development with family and student input.

The study also reinforced phenomenology as a valuable lens for understanding the nuanced meanings teachers attached to holistic IEP work, contributing to a dual-process view that integrated policy frameworks with situated, human-centered practice. Policies needed to balance clear expectations for holistic IEPs with local flexibility, ensuring accountability did not undermine individualized planning, while resources needed to reflect the demands of holistic work through time for collaboration and iterative refinement. Acknowledging the study's contextual limitations, future research could explore variations across settings and over time, including longitudinal inquiries into how holistic IEP practices influenced student outcomes, teacher well-being, and team dynamics, and intervention studies assessing targeted professional development and policy adjustments. Ultimately, the essence of holistic IEP implementation lay in translating policy ideals into humane, meaningful learning experiences; by foregrounding teachers lived experiences, this study pointed to pathways for educational systems that honored each student's full humanity, potential, and right to a personalized, dignified educational journey.

Implications

The study reinforced phenomenology as a robust approach for unpacking the lived meanings of complex, interdisciplinary educational practices. It suggested a dual-process theoretical orientation that integrated policy-level constructs such as accountability, and standards with situated, human-centered practices like relational dynamics, and professional judgment. This synthesis invited further theoretical development around how holistic goal hybridity—combining academic, social-emotional, communication, and functional domains—emerged in daily practice, and how these domains influenced teacher interpretations of success, moral agency, and professional identity. Future theorizing could articulate models of meaning-making in special/general education collaboration, including the role of reflective practice as a mechanism for translating tacit know-how into shared professional understanding.

The findings illuminated practical pathways to strengthen holistic IEP implementation. Professional development

needed to prioritize explicit training in holistic goal-setting, integrated assessment strategies, and cross-disciplinary collaboration that aligned with teachers' lived realities. Schools were able to foster practice by ensuring protected planning time, access to multidisciplinary teams, and structured opportunities for ongoing data-informed refinement of goals. An emphasis on co-constructive processes with families and students was embedded in daily routines, which enabled iterative adjustments grounded in authentic pupil progress. Practice implications also included designing classroom workflows that normalized holistic documentation, reduced administrative burdens, and supported timely communication of progress across stakeholders.

Policy implications centered on balancing accountability with genuine individualized instruction. Policymakers needed to articulate expectations for holistic IEPs in ways that preserved professional autonomy and local adaptability, while avoiding one-size-fits-all mandates that undermined nuanced goal-setting. Resource allocation had to reflect the real-time demands of holistic planning, including time for collaboration, access to multidisciplinary supports, and mechanisms for ongoing data synthesis. Policies needed to institutionalize family and student engagement as standard components of the IEP cycle, ensuring their voices informed goal development, progress interpretation, and decision-making. Finally, policy frameworks needed to encourage iterative refinement processes and provide clear guidance on documenting and demonstrating holistic progress without penalizing schools for contextual constraints.

Equity considerations, holistic IEP implementation had to attend to heterogeneous learner needs across contexts, ensuring that goal-setting practices were culturally responsive and accessible to diverse families. Equitable supports required targeted resources for schools serving historically under-resourced populations, including staffing models that enabled sustained collaboration.

Teachers' well-being was recognized in the light of the emotional and cognitive load attached to designing and monitoring holistic IEPs. Policies and school cultures needed to promote workload management, peer support structures, and access to mentoring or coaching to sustain teacher well-being and prevent burnout. Leadership and organizational culture: School leaders played a pivotal role in shaping environments that valued collaborative practice, experimentation with goal structures, and continuous improvement. Leadership needed to model reflective practice, allocate time for joint planning, and establish feedback loops that captured frontline insights to inform ongoing policy and practice refinement. Stakeholder engagement: empowered families, students, and community partners as co-designers of the IEP process. Established channels for meaningful participation, transparent communication, and shared decision-making to strengthen the trust, relevance, and effectiveness of holistically conceived goals. Implementation fidelity and evaluation, researchers developed robust, context-sensitive metrics that capture not only short-term outputs but long-term student growth across multiple domains. Employ mixed-methods evaluations to understand how systemic supports, teacher agency, and collaboration networks contributed to the fidelity and impact of holistic IEP practices.

Recommendations

Teachers' Lived Experiences in Holistic IEP Implementation: A Phenomenological Study, focused on practice enhancements such as strengthening professional understanding of holistic IEPs through targeted PD, case-based learning, reflective practice, and peer mentoring; boosting collaboration via structured multidisciplinary planning, regular co-planning, and collaborative coaching; centering student voice and family partnership with accessible self-advocacy, clear communication channels, and culturally responsive materials; aligning assessment and progress monitoring using multiple measures and reporting cycles that reflect real-life transfer; supporting teacher well-being and workload management with planning time, coaching, and streamlined administration; and investing in inclusive design through universal design for learning and scalable holistic IEP templates. Policy recommendations emphasized fidelity standards that integrated academic, social-emotional, communication, and functional goals, funding for planning time and related services, strengthened teacher preparation with phenomenological emphasis, equity and access measures, and robust data privacy practices. Future research needed to deepen phenomenological inquiry across diverse contexts and populations, examine longitudinal impacts and sustainability, investigate organizational barriers and implementation mechanisms, evaluate student-centered outcomes and transitions, advance methodological approaches through qualitative methods and participatory designs, and assess policy impact and scalability across districts of Quezon Province, specifically in Lucena City.

Limitation of the Study

This study, a phenomenological examination of teachers' lived experiences in holistic IEP implementation, was subject to several limitations that constrained the breadth, transferability, and interpretive depth of its conclusions: first, the contextual scope and transferability are limited by the in-depth focus on a particular set of schools and districts, which might not generalize to other geographic regions, school types, or policy environments; second, sample representativeness might have been affected by purposeful, small-to-moderate sampling and potential self-selection bias, whereby participants with particularly salient experiences disproportionately influenced findings; third, the inherently interpretive nature of phenomenological analysis introduced subjectivity tied to researchers' assumptions, coding decisions, and interview prompts, despite safeguards such as bracketing, and member checks; fourth, reliance on self-reported data from interviews and reflections raised concerns about recall bias and social desirability, with limited corroboration from observational data or documents due to access and ethical considerations; fifth, temporal limitations might have restricted insight into evolving practices or policy changes, suggesting that longitudinal designs would have better captured development over time; sixth, variability in what constituted "holistic" goals and integrated services across contexts may challenge cross-case comparisons and synthesis; seventh, access to stakeholders beyond teachers - such as families, administrators, related service providers - was constrained, which limited perspectives on feasibility and fidelity; eighth,

ethical and privacy constraints reduced the granularity of contextual detail regarding sensitive cases, potentially limiting applicability to practice; and ninth, the analytical scope might have underemphasized alternative theoretical lenses like implementation of science, equity frameworks, or critical policy analysis, thereby narrowing the exploration of broader systemic forces beyond individual lived experiences.

6. References

1. Aldas JR, Dela Cruz MP, Santos HA, Villanueva LQ, Ramos KT. Ecological perspectives on IEP implementation in SPED schools in Tacloban City. *Philippine Journal of Special Education*. 2025; 4(1):60-82.
2. Anora HC, Tenerife-Cañete JLL, Pinili LC, Mangubat RC, Espina RC, Calasang VO. Professional development and teaching competencies among SPED teachers: Implications for IEP implementation. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. 2025; 9(9):123-133.
3. Bateman BD, Herr CM. Writing measurable IEP goals and objectives. Attainment Company, 2006.
4. Bayani RT. Challenges in implementing special education programs in selected Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Education*. 2021; 100(2):45-67.
5. Beltran KA, Agripa SA, Bustarga AJO, Cruz KBD, Marmol SL, Morallo SJA. Practices and challenges in implementing inclusive education in Philippine elementary schools. *Journal of Education Research*. 2025; 6(1):8-22. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v6i1.2251>
6. Bronfenbrenner U. The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Harvard University Press, 1979.
7. Clandinin DJ. Engaging in narrative inquiry. Left Coast Press, 2013.
8. Clandinin DJ, Connelly FM. Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research. Jossey-Bass, 2000.
9. Cobb C. Goal setting and the IEP process: A practical guide for special educators. *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 2015; 51(2):95-102. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451215577472>
10. Concepcion RM, Abaya DO, Magaya ADK. Bridging knowledge and practice: Special education teachers' role in Individualized Education Plan development. *Journal of Education, Learning, and Management*. 2025; 2(1):92-99.
11. Connelly FM, Clandinin DJ. Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*. 1990; 19(5):2-14. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X019005002>
12. Creswell JW. Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (3rd ed.). SAGE, 2013.
13. Dayso RP, Borneo CA, Ramos LG. School-level implementation of inclusive education policies in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2025; 3(1):15-32.
14. Department of Education. Institutionalization of SPED programs in the Department of Education (DepEd Order No. 26, s. 1997). Department of Education, 1997.
15. Department of Education. Inclusive education as a strategy for increasing the participation rate of children (DepEd Order No. 72, s. 2009). Department of Education, 2009.
16. Donaire MA, Santos JP, Uy RC. Effectiveness of Individualized Education Plans in enhancing educational outcomes for students with disabilities. *Asian Journal of Inclusive Education*. 2024; 12(2):55-71.
17. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. Inclusive education in Europe: Developments and challenges. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2021.
18. Friend M, Bursuck WD. Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers (8th ed.). Pearson, 2019.
19. Fullan M. The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.). Teachers College Press, 2007.
20. Fullan M. The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact. Jossey-Bass, 2014.
21. Fullan M, Quinn J. Coherence: The right drivers in action for schools, districts, and systems. Corwin, 2016.
22. Gabutan MR, Lopez PJ, Dela Cruz FM. Teachers' and parents' perspectives on standardized IEPs in Cebu City public schools. *Journal of Special Needs Education*. 2025; 9(1):41-58.
23. Gregory AK. An inquiry into teachers' storied experiences with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for elementary students with intellectual disability (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto), 2015.
24. Hargreaves A, Fullan M. Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school. Teachers College Press, 2012.
25. Hattie J. Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge, 2009.
26. Jala CL. A narrative inquiry of special needs education teachers in educating learners with special educational needs and disabilities. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*. 2025; 3(7):1-18.
27. Karaan FP Jr, A HC, JJ T-C, P LC, M RC, E RC, *et al.* Awareness and preparedness of teachers on the Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) for special education learners within inclusive settings. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. 2025; 9(11):900-910.
28. Kurth JA, Mastergeorge AM. Individual education plan goals and services for adolescents with autism: Impact of age and educational setting. *The Journal of Special Education*. 2010; 44(3):146-160. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466908329825>
29. Lincoln YS, Guba EG. Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE, 1985.
30. Manalaysay MC. Implementation of individualized education programs in selected Philippine public schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*. 2020; 8(3):35-45.
31. Mangongon FAA. Challenges encountered by special educators: Inputs for improving the Individualized Education Program. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*. 2023; 2(1):136-150. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v2i1.25>
32. McLaughlin MJ, Nolet V. What every principal needs to know about special education (2nd ed.). Corwin Press, 2004.

33. Obcial M, Tangaja G, Senobio J, Trencio A, Sitoy R. Evaluating the implementation of inclusive education policies for learners with disabilities in elementary schools. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. 2025; 45(10):1238-1256. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.451006>
34. Odom SL, Brantlinger E, Gersten R, Horner RH, Thompson B, Harris KR. Research in special education: Scientific methods and evidence-based practices. *Exceptional Children*. 2005; 71(2):137-148. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290507100201>
35. Osher D, Kidron Y, Brackett M, Dymnicki A, Jones S, Weissberg RP. Advancing the science and practice of social and emotional learning: Looking back and moving forward. *Review of Research in Education*. 2012; 36(1):1-27. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X11427739>
36. Pimentel DR. Implementation of individualized education plans in Philippine schools: Issues and prospects. *Philippine Social Science Journal*. 2019; 2(1):60-70.
37. Republic Act No. 7277. An Act providing for the rehabilitation, self-development and self-reliance of disabled persons and their integration into the mainstream of society and for other purposes (Magna Carta for Persons with Disability), 1992.
38. Republic Act No. 9442. An Act amending Republic Act No. 7277, otherwise known as the Magna Carta for disabled persons, and for other purposes, 2007.
39. Republic Act No. 10533. An Act enhancing the Philippine basic education system by strengthening its curriculum and increasing the number of years for basic education (Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013), 2013.
40. Republic Act No. 11650. An Act instituting a policy of inclusion and services for learners with disabilities in support of inclusive education (Inclusive Education Act for Learners with Disabilities), 2022.
41. Shogren KA, Garnier-Villarreal M, Dowsett C, Little TD. Exploring student, family, and school predictors of self-determination using NLTS2 data. *Remedial and Special Education*. 2017; 38(3):145-155. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932516666535>
42. Turnbull A, Turnbull R, Wehmeyer ML, Shogren KA. *Exceptional lives: Special education in today's schools* (8th ed.). Pearson, 2015.
43. UNESCO. The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. UNESCO, 1994.
44. United Nations. *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. United Nations, 2006.
45. Velasco ML, Reyes ZR. Issues and concerns in implementing individualized education programs in public schools. *Philippine Journal of Education*. 2018; 99(1):23-32.
46. Weick KE. *Sensemaking in organizations*. SAGE, 1995.