

**A Review the Literature on Problems and Challenges Encountered by Educators  
During the IEP Process**

---

**A Synthesis Project**

**Presented to the**

**Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education**

**The College at Brockport**

**State University of New York**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment**

**of the Requirements for the Degree**

**Master of Science in Education**

**(Adapted Physical Education)**

---

**By**

**Schecyl M. Santiago - Lugo**

**Spring, 2018**

THE COLLEGE AT BROCKPORT  
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
BROCKPORT, NEW YORK

Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education

Title of Synthesis Project: A Review the Literature on Problems and Challenges  
Encountered by Educators During the IEP Process  
A Synthesis of the Research Literature.

Cathy Houston-Wilson

5/15/18

Instructor Approval

Date

Accepted by the Department of Kinesiology, Sport Studies, and Physical Education, The College at Brockport, State University of New York, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science in Education (Physical Education).

Cathy Houston-Wilson

5/15/18

Chairperson Approval

Date

## **Abstract**

The Individualized with Disabilities Educational Act (IDEA) ensures that every child diagnosed with an eligible disability ages 3-21 is provided a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment. One of the provisions of IDEA is that students who qualify for special education services receive an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). IDEA requires specific guidelines to be met by schools however, research indicates IEP's established by educators have missing components and quality IEP's are lacking. Therefore, the purpose of this synthesis project is to review the literature on problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process.

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	5-8
Statement of the Problem .....	6
Research Question.....	7
Purpose of the Literature Review .....	7
Operational Definitions .....	7
Assumptions .....	7-8
Delimitations .....	-8
 Chapter 2: Methods.....	 9-10
 Chapter 3: Literature Review.....	 11-21
Role of the Multidisciplinary Team in the IEP Process.....	11-14
Role of the Special Education Teacher in the IEP Process.....	14-17
Parent Involvement in the IEP Process.....	17-18
Understanding the IEP.....	18
Importance of Communication in the IEP Process .....	19-21
Summary.....	21
 Chapter 4-Discussion and Recommendations for Future Research.....	 22-27
 References.....	 28-30
 Appendix A: Article Grid.....	 31-56

## **Chapter 1-Introduction**

Public Law 94-142 the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was established in 1975 by President Gerald Ford to ensure special education services for students with disabilities. The law was reauthorized several times over the years and is now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Educational Act (IDEA). The law was created to ensure that every child diagnosed with an eligible disability ages 3-21 is provided a Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment. The law also ensures that each child receives special education services and related services as appropriate. Another law, Public Law 114-95, the Every Student Succeeds Act was passed in December 2015. This law replaces the No Child Left Behind Act and is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Through the combination of these two laws, students with disabilities are ensured an appropriate education.

One of the provisions of IDEA is that students who qualify for special education services receive an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). The IEP was established to provide a plan that specifically identifies instructional goals, means to those goals, and the manner by which these goals can be measured (Gallagher, 1995). The IEP addressed many components specifically a statement of the child's present level of performance (PLP), annual educational goals, modifications and accommodations that may be needed to meet goals, identification of specific dates and methods to measure student's progress among other items (Stanberry, 2018). The IEP also requires a multidisciplinary team to be formed, which includes the special education teacher, general education teachers, related service personnel, administrators, translator if needed, parents and when

appropriate the student. However, although IDEA requires specific guidelines to be met by schools, research indicates IEP components are sometimes missing and quality IEP's are lacking (Rakap, 2015). Research also indicates that multidisciplinary teams are not being formed (Avcioglu, 2012). For instance, some of the problems encountered in the 1960s and 1970s regarding the IEP process are still a problem today. These problems include missing data; poorly written goals and objectives; unclear link of goals with assessment, program and evaluation; no monitoring in effect; lack of parent involvement, time consuming meetings; and missing professionals in meetings (Gallagher, 1995).

Under IDEA, the IEP is no longer exclusively the responsibility of the special education teacher. Now the process of developing the IEP has shifted to a regular education setting due to so many students with disabilities being included in the general education setting and accommodations should be made for these students according to the law (Tarver, 2006). Students who qualify for special education should be able to benefit from the different educational opportunities that are being offered in order for the child to be able to achieve their highest potential (Avcioglu, 2012). When collaboration between teachers is lacking during the IEP process, student educational programs and opportunities are limited. Moreover, problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process need to be addressed in order to facilitate more effective and appropriate IEP's for students with disabilities.

### **Statement of the problem**

As time has passed research indicates that problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process seem to be similar to the problems encountered in the 1960's and 1970's (Gallagher, 1995). This is concerning because technology and IEP

law requirements have evolved, yet the same problems are still encountered and not resolved. A review of literature will acknowledge the problems and challenges encountered during the IEP process and will better help assist schools in making the necessary modifications to facilitate quality IEP's for students.

### **Research Question**

1. What are the problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process?
2. How can the IEP process be more effective in establishing quality IEP's for students?

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this synthesis project is to review the literature on problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process.

### **Operational Definitions**

**1. IDEA-** Individual with Disabilities Education Act.

Legislation designed to ensure that all children with disabilities have access to a free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their specific needs and prepare them for employment and independent living (*Manny Felix and Garth Tymeson, 2017*).

**2. Individualized Education Plan-**

A legal document that is developed to ensure high-quality educational programming for children with disabilities (*Lieberman, Houston-Wilson, 2016*)

### **Assumptions**

The following assumptions were used in this synthesis:

1. The Literature review was exhaustive and comprehensive

2. Participants were reflective of the population under study.
3. Results reported were reflective of the population under study.

### **Delimitations**

This synthesis is delimited to:

1. Studies that examine female and male educators from pre-service teachers to professional educators.
2. Teachers employed in a variety of school districts who work with students with disabilities.
3. Teachers employed in different parts of the United States.
4. Literature review from 2000-2018.

## Chapter 2 – Methods

The purpose of this chapter was to review the methods used to review the literature on problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process. The studies collected for this synthesis were located using the database EBSCO from the College at Brockport Drake Library. Within EBSCO database the following databases were searched using Academic Search and SPORTDiscus together. From these searches, a total of 10 articles met the criteria for inclusion in this literature review. Criteria for selection of articles included date range of the year 2000-2018. Articles selected were scholarly peer-reviewed full-text articles. These specific requirements for articles selection were done to ensure the most recent information related to IEP problems and challenges encountered by educators. All articles selected as part of the literature review provided context about the topic, background information and supplemental information to complete the review. All sources are cited in the reference section of this paper.

Articles selected for this literature review were selected using the following keywords and phrases; “IEP, “Special Education IEP” and “problems encountered IEP”. The keyword “IEP” yielded 2,423 hits on the database and 6 articles were used for the literature review. The phrase “Special education IEP” yielded 598 hits on the database. Out of those 598 hits 3 articles were selected for the literature review. The third and final phrase was “problems encountered IEP” which obtained 3 hits on the database. One article was selected for the literature review using this phrase.

An important aspect of the selection of articles was making sure all articles included relevant information related to problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process. All of the articles selected included perspectives of

teachers during the IEP process. Participants included in the articles were all experienced teachers both male and female working with students with disabilities in both inclusive and segregated settings in rural, urban, and suburban school settings.

A total of 10 articles were used to compile the data for this synthesis and review of literature. Articles selected for this synthesis and literature review were obtained from a variety of recognized journals. The Journal of Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice provided two articles for this study. The Journal of Instructional Psychology, Educational and Psychological Consultation, Research & Practice for persons with severe Disabilities, Council for Exceptional Children, Learning Disability Quarterly, International Journal of Inclusive Education, Rural Special Education Quarterly, and PALESTRA all provided one article.

The critical mass of all participants in this study was 2,285 teachers. Out of the 10 articles, only 6 articles included participants gender therefore 166 participants were male and 318 were females. 1,801 participants did not specify gender in the articles selected. Participants included adapted physical education teachers, general education teachers, special education teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, related services, parents, students and others. Students included in some articles were students with a variety of disabilities placed in inclusive and segregated settings. All articles included teachers perspectives related to the IEP process.

### **Chapter 3- Literature Review**

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature on problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process. Based on similarities of the articles included in this synthesis, this chapter is divided into the following themes: Role of the Multidisciplinary Team in the IEP process, Role of the Special Education Teacher in the IEP Process, Parent Involvement in the IEP Process Understanding the IEP, and the Importance of Communication in the IEP process.

#### **Role of the Multidisciplinary Team in the IEP Process**

It is essential that a multidisciplinary team be formed for the IEP meeting as required in IDEA-IA (2004) in order to determine appropriate goals and objectives for the student. “IEP’s are designed to be developed by each student’s IEP team, which consists of teachers, parents, students and other professionals who work collaboratively to develop goals and supportive plans”(William-Diehm, Brandes, Chestnut, & Haring, 2014, p. 4). However, research indicates that professionals are not discussing goals and objectives together. This makes the IEP team non-functional as not all representatives are present or serving as a member of the multidisciplinary team (William-Diehm, Brandes, Chestnut, & Haring, 2014).

To support this notion Avcioglu, (2012) studied the role of the multidisciplinary team. In this study, a questionnaire was distributed to 116 Guidance and Research Center (GRC) managers in Turkey to determine their perceptions of problems encountered in the identification, placement, follow up, IEP development and integration practice. GRC are responsible for providing services to students with disabilities and offer guidance and psychological consultation services to individuals and parents (Avcioglu, 2012). Among

the problems encountered by GRC managers, results of this study indicated multidisciplinary teams not being formed and no resources available on how to prepare, apply, and evaluate the IEP. (Avcioglu, 2012).

Samalot and Lieberman (2017) also studied the role of the multidisciplinary team in IEP development. The purpose of this study was to determine general physical education (GPE) and adapted physical education (APE) IEP involvement and to identify barriers and solutions that will help them be included in this process. 137 teachers completed a 17 item open-ended questionnaire that was sent by email to all members of the Certified Adapted Physical Educators (CAPE) distribution list (Samalot & Lieberman, 2017). Results of this study indicated that although the majority of the participants mentioned being involved during the IEP process, teachers also mentioned never being asked to attend the IEP meeting or collaborating with team members. According to the researchers, in the last 10 years physical education involvement in the IEP process has decreased dramatically (Samalot & Lieberman, 2017). Respondents felt that lack of involvement in the IEP process led to job dissatisfaction. If a specific education program needs to be designed for students with disabilities, then that program should be consulted for the development of the IEP (Samalot & Lieberman, 2017). Specifically, physical education should be addressed and faculty in physical education or adapted physical education should be considered members of the multidisciplinary team during IEP meetings. Physical educators have a lot to contribute to the team, they help children to develop in many ways including socially, cognitively and physically. Lieberman and Samalot (2017) asserted that based on the open-ended answers from the participants, training and workshops need to be provided in order to have a better

understanding of the IEP process for all involved. Physical educators who responded to the survey expressed concerns about not being valued when they are not considered part of the multidisciplinary team. Authors in this study state the importance of recognizing physical education teachers and the importance of getting familiar with the laws and requirements of the physical education class (Lieberman & Samalot, 2017).

However, Tarver (2006) surveyed regular education teacher's perceptions on the utility of IEPs for children with disabilities in an inclusive setting. This study included a questionnaire of 16 items that were distributed to 123 regular education teachers. The questionnaire included items related to the importance of the IEP for current students in their classrooms. The majority of the teachers in this study reported positive outcomes related to the IEP team decision process. Teachers in this study indicated IEP's being a team decision. Another study that supported this notion was the study conducted by Martin, Marshall, and Sale (2004). The purpose of this study was to determine if perceptions of IEP team member's role differ or perceptions change when other team members and students attend the IEP meeting. This study examined perceptions of 1,638 secondary IEP meeting participants (Martin, Marshall, and Sale, 2004). Participants attended a total of 393 IEP meetings held over 3 consecutive academic years from five school districts and from four cities or towns in southwestern State. A two-part 10-item questionnaire was used to obtain teachers perceptions. The first part of the questionnaire asked participants to indicate their role during the IEP meeting and indicate who attends the meeting. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of 10 survey items in which participants had to mark one of the following "not at all", "a little", "some", or "a lot. In this study when general educators attended the IEP meeting participants indicated talking

more about student strengths, needs and interest, feeling more empowered, feeling more knowledgeable on what to do next and feeling better about the meeting (Martin, Marshall, and Sale, 2004). When general education teachers and related services professionals attended the IEP meeting, the IEP team reported knowing the reason for the meeting and talking more about student's interest.

### **Role of the Special Education Teacher in the IEP Process**

Based on IDEA, the IEP is no longer exclusively the responsibility of the special education teacher. In some cases, the process of developing the IEP has shifted to a regular education setting and accommodations should be made for these students according to the law (Tarver, 2006). Students receiving special education should be able to benefit from the different educational opportunities offered to help them reach their highest potential possible according to their needs (Avcioglu, 2012). However, research indicates that the special education teacher is still taking on great responsibility during the IEP process resulting in general teachers or related services being left out or not being considered an important member of the IEP team.

A case study by Ruppap and Gaffney (2011) included the following participants: parents, principal, special education director, physical therapist, school psychologist, two speech-language pathologists, occupational therapist, special education teacher and preschool teacher. The purpose of the study was to examine an IEP in order to understand how team members interacted with each other and how this influenced the process of decision-making. Data collection in this study included field notes, audio recordings and interviews. Results of the study indicated that the special education

director and the psychologist spoke the most during the meeting. A small portion of the meeting consisted of team members in discussion, and the sequence of the meeting was dictated by the IEP document, which means that team member's opinions were not discussed. Moreover, the Special Education Director used the IEP document as a guide to lead the meeting, this restricted team members from discussing important information related to the child. The Special Education Director controlled the meeting and this made team members not participate as much during the meeting. The power some team members had in the meeting significantly influenced the outcome of the meeting. Recommendations include distributing leadership among team members to help make the process more effective (Ruppar & Gaffney, 2011).

Martin, Marshall, and Sale, (2004) conducted a 3-year study of middle, junior high and high school IEP meetings with the purpose of determining if perceptions of IEP team members role differ or perceptions change when other team members and students attend the meeting. A total of 1,638 participants were included in this study and attended 393 IEP meetings held over 3 consecutive, academic years from five school districts from four cities or towns in Southwestern state. In this study the results indicated the special education teachers leading and reported talking more during the meetings. They reported knowing what to do at the meeting, talking at the meeting, helping to make decisions and knowing what to do next.

Moreover, quotes from teachers included in Lieberman and Samalot (2017) study exemplifies this finding: "the special education department writes the IEP goals and I would like to be invited and work with the special education department" (Lieberman & Samalot, 2017, p. 5). Another quote included in the study indicated frustration from

the teachers "it's not that I am being excluded the obstacle for me is that I have to justify why I need to be involved" (Lieberman & Samalot, 2017, p. 6). Another teacher in the study mentioned, "I am not considered important in the process, the school does not consider the PE department important" (Lieberman & Samalot, 2017, p.6).

Participants of the study mainly agreed that PE teachers should be included in the IEP process and should be considered as important as any other member of the IEP team.

Teachers in this study felt frustrated and did not feel included as part of the IEP team.

On the other hand, Nilsen (2017) studied special education and general education teachers IEP collaboration. Results indicated special education teachers often felt completely alone and emphasized the lack of participation of other teachers. Special education teachers often have to nag and pressure others teachers to be involved. Special education teachers call for more cooperation in the development of the IEP. Yet, general education teachers felt that it is the responsibility of the special education teacher and they felt the special education teachers are in control during the meeting. Both teachers see the value of each other but result in this study indicate they are unable to make collaboration work (Nilsen, 2017).

### **Parent Involvement in the IEP Process**

Parents play a vital role as part of the multidisciplinary team as they can assist teachers and administrators in determining appropriate placement for their child and can provide valuable information during the IEP meeting (Columna, Cook, Foley & Bailey, 2014). Yet, research indicates parents may not be considered part of the IEP team. For example, Ilik and Sari (2017) stated parents don't always know their roles or responsibilities during the IEP meeting. Moreover, Avcioglu,(2012) found in some

instances parents are being ignored and not enough information is being provided to parents resulting in parents not attending IEP meetings. Cavendish and Connor (2018) noted that parents maintained a passive role during the meeting.

Williams-Diehm, Brandes, Chestnut and Haring, (2014) studied urban and suburban school teacher caseloads and noted that their loads changed annually, preventing them from developing long-term student and family relationships. In Ruppert and Gaffney (2011) study teachers indicated establishing relationships with parents helps increase parent involvement and encourages them to make more informed decisions during IEP meetings. However, teachers often face challenges when attempting to include parents during the IEP meeting. For example, Cavendish & Connor, (2018) examined perspectives on factors that influence parent and student involvement in the IEP transition planning. Some of the challenges identified by teachers related to parent involvement during the IEP meeting were parents not understanding the meeting. Parents indicated they would only attend meetings only when receiving a letter stating they had to be present during the meeting. Parents and students also discussed how the IEP was emotionally draining as the meeting only focused on deficits of students (Cavendish & Connor, 2018). Other challenges included were work-related time constraints, language barriers, and special education jargon frequently used in meetings (Cavendish & Connor, 2018). Cavendish and Connor (2018), recommend utilizing “Skype” to help include parents when they are unable to attend IEP meeting and providing a translator that is familiar with special education and IEP terminology who is able to explain terms to parents. These strategies can make parents feel more comfortable and can enhance their participation in IEP meetings (Cavendish & Connor, 2018).

## **Understanding the IEP**

One of the main problems encountered by educators was their lack of understanding the IEP. Many teachers providing services to students with special needs lack knowledge related to the IEP process and this can be concerning when developing appropriate programs for students. Furthermore, results of studies related to IEP development support this statement. For example, Ilik, and Sari (2017) and Avcioglu (2012) indicated that many teachers did not have sufficient knowledge about the IEP process. In addition, Nilsen (2017) reported general education teachers had limited knowledge related to the IEP. Researchers recommend that IEP In-Service and pre-service training for teachers be provided on a regular basis. These training help general educators become more familiar with IEP terminology and processes so that they can feel more knowledgeable and prepared when attending IEP meetings (Martin, Marshall, & Sale, 2004). Ilik and Sari, (2017) noted that after participating in the In-Service IEP Development Training Program teachers in the experimental group compared to teachers in the control group, felt more competent in all areas of the IEP. Teachers who attended in-service training found themselves more knowledgeable and better qualified to make decisions regarding the student. In-service training has been found to effectively teach the necessary information and skills that teacher needs to successfully participate in the IEP and understand the process.

### **Importance of Communication in the IEP Process**

IEP's are designed to enhance collaboration and communication between special education teachers, general education teachers, students with disabilities and their parents, school administrators, and other related supporting agencies (Williams-Diehm, Brandes, Chestnut, & Haring, 2014). However, research indicates that teachers may not be communicating effectively with other members of the team before and during the IEP meeting. Important information is not being distributed or communicated with teachers prior to the meeting creating gaps in information amongst members. This creates barriers when developing appropriate programs for students with disabilities. For example, Ilik, and Sari (2017) reported teachers not communicating with each other supportively. One quote by a teacher included in this study to support this notion "everyone does as much as they can to help the inclusiveness student, but they don't find common ground or talk in a way to improve our recommendations at these meeting" (Ilik & Sari, 2017, p.1559 ). Ilik and Sari (2017) recommend IEP team members obtaining important detailed information related to both the child and child's family prior to the meeting in order to avoid wasting time and provide more realistic recommendations to student needs. In order to produce more quality IEP's for students, it is vital that IEP team members work together and support each other (Ilik & Sari, 2017).

Ruppar and Gaffney (2011) indicated that lack of communication prior to the meeting affected the decisions made at the meeting. Sometimes these decisions were not always in the students best interest. Avcioglu (2012) study indicated insufficient supports on how to prepare, apply and evaluate IEP's has an impact on the services provided to the student. Nilsen (2017) also noted that lack of cooperative curriculum planning weakens

the opportunities for students with disabilities have in participating in inclusive settings. Teachers see the value of each other but are unable to make collaboration work (Nilsen, 2017).

Teachers emphasize that time and team-work are key factors in order to develop appropriate programs for students (Nilsen, 2017). Years of research have called for more communication among IEP team members yet, it does not appear to be a consistent common planning time for IEP team members beyond the yearly meeting (Hartman, 2016). Hartman (2016) study focus was to gain a better understanding of the practice of two IEP teams in two elementary schools. A total of 22 participants were included in the study which included parents, therapist, psychologist, teachers, general and special educators, paraprofessionals, administrators and other related services. The researcher identified four types of practice. The first was core practice which engaged in daily participation, an integrated practice which participated but not as frequent, an intermittent practice which did not balance participation, and finally disconnected practice which participation occurred on a monthly or yearly basis (Hartman, 2016). The type of practice indicated the level of communication and involvement with IEP team members.

Results of this study revealed that certain team members practice was valued while others members practice was discouraged (Hartman, 2016). The majority of the team members engaged intermittent and the rest of the team members were considered disconnected. Members who actively pursued and shared practices with other members had better outcomes when communicating with core practice. Moreover, changing how teacher conceptualize their engagement on IEP team can change the way team members

communicate with each other and be able to implement evidence-based individualized instruction and related services (Hartman, 2016).

### **Summary**

Research clearly states the problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process. Educators need to acknowledge problems and challenges encountered during the IEP process in order to make the necessary changes and facilitate more appropriate programs for students. Professional development training related to the IEP meeting are necessary to help educators understand their roles during the IEP meeting and help educators utilize strategies that enhance teamwork and collaboration.

## **Chapter 4-Discussion and Recommendations for Future Research**

The Purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process. As part of the literature review, the themes established based on the findings of the articles were multidisciplinary teams not formed, special education teacher, lack of IEP knowledge, parent involvement and lack of communication. This chapter will discuss specific findings in relation to these themes.

The problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process based on the findings of the literature review are concerning as ineffective IEP's are being established. According to IDEA (2004), all professionals involved in providing direct service on a student's IEP must attend IEP meeting when the specific content area is being discussed. Research, however, indicates multidisciplinary teams are not being formed and teachers directly working with students with disabilities are not included in the IEP process. A multidisciplinary team according to William-Diehm, Brandes, Chestnut, & Haring, (2014) should consist of teachers, parents, students and other professionals who work together and help develop supportive plans. The reality is that teacher's parents, and students are not invited to meetings and not considered part of the IEP team.

IDEA (2004) also states the IEP is no longer exclusively the responsibility of the special education teacher. The process has now shifted to a general education setting. Yet, according to Ruppert & Gaffney (2011) study, the special education teacher and psychologist dominated the meeting making other members included in the meeting feel powerless when determining decisions. The special education teacher used the IEP document as a guide during the meeting restricting team members from discussing

important information. Martin, Marshall, & Sale, (2004) study also indicated the special education teacher leading the meeting. Another problem encountered in the IEP process based on the literature review was found in the study conducted by Lieberman & Samalot (2017). In this study, physical education teachers indicated the special education teacher responsible for writing the goals and objectives for the physical education class. This affects the effectiveness of the IEP goals and objectives established for students as other members of the IEP team are writing goals and objectives and are not the experts in their specific subject and this is an inappropriate practice.

Although in the study Nilsen (2017) teachers indicated that the IEP is the responsibility of the special education teacher, special education teachers also voiced their concern about feeling alone and requesting more collaboration during the process. Moreover, in order to produce more quality IEP's for students, a multidisciplinary team should be formed and all teachers working directly with students should be included in the IEP meeting.

Another problem encountered during the IEP process based on the literature review was lack of IEP knowledge from educators. The teacher indicated in various articles not having sufficient knowledge about the IEP process and not knowing what to do during the meeting. Teachers not having enough knowledge about the IEP process continues to create barriers when developing students IEP's. Providing professional development and training related to the IEP process can help teacher feel more confident about their roles when attending an IEP meeting. Teachers who attended in-service training found themselves more knowledgeable and better qualified (Ilik, & Sari, 2017).

In-service training has been found to effectively teach the necessary information and skills that teacher needs (Ilik, & Sari, 2017).

Moreover, parent involvement was another problem mentioned in the articles included in the literature review. Parents can provide vital information related to the student and this information can be used during decision making. However, research indicates parents are not being invited to meetings and are not considered part of the IEP team. Teachers in articles indicated parents not knowing their role during the IEP meeting and information not provided to parents. This resulted in parents not attending meetings and feeling left out. According to Cavendish, Connor, (2018) study, challenges to include parents in meetings were work-related time constraints and language barrier. Parents can assist the IEP team and help determine the most appropriate teaching environment for their child (Columna, Cook, Foley, & Bailey, 2014). Therefore, the administration should always exhaust strategies to include parents during the IEP meeting. If parents have conflicts with time constraints, technology can be implemented in order for parents to feel apart of the process and stay informed about their child's decisions.

Administration can also organize an in-service presentation for parents that includes information related to the IEP meeting where parents. This can help parents know their role during their meeting and understand components and terms related to the IEP. Training programs and written documents should be provided to families of normally developing children and families of special education students to facilitate more understanding of the IEP process (Ilik, & Sari, 2017). A solution in relation to parents language barrier could be to have a translator that can help assist parents. This will help parents voice their concerns and feel more comfortable during the meeting. It is important

for parents to be included and informed about decision making related to their child as this will help create a positive welcoming environment for parents and teacher to communicate effectively.

The last theme included in the literature review was lack of communication between educators during the IEP process. Teachers acknowledge the importance of collaboration between other members during the IEP process but lack the skills and strategies to achieve communication and collaboration. It is very important for teachers to communicate with each other before and during the IEP meeting. Communicating and creating collaboration among IEP team members can help make the process smoother and more effective. Teachers can share ideas and expertise and establish more quality IEP's for students. When educators learn how to actively participate during the IEP meetings, understand the roles each member has during the meeting and the IEP team treats everyone as equal members the educational planning process for students will be appropriate (Martin, Marshall, & Sale, 2004).

The problems and challenges encountered by educators during IEP process seem to be concerning when developing effective IEP's for students. IEP is designed to enhance collaboration and communication between special education teachers, general education teachers, and students with disabilities, school administrators, and other related supporting agencies (Williams-Diehm, Brandes, Chestnut, & Haring, 2014). High-quality goals and objectives included in the IEP allow professionals to have a better understanding on what skills to work on, when and where to work on these skills, and they help monitor students progress, and measure effectiveness (Rakap, 2015). IEP is a product and a process, and successful IEP depends on the process of preparing

appropriate educational statements for the child with a disability (Tarver, 2006). IEP training should be provided to not only the IEP team but also to all faculty members working with students with disabilities in inclusive settings. Moreover, professional development related to the IEP process and strategies implemented to enhance collaboration can help educators produce quality IEP's for students and help reduce the problems and challenges encountered by educators.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

Recommendations for future research in relation to the problems and challenges encountered by educators during the IEP process should focus on the positive outcomes of in-service training and professional development. More research needs to be conducted to analyze how in-service training and professional development related to the IEP process can help educators gain more knowledge and produce more quality IEP's for students. In service, training should include important laws, components of the IEP, the importance of establishing multidisciplinary teams, how to write appropriate goals and objectives, and collaboration strategies.

The second recommendation for future research would be to look into the level of involvement of physical education teachers during the IEP process. The study conducted by Lieberman & Samalot (2017) only surveyed CAPE certified adapted physical education teachers in three different national conferences and this represents a small portion of physical education teachers. Physical educators are left out of the IEP process and not considered part of the multidisciplinary team even when they are providing services to students with disabilities. Much research has been conducted on teachers,

parents and students perspectives related to the IEP process, but not much research has been conducted specifically on the perspectives of physical educator's involvement during the IEP process. Therefore, research is recommended on this topic.

One final recommendation for future research would be to further research on strategies to produce quality IEP's. All school district seems to have their own protocol or process on how to conduct IEP meetings, yet which strategies implemented work best to produce quality IEP's. Conducting research on this topic will help implement the best strategies in schools when conducting IEP meetings. It is important for administrators and educators to acknowledge the problems and challenges encountered during the IEP process and use strategies to help resolve problems to make the process more efficient.

## References

- Avcioglu, H. (2012). Guidance and research centers managers perceptions of problems encountered in the identification placement- follow up, individualized education program development and integration practice. *Educational Consultancy and Research Center, 12* (3), 2025-2031.
- Block, M. (2016) *A teacher guide to adapted physical education including students with disabilities in sports and recreation 4<sup>th</sup> edition*. Baltimore, Pual H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Cavendish, W., Connor, D. (2018). Toward authentic IEP's and transition plans: students, parents and teachers perspectives. *Learning Disability Quarterly 41* (1) 32-34.
- Columna, L., Cook, A., Foley, J. T., & Baily, J. (2014). Survey development to assess parental satisfaction with adapted physical education teacher's abilities working with children with autism. *Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy, 19* (5), 481-493.
- Gallagher, J. Desimone., & Porter, K. (1995). Lesson learned from implementation of IEP: applications to the IFSP. *Pro-ED Inc, 15* (3), 353-378.
- Hartmann, S. S. (2016). Understanding the everyday practice of individualize education program team members. *Journal of Education and Psychological consultation, 26* (1), 1-24.
- Ilik, S. S., & Sari, H. (2017). The training program for individualized education programs (IEPs): its effect on how inclusive education teachers perceive their competencies in devising IEPs. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice 17*, 5 1547-1572.

- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C., 1401 et seq. (2004).
- Kowalski, M. E., Lieberman, J. L., & Daggett, S. (2006). Getting involved in the IEP process. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance* 77 (7), 35-39.
- Lieberman, L., & Samalot, R., R. (2017). Adapted physical educators current level of involvement in the IEP process.
- Lieberman, J. L. & Houston- Wilson, C. (2018). *Strategies for inclusion 3<sup>rd</sup> edition*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Nilsen, S. (2017). Special education and general education coordinated or separated? A study of curriculum planning for pupils with special education needs. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 21 (2), 205-217.
- Martin, E. J., Marshall, H. L., & Sale, P. (2004). A 3-year study of middle, junior high and high school IEP meeting. *Council for Exceptional Children*, 70 (3), 285-297.
- Rakap, S. (2015). Quality of individualized education program goals and objectives for preschool children with disabilities. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 30 (2), 173-186.
- Ruppar, L. L., & Gaffney, S. J. (2011). Individualized education program term decision: a preliminary study of conversations, negotiations, and power. *Research and Practice with Sever Disabilities*, 36 (1), 11-22.
- Stanberry, K. (2018). Understanding individualized educational plan. Retrieved from <https://www.understood.org/en/school-learning/special-services/ieps/understanding-individualized-education-programs#top>
- Tarver, L, A. (2006). Are individualized education plans a good thing? A survey of teacher's perceptions of the utility of IEPs in regular education settings. *Journal of Instructional*

*Psychology 33 (4) 263-272.*

Winnick, J., P. & Porreta, D., L. (2017). *Adapted physical education and sport 6<sup>th</sup> edition.*

Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Williams-Diehm, L.,K., Brandes,A., J., Chestnut, W., P,& Haring, A., K. ( 2014).

Student and parent IEP collaboration: a comparison across school settings. *Rural*

*Special Education Quarterly 33 (1) 3- 11.*

**APPENDIX A**

**ARTICLE GRID**

Author	Title	Source	Purpose	Methods & Procedures	Analysis	Findings	Discussion/ Recommendations Research Notes –  Commonalities/Differences
Samalot & Lieberman (2016)	Adapted Physical Educators current level of Involvement in the IEP Process	<i>PALESTRA</i>	The purpose of the study was to find out how involved GPE and APE teacher are during the IEP process, and to identify barriers and solutions that will help them be included in this process.	The data in this study were collected in the following; open-ended questions were documented in tables and put in a separate file, transcripts we analyzed independently by each researcher, to reach consensus on themes and subthemes. Researchers found revealing data points and were highlighted and coded with meaningful labels. A total of 137	Themes, subthemes and quotes from transcripts were given to an external reviewer to verify that the purpose of study was reflected and corresponded to the study.	Teachers indicated that in many cases the special education teacher, occupational therapist, physical therapist or general classroom teachers are the ones who write the goals for physical education. Some teachers indicated that they lacked knowledge in IEP process and did not know what to do. 102 participants	Although mostly all participants indicated they were part of the IEP process, teachers indicated many barriers during the process. (1) Lack of respect (2) better communication (3) training and communication. Authors recommendation related to the teacher barriers during the IEP process are the following; Lack of respect: teachers and administrators must be familiarized with the laws and requirements related to involvement of the physical educator during the IEP process, and acknowledge that physical education is a direct service. Communication: all members of the IEP team

				<p>participants completed the questionnaire.</p> <p>96 females 39 males 2 no specify</p>		<p>indicated that they were involved in IEP process and 32 indicated that they were not. In attending IEP meetings 107 were allowed in the IEP meeting and 15 were not. Some of the reasons stated by the participants were no substitute provided to cover classes, never asked to attend, and not having unique goals. The three main themes of the questionnaires were lack of respect, better communication and training and</p>	<p>must communicate effectively to share important information related to the student. Another recommendation is for teachers to be creative and use available resources, for example, use pictures and videos that can be shared among members of the IEP team. Training and communication: Physical educators should advocate for professional development related to the IEP process for example preparation days, conference days, in-services.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						communication.	
Tarver (2006)	Are Individualized Education Plans a Good Thing? A Survey of Teachers' Perceptions of	<i>Journal of Instructional Psychology</i>	The purpose of this study was to survey perceptions of regular education teachers towards the	123 regular education teacher (105) females (16) male. Teacher from South Alabama ,Southeast Georgia and teachers	Survey was collected in a 3 month period. Questionnaire were placed in teacher's mailboxes. Teachers could	48% of teachers agreed and 15% strongly agreed that (IEPs) provide a curriculum for special education	Majority of regular education teacher found the process of the (IEP) useful when implementing educational goals and objectives for children with disabilities. Teachers indicated that they played a

the Utility of IEPs in Regular Education Settings.			usefulness of IEP's in inclusive classrooms.	attending graduate school in Alabama State University were surveyed. Average year of experience of teacher was 13 years. Questionnaire was used to obtain data which included 16 questions related to the importance of (IEP) for current students in their classrooms.	return questionnaire in the principal investigator's mailbox. Reliability analysis of items resulted in an alpha coefficient of .70 suggesting strong internal consistency of items.	students currently within their classrooms. 21% disagreed and 5% strongly disagreed that (IEPs) provide curriculum for their students 48 % agreed and 9% strongly agreed that the (IEP) were useful, 26% disagreed and 3% strongly disagreed. 31% agreed that the (IEPs) are more program specific than student specific , 6.5% strongly agreed. 22.8% agreed that the time spent developing (IEPs) did not justify their worth 4.1%	role when determining goals and objectives for their students, and the process was a team activity. (IEP) goals were student specific rather than curriculum specific. Survey indicated that more training is needed for regular education teachers on the process of the (IEP). A decent amount of teacher responded negatively to items, stating that they did not feel they were involved in the process and felt that the only team decision is placement. Teacher also indicated that the time spent developing IEP was not justified. Authors recommend future research to close the academic gap with children with disabilities and their regular education peers. They also recommend that teacher are offered appropriate trainings and support in order to provide
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---

						strongly agreed 44.7% disagreed, 15.4% strongly disagreed. 47% disagreed that no part of the (IEP) is a team decision 22.8% strongly disagreed , 3.3% strongly agreed, 15. 4% agreed.	the most appropriate instruction for students with a variety of disabilities. Specifically new teachers should be provided in-service trainings and mentoring that helps the new teacher adapt their classroom to students with disabilities. Teacher training programs in university level should include preparation and modifications for students with disabilities.
Hartmann, S. E. (2016)	Understanding the Everyday Practice of Individualized Education Program Team Members	<i>Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation</i>	The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the practice of two IEP teams in two elementary schools.	Parents, therapist, psychologist, teachers, general ad special educators, paraprofessionals, administrators and other related services. 22 total participants 21 Female 1 Male	Case study methods was used to examine daily practices of two IEP teams. Comprehensive descriptions was used to compare the two IEP teams overtime. Wenger's (1998) Cop framework was utilized in order to go more	Researcher identified four types of practice (1) core practice (2) Integrated practice (3) intermittent practice (4) disconnected practice. Some members of the team included the special education teacher , adapted	Finding support previous research on team practices in school. Finding suggest that having one type of structure (Multidisciplinary or trans disciplinary team instead of thinking of effective IEP practice may be useful. Changing how teacher conceptualize their engagement on IEP team can change the way they communicate with other team members, and be able to implement evidence-

					<p>in depth of interactions, define activity of the two IEP teams. HypeRESERACH (version 2.7) was used to organize referenced data. Researcher developed a codebook, wrote memos, and used Wenger's (1998) processes of participation and reification. Matrices was used to analyze how frequently members of the IEP engaged in practice. Used strategies of analyzing multiple sources of evidence, researcher</p>	<p>physical education teacher and paraprofessional indicated that they were very involved with the students progress and communicated daily. Some members of the team felt that this was an adequate practice, others felt it was the best practice and other team members wished they had more time to work with each other. Members that did not participate or integrate as much as other team members were</p>	<p>based individualized instruction and related services. Members who actively pursued and shared practices with other members had better outcomes when communicating with core practice.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					feedback, intercoder reliability, and member checks to reduce researcher bias.	discouraged by core practice. The majority of the team members engaged intermittent. The rest of the team members were considered disconnected. Special education teacher and paraprofessional controlled other members access to the practice of others on the team.	
Ilik, S. S., & Sari, H. (2017)	The Training Program for the Individualized Education Programs	<i>Educational Sciences: Theory &amp; Practice</i>	The Purpose of the study was to reveal the effect that the IEP training program has	Mixed- methods uses qualitative and quantitative research design.  1 <sup>st</sup> stage	Qualitative descriptive analysis was utilized to analyze qualitative data.	41.5% stated not having experienced any problems obtaining information	After participating in the In- Service IEP Development Training Program teachers in the experimental group compared to teachers in the

<p>(IEPs): Its effect on How Inclusive Education Teachers Perceive their Competencies in Devising IEPs</p>			<p>on how inclusive education teacher perceive their IEP competencies for the development process.</p>	<p>qualitative research design was used in order to determine teacher's opinion on educational needs and preparation design program. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to follow interview protocol. Non-random purposive sampling method used to select teachers participating in interviews. 24 teacher 16 Female 8 Male 3 have taken IEP training 21 Have not.</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> stage quantitative pre-test/ post test</p>	<p>Researcher transcribed interview from voice recording after completing interviews. Each interview was evaluated individually. SPSS 18.0 was used to analyze quantitative data. A parametric, statistical, independent samples t-test was used to compare pre and post test scores.</p>	<p>about students. Information needed did not reflect students actual situation. 41.6% stated having had experienced problems obtaining students information from administrators or from students families. Most were not aware that a students with special need was placed in their classroom as an inclusive student. 54.1% stated not having any problems with the IEP coming together. Some teachers voiced</p>	<p>control group, feel more competent in all areas of the IEP. One group of teacher indicated that they were unable to obtain students information and those that were able to obtain information stated that it did not reflect reality. The creates a problem with the quality of the IEP.</p> <p>1. IEP team members need to have important information related to the student to avoid wasting time and provide more realistic recommendations. 2. All preparation should be completed before the IEP meeting.</p> <p>Teacher stated that no collaboration between members was evident. Reasons for this problem include</p> <p>1. Unable to find common time 2. no sufficient knowledge about the process</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<p>experimental and control group design was utilized to implement and evaluate programs. Teachers were selected using random sampling. Total of 19 teachers in both experimental and control group.</p> <p><b>Experimental group</b> 10 females 9 males</p> <p><b>Control group</b> 11 females 8 males</p>		<p>concern that although each party completed the necessary work, no communication was effective with each other. 45.8% stated experiencing no problems with the IEP team coming together. Yet, problems mentioned were not finding a suitable time to meet, teachers had too many classes, lack of knowledge, and team only existing in paper. Psychologist did not participate. IEP team meetings are not considered to be realized, as they</p>	<p>Recommendations for this problem include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All team members must work in collaboration and support each other.</li> <li>2. All members must fulfill their responsibility.</li> </ol> <p>Teachers also stated written documents are not used while defining performance areas, observation and experiences had defined student performance area. Another problem was teachers experiencing difficulties defining support services during IEP preparation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Team collaboration problem</li> </ol> <p>Another problem related to family involvement, teachers stated parents not knowing their roles or responsibilities during the IEP meeting. Parents know their child best. Teachers stated not having enough information during</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

						<p>should. 75% performance areas supporting IEPs were not defined in writing. 25% did not receive education on identifying student's performance levels. 66.6% stated not having to seek help of others when determining student's goals. 83.3% experienced problems benefitting from support services. Families objection to their child receiving support services</p>	<p>the follow- up and evaluation process. 1 which tools to use during evaluation need to be defined beforehand based on objective benchmarks in the IEP. 2. Table prior to evaluation should be created in order to correctly evaluate short term goals. 3. Providing in-service training programs that apply evaluation methods for teachers will help when observing students performance and tracking their progress. Teachers who attended in- service training found themselves more knowledgeable and better qualified. In-service training has been found to effectively teach the necessary information and skills that teacher need. Quality of IEP improved following the program. Recommendations</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>was a frequent cited problem from teachers. 54. 1% families should be more aware, teacher believe it is necessary to educate parents. IEP team does not meet in a regular basis, teachers indicated the importance of including the classroom teacher.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. legal measures should be taken to ensure IEP team come together.</li> <li>2. students information should be accessible using the internet.</li> <li>3. IEP- related courses should be included in teacher preparation undergraduate programs.</li> <li>4. Written documents and trainings for families should be provided.</li> </ol>
Ruppar, L. L., & Gaffney, S. J. (2011)	Individualized Education Program Team Decisions: A Preliminary Study of Conversations, Negotiations and Power	<i>Research &amp; Practice for persons with severe Disabilities</i>	The purpose of the study was to examine an IEP in order to understand how the team members interact with each other and how this influences the process of	This study used instrumental case study. Researchers decided to focus on the decision making process of a student with severe disability. 1 <sup>st</sup> criteria for selecting case was that the meeting had to be about	Transcript of the semi structured interviews, field noted and the child's documents provided enough information. Transcript of the IEP meeting and interviews were	As member of the team arrived they greeted each other. Team members were responsible for determining important decisions and filling out paper work in a set	Team member's opinion were not discussed. Lack of communication prior to the meeting affected the decision making of the meeting. Special education director used the IEP document as a guide to lead the meeting, this restricted team members from discussing important information

			<p>decision-making.</p>	<p>the development of the IEP for a student with severe disability. The 2<sup>nd</sup> criteria was that the meeting should concern a transition between programs. Three local special education coordinators were contacted from three local districts to see if they were willing to participate. Township School District indicated that there were three IEP meetings coming up for students with severe disabilities. Researcher purposefully selected a 5 year old boy with severe disabilities</p>	<p>independently analyzed. Labels and memos were recorded on the transcripts through multiple readings. Researcher sifted through their highlighted transcripts, labels, and memos and identified major themes or issues. Triangulation of multiple data sources was achieved with generation of list, summary statements and initial categories. Researchers arranged multiple</p>	<p>time period. The special education director facilitated discussion. Psychologist also took role as a leader. Special education teacher was quiet during the meeting. Determining students eligibility determination prompted the most discussion yet, only the psychologist and mother expressed what they thought. Other members of the team remained quite. Goals presented did not reflect the child's</p>	<p>related to the child. Writing goals prior to the meeting creates inconsistency with recommended practice. Parent involvement help with decisions making. Special education director had power during the meeting, and this made team members not participate as much. The power some team members had in the meeting significantly influenced the outcome of the meeting. Recommendations include distributing leadership among team members. Leadership roles can be alternated. The use of alternative agenda was also recommended, which can provide structure for identifying areas of agreement. Teachers stated that child's placement should not be determined before determining goals a practice in consisted with</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------	---	---	--	--

				<p>which was preparing for transition. Members of the IEP team were contacted with anticipation to discuss the study, answer questions and secure permission. 12 members agreed to participate which included parents, principal, special education director, physical therapist, school psychologist, two speech- language pathologists, occupational therapist, special education teacher and preschool teacher. First and second research were involved in data collection. Data collection</p>	<p>meetings to discuss common themes, disagreements and made the necessary modifications to reach agreement.</p>	<p>present level of performance, due to lack of communication, lack of experience and communication. When the team members discussed placement many team members did not agree with the decision but did not voice their concerns. The special education director and psychologist spoke the most during the meeting. A small portion of the meeting consisted of team members in discussion. The sequence of the meeting was</p>	<p>recommendations about IEP development. The child's placement was determined after goals were determined. Open discussion during the meeting could have helped rather than using the IEP document to guide the meeting. It was not clear in the study if teachers were aware of the curricular planning tools.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

				included field notes (setting of meeting, non-verbal interactions) audio recordings, interviews follow up questions.		dictated by the IEP document.	
Avcioglu, H. (2012).	Guidance and Research Centers (GRC) Managers Perceptions of Problems Encountered in the Identification, Placement, Follow up, Individualized Education Program (IEP) Development and Integration Practice	<i>Educational Science: Theory &amp; Practice</i>	The purpose of this study was to determine Guidance and Research Centers Manager's (GRC) opinions about the problems encountered in the process of placement, IEP, and follow up in students with disabilities.	116 (GRC) manager's 96 participants were male 20 were female. 86 graduated from the guidance and psychological counseling, 30 graduated from Education Management and Planning and Educational programs and teaching. Part I: personal information about managers Part II expressions about problems encountered	Frequency and percentages of (GRC) Managers answers were calculated. T-test and ANOVA was used to determine whether or not gender, age, vocational seniority, duration as a (GRC) manager, and undergraduate program were significant to the problems encountered mentioned in the study. To	General scanning problems medical identification reports are not being reported in details making it difficult for the families to understand. Not forming and adequate evaluation team, Not taking into consideration social environment. Problems involved IEP parents ignored professionals	Most important problems related to the IEP declared by GRC managements where parents being ignored, no information provided to parents results in parents not attending, lack of knowledge from teachers about IEP, not forming a multidisciplinary team, and no sufficient resources about how to prepare, apply and evaluate IEP. Placements of students are done without taking into consideration capacity of classroom, physical equipment, education environment, number of personnel and its quality. This becomes a problem because individualized

				<p>Specialist consulted validity of questionnaire.                  Reliability: Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated</p>	<p>find significant differentiation scheffe test was used.</p>	<p>lack knowledge and skill in IEP preparation and application, multidisciplinary team not formed, lack of resources about how to prepare, apply, and evaluate IEP. Different subjects and duration No personal to support that supply services for students that are placed in inclusion settings.</p>	<p>problems can not be implemented and students will not be able to benefit from the education program. GRC and teacher agree that the IEP is not prepared efficiently and problems are perceived same. Recommendation include providing additional trainings for teacher. Taking parents information into consideration.</p>
<p>Martin, E. J., Marshall, H. L., &amp; Sale, P. (2004)</p>	<p>A 3 Year Study of Middle, Junior High and High School IEP Meeting</p>	<p><i>Council for Exceptional Children</i></p>	<p>The purpose of this study was to examine perceptions of IEP team members researchers specifically</p>	<p>Participants in this study participated in 393 IEP meetings held over 3 consecutive, academic years from five school</p>	<p>Answers to each survey items were converted into a number. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA)</p>	<p>Presence of student during IEP meeting resulted in many value- added benefits, and validated legal requirements for</p>	<p>Both students and physical educators scored the lowest. Educators and parents must explain the process of the IEP, explain IEP terminology, facilitate information about their disability, and explain their</p>

			<p>wanted to determine if perceptions of IEP team members role differ or perceptions change when other team members and students attend the meeting.</p>	<p>districts from four cities or towns in southwestern state . A total of 1,638 participants participated in this study. Participants self identified their role. Each district had participated in state wide transition system change project, which encouraged student attendance at IEP meetings. Study included a two- part 10-item questionnaire. Each year the researcher provided the special education chair with a packet survey at each participating school and asked chairs to</p>	<p>determined the effect of who completed the survey items across the 10 survey questions. Variance ANOVA was used to as follow up test to the MANOVA and conservative Scheffe's F procedure was used to determine post hoc mean comparison.</p>	<p>adding students a general education teachers. Parents felt comfortable, administrator talked more about the students strengths, needs and interests. General educators felt more comfortable expressing what they thought and felt more prepared during the meeting. Other IEP participants indicated that when the student attended they helped less with decision making. When general</p>	<p>roles during the IEP meeting. It can also be helpful to provide the student with skills to actively participate during their IEP meeting. Pre and in-service programs are necessary to help students general educators be more familiar with IEP terminology and process so that they can feel more knowledgeable and prepared when attending IEP meetings. Student's interest are crucial when establishing transition IEP. Class activities, pre-IEP meeting discussions, or other creative means helps discuss transition IEP. Students and general educators must learn how to actively participate during the IEP meetings and participants of IEP treat them equal during the educational planning process.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

				<p>distribute them at the end of the IEP meetings. Researcher made follow ups phone calls or visits to the chairs during each year.</p>		<p>educators attended participants indicated that they would talk more about students strengths needs and interest. They also felt more empowered to make decisions, and felt they had more knowledge and felt better about the meeting. Students reported the lowest scores on 70% of questions. Parents and special educators reported talking more about students interests than</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	---	--

						<p>the students did. General educators scored the lowest on the questions 30%. General educators talked less about students strengths and needs and felt they did not help determine decisions and knew what to do next less than others. They also ranked the lowest in knowing the reason for the meetings, talking at the meetings, understanding what was said, and feeling good about the meetings. Special education</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						teachers lead the meeting and reported talking more during the meeting. Scored the highest scored on all items. They reported knowing what to do at the meeting, talking at the meeting, helping to make decisions and knowing what to do next.	
Cavendish, W., Connor, D. (2018)	Toward Authentic IEP's and Transition Plans: Student, Parent, and Teacher Perspectives	<i>Learning Disability Quarterly</i>	The purpose of this study is to obtain information about high school students with learning disabilities, their parents, and teachers perspectives on malleable	This is a mixed method study. Participants were recruited from a public high school in a large northeastern city. School is located in an urban district. 42 participants participated in the study.	This study utilized quantitative survey data and qualitative interviews. Quantitative analysis included descriptive data scores on both versions of SIS. Variance	General educators indicated general disagreement with the level of school effort to facilitate involvement with a mean score of 61.25. Students in 10 <sup>th</sup> and 11 <sup>th</sup> grade	Findings suggest there continues to be a gap between the intent of the policy and implementation. Student, parents and teachers all suggest that the implementation of the IEP meeting are focused on compliance with the law. Parents all recognized a passive role during the meeting. Students interests and strengths were

			<p>factors in school-based practice that facilitate students and family involvement in educational planning.</p>	<p>16 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade high school students with LD 17 special and general education teachers and 9 parents. 56% Male 44% females All 16 students were receiving special education services under the primary disability category of LD. Once parents consent and students assent forms were received, interview and survey were conducted. All items in the Student Involvement Survey (SIS) were read aloud to students and they recorded their</p>	<p>(ANOVA) was used for group comparisons to determine general and special education teachers, students and teachers. Both versions of SIS survey items were also matched across students and teachers and this determined agreement and disagreement. Interviews were conducted 1:1 students, parent and teacher. Audio files were transcribed after interviews and checked for accuracy. A grounded theory approach was</p>	<p>indicated general agreements with school effort to facilitate involvement with a mean score of 72.40. students and teachers agree that supports discussed in IEP meetings were not provided. Lacking was specific consideration of individual for graduation and college, career process. The school has a policy that if parents did not attend IEP meetings, students did not attend. Few students were</p>	<p>secondary and the main focus was the need to pass high stakes culminating exams. Teachers and students reported low level of agreement to facilitate meaningful student family involvement. Required state test performance was more important than individualized support for graduation. This resulted in lack of time and personal resources in providing supports for career preparation. Best practice suggest transition planning begin at 14. Another challenge was parent student involvement in the meeting. Some of the challenges included work related time constrains. One suggestions include the use of technology for example Skype. . Another challenge was language barrier, jargon heavy language used in meetings. One suggestion for this</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	--	---

				<p>responses.</p>	<p>used to analyze transcripts. Deductive approach was utilized to examine the differences between students, parents and teachers.</p>	<p>included in their IEP meetings. 6 out of 16 reported attending their IEP meeting. Only two stated they felt their opinions were considered. One of the challenges was scheduling meetings in which parents could attend. These challenges include work schedules and transportation issues. Teachers stated that parents did not seem to understand the meeting. Parents indicated language barrier and not taking opinions into</p>	<p>situation is to contract professional translators that are knowledgeable of IEP terminology and are able to better explain terms. This will make parents feel more comfortable. Schools did not invite students if parents were not present. A recommendation would be to use a intentional student directed approach to the development of the IEP. Other suggestions include using a strengths-based approach which can help build relationships upon success in recognizing student abilities. IEP meeting should be co-constructed with student and parent. This approach can help parents and students feel welcomed into school procedures. IEP planning and contacting parents should be part of the protocol of the IEP. Providing pre-IEP</p>
--	--	--	--	-------------------	--	---	---

						consideration. Career preparation was stated to be limited.	documents to parents and student can also help integrate their opinions into the meetings. Educators
Nilsen, S. (2017)	Special Education and General Education- Coordinated or Separated? A study of curriculum planning for pupils with Special Education Needs	<i>International Journal of Inclusive Education</i>	The purpose of this study was to examine special education and general education teachers IEP collaboration, and how they cooperate on planning.	A purposeful selection of teachers in primary and secondary schools from two municipalities participated. Teachers employed in primary school were teaching 11 year old students, and teachers teaching lower secondary taught students in 9 <sup>th</sup> grade. Study included 8 teachers from both primary and secondary level. All teachers had to be working with students with	A qualitative thematic analysis of interviews were conducted. Thematic categories was created using a deductive approach and an inductive approach. No significant difference in results was found between either the two municipalities or the two years covered by the study. However, the same patterns were common. Results were	During the IEP planning making, some teacher stated that at times the class teacher writes the IEP's. Special education teachers often feel completely alone and emphasize on the participation of other teachers. Specials education teacher often have to nag and pressure others teachers to be involved. Special education teacher call for	This study reported lack of teamwork between the special education teacher and general education teacher. special education teachers reported general education teachers rarely being involved when planning for students with disabilities. Special education teachers report general education teachers are rarely involved in formulating IEP's, and have limited knowledge related to the IEP. This results in limited opportunities when planning appropriate programs for students with disabilities. Lack of cooperative curriculum planning risks weakening the opportunities of students

				<p>specific learning difficulties related to reading, writing and mathematics. Teachers selected for interviews were familiar with planning practices for students with learning disabilities at the same school and in the same years. Interviews lasted 1 hour. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.</p>	<p>presented as a whole.</p>	<p>more cooperation in the development of the IEP. Teachers often quickly look over the IEP and say the plan looks okay. Some teachers feel that it is the responsibility of the special education teacher, and they feel special education teachers are in control. Teachers believe that cooperation will facilitate coordination and this will help to include both special education teachers and general educators. Both</p>	<p>with disabilities participating in inclusive settings. Teachers see the value of each other but are unable to make collaboration work. Teachers emphasize that time and team work are key factors.</p> <p>Researchers recommend special education and general education teachers working in collaboration in order to benefit the instruction and supports for students with disabilities. It is crucial that better coordination between special education and general education teacher needs to happen to progress towards more adapted programs and inclusive education. Teachers need to Work together, combine expertise and share responsibilities. Researchers recommend a collaboration approach, and</p>
--	--	--	--	---	------------------------------	---	---

						teachers agree that such cooperation can lead to more structured education plan for students.	co-teaching. Researcher state the importance to further develop collaboration and cooperation between teachers when planning for students with disabilities occurs.
Williams-Diehm, L.,K., Brandes,A., J., Chestnut, W., P, and Haring, A., K. ( 2014).	Student and Parent IEP collaboration: A Comparison Across School Settings	<i>Rural Special Education Quarterly</i>	Examine the participation and involvement of students and parents in IEP meetings from the perspective of the classroom teacher, the direct services provider across three demographic locations (urban, suburban, and rural).	Total of participants 159. 87% female and 13% male. the selection of participants required the following; being employed in a school setting, and participating in the IEP process. Emails were sent and roughly 400 eligible individuals received the invitation to participate. 167 responded to the survey 9 demographic items included	Log-Linear analysis was used in this study. All the resulting cells were categorical.	Rural, suburban, and urban schools were equal in perception for student IEP participation. Parent participation rate was high in all three settings. In the open-ended questions, special education teachers mentioned that "lack of time" was the main barrier to collaboration.	IEP should be a collaborative effort that should include parents and students during decision-making. Yet, collaboration frequently does not occur. Findings in this study did not match the hypothesis parents and student collaboration during IEP would be equally high across all settings.  Researchers conclude the following; Rural setting: veterans teachers participated in this study, which means that communication and supports already existed, and they do anything possible to support

			<p>age, gender, current employment position, total years in educational occupation, total years in currently helping position, highest education level achieved, and school setting. 13 items followed to determine collaboration and opinions from direct service provider teachers. 5 questions relating the number of IEP meetings participation. 8 Likert- scaled questions related to the direct participation in collaboration and participation respecting to</p>		<p>Student IEP collaboration was higher in rural schools than in suburban and urban school settings.</p>	<p>students. Therefore, this may have contributed to high student IEP collaboration.</p> <p>Researchers mentioned that in urban/ suburban schools teacher caseloads change annually, preventing the development of student and family relationships.</p> <p>An educational environment could be included to allow time for multilayered relationships that increase trust between student and families, and this can lead to better collaboration.</p> <p>Collaboration can be implemented through a specific curriculum, modeling, and mentoring. Professional development and ongoing support from the school system are crucial to enhancing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

				<p>students, parents, and outside agencies. Two open-ended questions.</p>			<p>collaboration and teamwork.</p> <p>Pre-service preparation and in-service professional development related to collaboration can help a teacher understand and overcome time and scheduling barriers, implement organized meetings, and support students and IEP members. Implementing strategies to enhance both student and parent collaboration can benefit educational settings.</p> <p>Students must understand their roles, schools can promote self-determination.</p> <p>Schools need to make sure parents are trained in their roles, and informed about activities, to help them understand school collaboration.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	---

