# Participation of Students with Disabilities in the Development of Individual Education Plan

Elvira I. Rajšli-Tokoš
School for Primary and Secondary Education "Bratstvo",
Bečej, Serbia

**Article Information***

Research Article ● UDC: 37.016-053.5-056.26/.36
Volume: 20, Issue: 2, pages: 39–60
Received: May 14, 2023 ● Revised: June 19, 2023
Accepted: June 22, 2023
https://doi.org/10.51738/Kpolisa2023.20.2r.39rt

**Author Note**

Elvira I. Rajšli-Tokoš https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2704-0187
I have no known conflict of interest to disclose.
Corresponding author: Elvira I. Rajšli-Tokoš
E-mail: rajslitokoselvira@gmail.com

*Cite (APA):
Rajšli-Tokoš, E. I. (2023). Participation of students with disabilities in the development of Individual education plan. *Kultura polisa*, *20*(2), 39–60. https://doi.org/10.51738/Kpolisa2023.20.2r.39rt

Kultura polisa
20(2), 39–60

**Abstract**

The usefulness of individual education plans (IEP) is undeniable for students, parents and teachers/special education teachers. In addition to development (team cooperation), and implementation, the participation of students with disabilities and developmental disorders is essential. According to modern literature, only the participation of students and self-directed IEP meetings provide various benefits (development of self-evaluation skills, self-advocacy, and probability of motivation to achieve the goals planned in the IEP, etc.). The aim of the paper is to examine teachers and special education teachers about the participation and role of students in the first meeting of the IEP team. Additionally, to determine the differences in relation to the experience of working with students with developmental disorders and the educational profile of experts. This research included 131 respondents (94 teachers and 37 special education teachers) from various regular and special secondary schools. The research was conducted online through "Google Forms", the data was collected through the questionnaire IEP Implementation Rating Scale – IEP IRS without the influence of the examiner. Based on the results, we concluded that students are often absent from the first IEP meeting, while teachers/special education teachers and parents are present. In this research, experience in working with students with developmental disorders was not significantly associated with student participation. However, differences in the educational profile are noted, special education teachers have a leading role and the participation of students with disabilities and disorders in development is modest.

*Keywords*: Individual educational plan, high school, teacher, special education teacher, student participation

Kultura polisa
20(2), 39–60

## Participation of Students with Disabilities in the Development of Individual Education Plan

The schooling of children with disabilities and developmental disorders has had different forms throughout history. First, there was the segregation (separation of students from their peers) and institutionalization (as a form of residence of students with developmental disabilities), after which there was integration (integration of students in the peer group, where peers also have developmental disabilities), and today all children are educated according to an inclusive model, a model "accessible for all". The role of special education teachers has changed throughout history. They used to have a leading role in the education and upbringing of students with disabilities and disorders in development. With the appearance of inclusion, teamwork was put into focus, teamwork with various experts, family members, and the very students with disabilities. The introduction of inclusion in the education system of the Republic of Serbia has resulted in innovations that teachers and special education teachers have been applying in the regular and special education system for more than a decade. One of those novelties is the introduction of the Individual Educational Plan (IEP), an official document of the institution, which corresponds to the needs of students, and for the purpose of including students with developmental disabilities in the peer group, educational achievements, optimal development, etc. The creation of such plans is not simple, although the Law defines the procedure for its creation (*Rulebook on detailed instructions for determining the right to an individual education plan, its application and evaluation*), including guidelines that help and guide experts. Authors Ilić-Stošović, Nikolić, and Maksić (2014) point out that the legislative basis is not precise enough, that there is no clearly developed methodology for creating the IEP, which not only confuses teachers, but also special education teachers and leads to various dilemmas. By reviewing the literature in the field of inclusive education, we come across the author's conclusions that inclusion has partially taken root in our country, including the implementation of IEP (Ilić-Stošović & Nikolić, 2013; Marković, 2017;

Matić, 2021; Stančić & Petrović, 2013). The authors cite various challenges, including: insufficient equipment in schools (funds and premises), insufficient readiness of the environment, non-acceptance of peers, low social status of students with developmental disabilities, prejudices and insufficient training of teaching staff, and modest cooperation of parents and teachers/special education teachers.

The changes that inclusion required were gradual (such as the creation of IEPs or the ability for education in traditional schools, at the parent's request), first for students of lower grades, later for students of higher grades of elementary school, and today the changes are more and more present among secondary school students as well. The teaching staff (special education teachers and teachers) together with parents and other professional associates created IEP and/or adapted the school program.

One of the ways to overcome the previously mentioned challenges, with a focus on the development and implementation of the IEP, refers to a successful first meeting of the IEP team members. According to the current regulations, the IEP team in secondary school consists of the homeroom teacher, subject teacher, expert associate, parent, personal assistant and, at the suggestion of the parents, an additional expert who is not employed at the institution and knows the student well (Narodna skupština Republike Srbije). At the first meeting of the IEP team, important parts are drawn up (e.g. the child's pedagogical profile), assistive technologies are determined, and goals and outcomes are set that will be achieved within the stipulated time frame. Each member of the IEP team has an important role to play in the first meeting. The student expresses their wishes, opinions, and suggestions, demonstrates achievements, highlights their own strengths, and identifies challenges; parents provide significant information about the student regarding daily functioning, while the teacher/special education teachers can provide the necessary information (available assistive technologies, learning strategies, possible ways of adaptation, etc.) and encourage the participation of all members, with the aim of creating and implementing the IEP at the highest quality.

At the first meeting, mutual cooperation between teachers/

special education teachers, parents and students, as well as other professional associates is required in order to achieve the main goal of creating the IEP, which is a reflection of what the child knows and can do, with clearly defined additional support needed in order for the student to reach their maximum. Dealing with the literature related to conducting a successful first IEP meeting, the authors Petrović, Pešović and Maćešić-Petrović (2016) conclude that there are three types of papers: papers that focus on teachers, then on students, and papers that propose strategies for implementing IEP management meetings by students.

With active participation at the first IEP meeting, the student develops skills of self-advocacy, self-respect, and self-evaluation and acquires a positive self-image. The skill of self-advocacy is a crucial skill and of utmost importance in higher grades of primary school, and its development is needed for a person's daily functioning. A great number of authors emphasize the importance of self-advocacy during the first IEP meeting (Cooper, 2019; Mitchell, Morning & Panter, 2019; Sanderson & Goldman, 2020; Schena, Rosales & Rowe, 2022). The active participation of students ensures the ability for the student to express their opinion, and preferences or to suggest goals that can contribute to the final creation of the IEP.

Research on the participation of students at first IEP meetings is scarce, especially in our region where there is no such research, which is especially important in secondary schools when the students are nearing the end of their education, or are being prepared to enroll in higher education institutions. Considering that the teaching staff (special education teacher or the teacher) has an important role in decision-making and directing the course of the first meeting of the IEP team, it is important to examine the importance and contribution of the students with disabilities and developmental disorders.

## Materials and Methods

### *Research Goal*

Examination of teachers and special education teachers about

the participation and role of students in the first IEP team meetings, as well as determining the differences in answers in relation to the experience of working with students with disabilities and developmental disorders and the educational profile of experts.

### *Sample*

The research sample consisted of 94 teachers (71.8%) and 37 special education teachers (28.2%). At the time of questioning, the respondents were partly employed in regular secondary schools, and partly in special secondary schools.

Out of the total number of teachers, 68 teach in a regular secondary school (73.1%) while 25 teachers teach in a special secondary school (26.9%), and one teacher did not express himself. Out of the total number of special education teachers, 4 work in a regular secondary school (10.8%), 33 work in a special secondary school (89.2%), and one special education teacher did not say where he works.

The focus of the research were teachers and special education teachers of secondary schools who work with students with developmental disabilities. Table 1 shows respondents based on their experience in working with students with disabilities and developmental disorders and according to their educational profile.

### *Data Collection*

The research was conducted in the period from March 30th, 2022 until June 1st, 2022. years. The respondents filled out the questionnaires independently, without the influence of the researcher, in the form of a questionnaire (*Google Forms*). The link to access the questionnaires was posted in various *Facebook* groups of teachers of regular and special secondary schools on the territory of AP Vojvodina.

The data was obtained from the teachers of the following regular secondary schools: Medical School "7. April"; Secondary school "Lukjan Mušicki"; Technical school, Mileva Marić – Anštajn; "Pinky" Traffic School; "Ivan Sačir" Technical School; Gymnasium

"Svetozar Marković"; Agricultural school with student dormitory Futog; Gymnasium and Vocational School "Svetozar Miletić"; Gymnasium "Svetozar Marković"; "Jovan Trajković" School of Economics and Trade; Secondary Agricultural School Zrenjanin; "Nikola Tesla" Electrical Engineering and Civil Engineering School; "Nikola Tesla" Gymnasium and Vocational School; Technical school with dormitory Apatin; Kikinda Technical School; Secondary School "E-GYMNASIUM" and Secondary Vocational School "Miloš Crnjanski".

Data was obtained from special education teachers of the following special secondary schools or special departments in regular schools: School for Elementary and Secondary Education "Jelena Varjaški"; Special Primary and Secondary School "Dr. Svetomir Bojanin"; School Center with students' dormitory "Dositej Obradović"; School for Primary and Secondary Education with the home "Vuk Karadžić"; Gymnasium "Veljko Petrović"; School for Primary and Secondary Education "Brotherhood" and Vocational High School "4. July".

It is important to note that all respondents had experience in working with students with developmental disabilities and were creating IEPs.

### *Assessment Instruments*

The following questionnaires were used in this research:

- *A general questionnaire*, which was constructed for the purpose of collecting general social-demographic data (gender, age, vocational education, type of school where the respondent is employed, type of disability or disorders that the respondent most often encounters at work, experience in working with students with disabilities in development, involvement in the work of the IEP team).
- *IEP Implementation Rating Scale (IEP IRS)*, by Myara, N. (2017). This instrument has 27 items, the items are divided into 6 subscales (First meeting of IEP for students – 9 items; Implementation of IEP for students – 2 items; First meeting

of IEP for parents – 5 items; Implementation of IEP for parents – 3 items; First meeting of IEP for teachers – 5 items; and Implementation of IEP for teachers – 3 items). The instrument is intended to examine the presence and participation of students, parents and teachers at the first meetings related to the preparation of the IEP. Each claim is analyzed in relation to the number of attendances and fulfillment of the observed roles for each member of the IEP team during the meeting. The reliability of the Scale based on the Krombach α coefficient is 0.892, indicating that the measuring instrument has good reliability.

### *Statistical data processing*

Statistical data processing and analysis were performed using IBM SPSS software (Statistical Package of Social Science), version 25. Descriptive statistics were used in the paper to describe the sample. One-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to examine statistically significant differences for scores obtained on the *IEP Implementation Rating Scale* in relation to experience working with children with disabilities and developmental disorders. The t-test of independent samples was applied to examine the statistically significant difference in the scores obtained on the *IEP Implementation Rating Scale* in relation to the professional education profile of the respondents.

## Results

Table 2 shows the middle values (ranging from 0.34 to 0.64) for the overall Scale *for assessing the degree of IEP implementation and its subscales*.

The obtained results indicate that teachers/special education teachers most often attend the first IEP meeting (M=2.59, SD=0.45) and IEP implementation (M=1.86, SD=0.42), while students participate the least in the first IEP meeting (M =1.30, SD=0.42) and in the implementation of IEP (1.31, SD=0.34).

Based on the obtained results, it was observed that teachers are almost always present at the first IEP meeting (M = 2.83, SD = 0.43), that the teacher identifies and prioritizes the needs of students at the first IEP meeting (M = 2.64, SD = 0.58), that the teacher identifies one or more goals and outcomes at the first IEP meeting (M = 2.64, SD = 0.56), and that parents/guardians very often participate in the first IEP meeting (M = 2.40, SD = 0.75). While the respondents achieved the lowest results on the items for statements related to students, i.e. that students revise their IEP (M = 1.16, SD = 0.36), that the student proposes his own goals and outcomes at the first IEP meeting (M = 1.18, SD = 0.42 ) and that the student introduces himself, prepares and presents examples of his work at the first IEP meeting (M = 1.19, SD = 0.41).

When it comes to the attendance of students with disabilities and developmental disorders at the first IEP meeting, in this research the answer from 71 participants (53.4%) (teachers/special education teachers) that the student never attends the first meeting, from 51 participants (38.3%) that the student sometimes attends the meeting, while 11 participants (8.3%) said that the student is always present at the first IEP meeting.

As part of this research, it was investigated whether there are statistically significant differences for the subscales of the *IEP Implementation Rating Scale* in relation to the experience of working with students with disabilities and developmental disorders. One-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the difference.

The only statistically significant difference was found between the scores and it is shown in Tabel 5. Based on the results shown in Table 4, it can be concluded that the level of significance of the ANOVA test is lower than the observed level for the subscale Student participation – IEP implementation (F=4.216, p=0.001), and that there is a statistically significant difference in relation to experience in working with students with developmental disabilities. A *post-hoc* test was applied to determine which individual groups had a statistically significant difference. The obtained results showed that there is a difference between respondents who have experience

working with children in the period from 5 to 10 years compared to respondents with experience from 16 to 20 years, that is, from 21 to 25 years. Respondents who have shorter experience in working with students with disabilities and developmental disorders achieved a lower score on the Student Participation subscale implementation of IEP.

The level of significance of the ANOVA test is higher than the observed level for the first meeting of the IEP for students (F=1.752, p=0.128), the first meeting of the IEP for parents (F=0.527, p=0.755), the implementation of the IEP for parents (F=0.651, p=0.661), the first meeting of the IEP for teachers (F=0.419, p=0.835) and the implementation of the IEP for teachers (F=1.281, p=0.276), on the basis of which we conclude that there is no statistically significant difference in relation to work experience.

The following text shows the results obtained on the subscales of the *IEP Implementation Rating Scale* in relation to the educational profile of the experts involved in the IEP team (teacher/special education teachers). An independent samples t-test was used to test the difference in relation to the preparations. Table 5 shows the obtained results.

The obtained results indicate that the significance level of the t-test is lower than the observed statistical significance on the two subscales, which leads to the conclusion that there is a statistically significant difference between the *First Meeting of the IEP for students* and the *First Meeting of the IEP for teachers* in relation to the educational profile expert. Special education teachers achieved a higher degree of agreement on the subscale *First meeting of the IEP for teachers (special education teachers)*, but also a lower degree of agreement on the score on the subscale *First meeting of the IEP for students*. The significance level of the t-test is higher than the observed statistical level, which leads to the conclusion that there is no statistically significant difference in the other observed subscales in relation to the professional education profile.

## Discussion

Based on the obtained descriptive data, we see that special

education teachers and teachers are always present, the presence of parents in planning is also recorded, and unfortunately, in most cases, students are not even present at the first IEP meeting, and we recorded a very small percentage of students with disabilities and developmental disorders who are always present at the first IEP meeting.

A lower degree of student participation in the first meeting of the IEP team was also found in the results of other researchers. Authors Sanderson & Goldman (2021) state that only a third of students are physically present at the first IEP meeting, but that the IEP is created based on student characteristics and cooperation between parents and experts. Based on the presented results, it can be seen that the equal involvement of all participants of the IEP team is a challenge that is most often present in practice.

Authors Martin, Van Dycke, Greene et al. (2006) report that students themselves spoke only 3% of the time during the IEP meeting, and special education teachers 51%. According to these authors, 20% of students with developmental disabilities mentioned their strengths and weaknesses, and 27.1% participated in the development of goals.

Furthermore, the authors Dorokin, Martin and Greene (2020) point out that IEP meetings do not provide opportunities for students to participate, because the structure of the IEP meeting is led by experts, and the interactive component of IEP was not observed by these researchers because they state that the purpose is to complete IEP documentation, although students with disabilities were physically present during the IEP meeting. This information is cited as bad news because the United States laws such as IDEA (*Individuals with Disabilities Education Act)* provide for cooperation during the first IEP meeting.

Authors Davis and Comming (2019) published an interesting paper that noted the poor achievement of students with behavioral and emotional disorders after secondary school graduation. The authors explain the reason for such results is the fact that the plans foreseen for these students did not provide positive outcomes for the students'

own daily lives later on. It is especially important for these students to take a leading role in planning their own education, choosing goals for the future, and achieving those goals. Conducting your own IEP meeting can provide an opportunity for self-advocacy and self-esteem, which, according to contemporary literature, are important skills in an individual's life.

Differences in relation to experience in working with students with disabilities and developmental disorders were not found in the majority of subscales, which is a surprising result. The only statistically significant difference was obtained on the subscale *Implementation of IEP for the student*. Nevertheless, by analyzing the results, it can be seen that with the growth of experience in working with students with developmental disabilities, the involvement of students in the process of creating IEP also increases.

This data is supported by various researchers. Authors Kosko and Wilkis (2009) found that the educational profile of experts has a greater influence than experience in working with students with disabilities and developmental disorders. While Author Roll-Pettersoon (2008) reports that the same experience is not the only, nor the most significant way how teachers and special education teachers acquire and improve work skills and IEP planning for students with disabilities and developmental disorders.

A possible explanation for the results obtained in this way is that experience cannot be the only decisive factor. Educational profile and many other factors such as additional education, professional development, teamwork, etc. must be taken into account.

Based on the obtained results, we can conclude that there are statistically significant differences when looking at the educational profile in relation to student participation in the IEP meeting. Special education teachers achieved a higher degree of agreement on the subscale *First meeting of the IEP for teachers (special education teachers)*, but also a lower degree of agreement on the score on the subscale *First meeting of the IEP for students*. The data shows that special education teachers play a leading role and that students with disabilities and developmental disorders in most cases are not even present at

the first IEP meeting.

The results of research conducted in Norway (Hartveit, 2022) support the results obtained in this study, where a limitation in communication between experts (special education teachers) and students with disabilities and developmental disorders was found. As the main reasons, the authors cite difficulties such as the fast speaking of experts, the use of professional jargon, asking questions aimed at parents instead of students, as well as the expert's attitude that the parent knows the child better than the child himself. In addition, students' dissatisfaction with the introduction of various topics in the first IEP meeting additionally affects the quality and implementation of IEP.

The authors AL-Shammari and Garry (2020), examining the knowledge and experience of teachers/special education teachers in the development and implementation of IEP in regular schools in Kuwait, state that special education teachers and teachers need intensive and comprehensive education in order to be able to successfully implement IEP in practice and to increase the involvement of students, regardless of their educational profile. The results of their research showed that there are experts who believe that they can face the challenges, especially teachers of mathematics, Arabic language and Islamic teaching, who received additional education and proved to be extremely successful in the implementation of IEP, in contrast to teachers who believe that they do not have enough knowledge and do not feel competent to create and implement IEP. The results they achieved are in support of that.

Authors Rashid & Wong (2023) stated in their literature review that teachers and special education teachers most often face challenges: assessment process and knowledge of criterion tests, which lead to difficulty in measuring student achievement and IEP success.

Based on the above, we see the dominant influence of experts (special education teachers) which is not only present in our country but in other countries as well. Teamwork is the base element of inclusive education and it represents the foundation on which are based numerous decisions during the education of students with developmental disabilities.

On the other hand, according to Kozikoglu (2021), teachers believe that they do not have sufficient knowledge, and they have difficulties in determining the goals and activities within the IEP development. The IEP team's challenges in sharing responsibilities among members proved to be statistically significant in the mentioned research.

## Conclusion

Limitations of this study relate primarily to the sample size and the uneven ratio of teachers and special education teachers.

The first conclusion is that at the first IEP meeting, teachers and special education teachers are present, the presence of parents is also noted, while students with disabilities and developmental disorders are occasionally or not even present at all.

The second conclusion is that the experience of working with students with disabilities and developmental disorders does not affect the participation of students with disabilities and developmental disorders during the first IEP meeting.

The third conclusion based on the obtained results is that there are differences in the participation of students at the first IEP meeting and the educational profile of experts. Special education teachers take a leading role during the first IEP meeting (planning and identifying needs and goals, highlighting the strengths of students with developmental disabilities).

The literature dealing with this topic is really modest, therefore systematization of existing knowledge is needed, as well as further examination of various contextual factors that could be important for the participation of students with disabilities and developmental disorders during the first IEP meeting.

The recommendation is the education of teachers and special education teachers about the importance of cooperation among the members of the IEP development team, as well as the provision of additional support to students with developmental disabilities to independently conduct the IEP meeting.

## References

Al-Shammari, Z., & Hornby, G. (2020). Special education teachers' knowledge and experience of IEPs in the education of students with special educational needs. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *67*(2), 167–181.

Cooper, S. (2019). *Student involvement in IEP meetings in British Columbia (T)*. University of British Columbia.

Davis, M. T., & Cumming, I. K. (2019). Planning and implementing student-led IEPs for students with EBD. *Beyond Behavior*, *28*(2), 90–98.

Doronkin, J. L., Martin, J. E., Greene, B. A., Choiseul-Praslin, B., & Autry-Schreffler, F. (2020). Opening Oz's curtain: who's really running the annual IEP meeting to discuss secondary transition issues?. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *20*(3), 206–216.

Hartveit Lie, J. (2022). Student participation in dialogue in individual subject curriculum meetings: students' and parents' perceptions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *26*(9), 913–926.

Ilić-Stošović, D., & Nikolić, S. (2013). Identifikacija teškoća u izradi Individualnih obrazovnih planova. *Tematski zbornik radova-„Novine u specijalnoj edukaciji i rehabilitaciji ", Beograd, Srbija, 2013*, 139–156.

Ilić-Stošović, D., Nikolić, S., & Maksić, J. (2014). Izrada individualnih obrazovnih planova: da li nam je zakon razumljiv. *Zbornik radova-8. Međunarodni naučni skup "Specijalna edukacija i rehabilitacija danas", Beograd, Srbija, 7–9.11.2014*, 277–283.

Kosko, K. W., & Wilkins, J. L. (2009). General Educators' In-Service Training and Their Self-Perceived Ability to Adapt Instruction for Students with IEPs. *Professional Educator*, *33*(2), n2.

Kozikoğlu, İ., & Albayrak, E. N. (2021). Teachers' attitudes and the challenges they experience concerning individualized education program (IEP): A mixed method study. *Participatory Educational Research*, *9*(1), 98–115.

Marković, M. (2017). Mogućnosti ostvarivanja inkluzije u školskom kontekstu. *Possibilities of achieving inclusion in the school system], Godišnjak za pedagogiju*, *2*(1), 51–62.,

Martin, J. E., Van Dycke, J. L., Christensen, W. R., Greene, B. A., Gardner, J. E., & Lovett, D. L. (2006). Increasing student participation in IEP meetings: Establishing the self-directed IEP as an evidenced-based practice. *Exceptional Children*, *72*(3), 299–316.

Matić, I. D. (2021). Individualni obrazovni plan-izazovi realizacije. *Pedagoška stvarnost*, *67*(2), 186–201.

Mitchell, V. J., Moening, J. H., & Panter, B. R. (2019). Student-led IEP meetings: Developing student leaders. *JADARA*, *42*(4), 8.

Narodna skupština Republike Srbije. 2018. Pravilnik o bližim uputstvima za utvrđivanje prava na individualni obrazovni plan, njegovu primenu i vrednovanje [Rulebook on detailed instructions for determining the right to an individual education plan, its application and evaluation]. (Službeni glasnik RS, br. 74/2018).

Pantović, A., Pešović, J., & Maćešić-Petrović, D. (2016). Značaj i uloga učenika u IOP sastanku. *Zbornik radova-Nacionalni naučni skup, "Socijalna inkluzija dece sa razvojnim smetnjama i problemima u ponašanju", Beograd, 6. decembar 2016*, 51–59.

Rashid, S. M. M., & Wong, M. T. (2023). Challenges of implementing the individualized education plan (IEP) for special needs children with learning disabilities: Systematic literature review (SLR). *IJLTER. ORG*, *22*(1), 15–34.

Roll-Pettersson, L. (2008). Teacher's perceived efficacy and the inclusion of a pupil with dyslexia or mild mental retardation: Findings from Sweden. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 174–185.

Sanderson, K. A., & Goldman, S. E. (2022). Understanding the characteristics and predictors of student involvement in IEP meetings. *The Journal of Special Education*, *56*(1), 3–13.

Sanderson, K. A., & Goldman, S. E. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions used to increase adolescent IEP meeting participation. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals*, *43*(3), 157–168.

Schena, D., Rosales, R., & Rowe, E. (2022). Teaching self-advocacy skills: A review and call for research. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 1–49.

Stančić, M., & Petrović, Z. S. (2013). Mišljenje vaspitača o koristima od inkluzije i načinima njenog ostvarivanja. *Specijalna edukacija i rehabilitacija*, *12*(3).

# Appendix

## Table 1

*Number of teachers and special education teachers in relation to the experience of working with children with disabilities*

| | | Teachers | Special Education Teachers | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1-4 years** | *f* | 24 | 9 | 33 |
| | % | 72.7 | 27.3 | 100 |
| **5-10 years** | *f* | 27 | 8 | 35 |
| | % | 77.1 | 22.9 | 100 |
| **11-15 years** | *f* | 16 | 3 | 19 |
| | % | 84.2 | 15.8 | 100 |
| **16-20 years** | *f* | 11 | 5 | 16 |
| | % | 68.8 | 31.3 | 100 |
| **21-25 years** | *f* | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| | % | 64.7 | 35.3 | 100 |
| **More than 26 years** | *f* | 5 | 6 | 11 |
| | % | 45.5 | 54.5 | 100 |
| **Total** | *f* | 94 | 37 | 131 |
| | % | 71.8 | 28.2 | 100 |

*Note.* Results of the author's research.

**Table 2**

*Descriptive indicators of the scale for assessing the degree of IEP implementation*

| | M | SD |
|---|---|---|
| **First IEP meeting for students** | 1.30 | 0.42 |
| **Implementation of IEP for students** | 1.31 | 0.34 |
| **First IEP meeting for parents** | 2.01 | 0.64 |
| **Implementation of IEP for parents** | 1.60 | 0.36 |
| **First IEP meeting for teachers** | 2.59 | 0.45 |
| **Implementation of IEP for teachers** | 1.86 | 0.41 |
| **Total score** | 1.76 | 0.29 |

*Note.* Results of the author's research.

**Table 3**

*Differences in scores on the subscale of the First Meeting at the IEP for students in relation to the experience of working with students with developmental disabilities*

| | Middle Value | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1-4 years (N=33)** | 1.40 ± 0.42 | 1.752 | 0.128 |
| **5-10 years (N=35)** | 1.15 ± 0.29 | | |
| **11-15 years (N=19)** | 1.38 ± 0.44 | | |
| **16-20 years (N=16)** | 1.40 ± 0.49 | | |
| **21-25 years (N=17)** | 1.32 ± 0.51 | | |
| **More than 26 years (N=11)** | 1.18 ± 0.35 | | |

*Note.* Results of the author's research.

**Table 4**

*Differences in scores on the subscale Implementation of IEP for students in relation to experience in working with students with developmental disabilities*

| | Middle Value | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1-4 years (N=33)** | 1.34 ± 0.36 | 4.216 | 0.001* |
| **5-10 years (N=35)** | 1.14 ± 0.25 | | |
| **11-15 years (N=19)** | 1.39 ± 0.39 | | |
| **16-20 years (N=16)** | 1.46 ± 0.34 | | |
| **21-25 years (N=17)** | 1.47 ± 0.27 | | |
| **More than 26 years (N=11)** | 1.18 ±0.25 | | |

*Note.* Results of the author's research.

**Table 5**

*Differences in the scores of the subscales of the IEP Implementation Rating Scale in relation to the educational profile (teacher/special education teachers)*

| | Teacher (N=94) | Special education Teacher (N=37) | T | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Middle Value | | | |
| **First IEP meeting for students** | 1.37 ± 0.44 | 1.12 ± 0.29 | 3.686 | <0.005* |
| **Implementation of IEP for students** | 1.32 ± 0.35 | 1.29 ± 0.29 | 0.409 | 0.683 |
| **First IEP meeting for parents** | 1.98 ± 0.64 | 2.08 ± 0.64 | -0.732 | 0.466 |
| **Implementation of IEP for parents** | 1.61 ± 0.35 | 1.55 ± 0.38 | 0.929 | 0.354 |
| **First IEP meeting for teachers** | 2.51 ± 0.48 | 2.79 ± 0.31 | -3.948 | <0.005* |
| **Implementation of IEP for teachers** | 1.86 ± 0.36 | 1.86 ±0.53 | -0.049 | 0.961 |

*Note.* Results of the author's research.

Kultura polisa
20(2), 39–60

# Učešće učenika sa smetnjama u razvoju u izradi Individualnog obrazovnog plana

Elvira I. Rajšli-Tokoš
Škola za osnovno i srednje obrazovanje "Bratstvo"
Bečej, Srbija

**Sažetak**

Korisnost individualnih obrazovnih planova (IOP) je nesporna učenicima sa smetnjama u razvoju, roditeljima i nastavnicima/defektolozima. Pored izrade (timske saradnje), implementacije (sprovođenje/realizacija isplaniranog) važno je učestvovanje učenika sa smetnjama u razvoju. Učešće učenika i samostalno vođenje IOP sastanka prema savremenoj literaturi daje razne benefite poput razvoja veštine samoevaluacije, samozastupanja i mogućnost motivacije za postizanje ciljeva koji se planiraju u IOP-u, itd.

Cilj rada je ispitivanje nastavnika i defektologa o učešću i ulozi učenika na prvom sastanku IOP tima, kao i utvrđivanje razlika u odnosu na iskustvo u radu sa učenicima sa smetnjama u razvoju i obrazovni profil stručnjaka.

U istraživanju učestvovao je 131 ispitanika (94 nastavnika i 37 defektologa) iz različitih redovnih i specijalnih srednjih škola. Istraživanje je sprovedeno onlajn preko "Google Forms" platforme. Podaci su prikuljeni putem upitnika Skala za procenu stepena implementacija individualnog obrazovnog plana bez uticaja ispitivača.

Zaključeno je da učenici često nisu prisutni na prvom IOP sastanku, dok se beleži prisustvo nastavnika/defektologa i roditelja. U ovom istraživanju iskustvo u radu sa učenicima sa smetnjama u razvoju nije od značajne povezanosti sa učešćem učenika. Međutim razlike u obrazovnom profilu se beleže, defektolozi imaju vodeću ulogu i učešće učenika sa smetnjama u razvoju je skromna.

*Ključne reči:* Učenici sa smetnjama u razvoju, individualni obrazovni plan, srednja škola, nastavnik, defektolog, učešće učenika